

Original Article

Project Reading Advancement through Practices and the Reading Competence of Grade 7 Learners

Mildred Ñubog^{1,2,*}

Received: 06 July 2026; Revised: 01 September 2026;
Accepted: 03 September 2026; Published: 07 September 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66074/D9M2Z5N1Y>

Abstract

It aimed to address the prevalent reading difficulties among students, particularly those classified at the frustration level on previous assessments. The research employed a mixed-methods design with a pretest-posttest approach, involving 25 respondents identified as struggling readers. Data were gathered using the standardized Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil IRI) to measure reading proficiency and a researcher-made survey to gather insights into students' learning preferences and experiences. Results showed improvements in the learners' performance across the assessed areas, including silent reading, word reading, comprehension, and oral reading accuracy following the implementation of the reading practices. Learners demonstrated improvements in word recognition and oral reading performance, as well as in their ability to process and understand texts. Statistical analysis showed significant differences between the pretest and posttest results; however, because the study did not include a control or comparison group, these differences cannot be attributed conclusively to the reading practices alone. Qualitative findings indicated that learners preferred silent reading because it helped them concentrate, while they also recognized the value of word-reading exercises. Consequently, the program successfully reduced the number of readers at the frustration level and increased the proportion of students reaching instructional and independent reading levels. The study concludes that structured reading practices are a reliable strategy to develop literacy skills. It recommends implementing differentiated and personalized interventions and creating appropriate

¹ San Vicente National High School, Oriental Mindoro, Philippines
² Mindoro State University-Alcate, Victoria, Oriental Mindoro, Philippines
*mildred.nubog@deped.gov.ph

learning materials to sustain progress and address the diverse learning needs of students.

Keywords: comprehension, personalized reading materials, reading advancement, reading practice

1. Introduction

Reading advancement is a continuous and multidimensional process involving the development of learners' decoding, reading fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, reading strategies, engagement, and motivation. These interconnected components help learners progress from basic word recognition toward becoming skilled, confident, and independent readers. The Simple View of Reading provides a theoretical foundation for this process by emphasizing the interaction between decoding and linguistic comprehension in reading comprehension (Sparks, 2021). Research further indicates that decoding accuracy and speed are associated with later reading comprehension, particularly among beginning readers (Kim et al., 2021), while reading fluency contributes to comprehension and provides useful information about learners' reading profiles (Washburn, 2022).

Vocabulary knowledge is another essential component of reading advancement because it enables learners to understand unfamiliar words, connect ideas, and construct meaning from increasingly complex texts. Research has demonstrated a substantial relationship between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension (Zhang & Zhang, 2022). Likewise, integrated literacy and content-area instruction can positively influence both vocabulary and reading comprehension (Hwang et al., 2022). Effective readers also use reading and metacognitive strategies, such as previewing, skimming, scanning, monitoring comprehension, and using context clues. Reading motivation and metacognitive strategies have been found to work together in supporting reading achievement among adolescents (Jang et al., 2023), while learners' proficiency, academic level, and text characteristics may influence their use of reading strategies (Li et al., 2024).

A meta-analysis of 39 intervention studies found that school-based interventions designed to increase reading motivation produced positive effects on both reading motivation and reading comprehension, particularly when interventions stimulated students' interest in reading (van der Sande et al., 2023). Thus, reading advancement should be viewed holistically as the progressive development of interconnected reading skills rather than comprehension alone.

The issue is particularly relevant in the Philippine educational context. The PISA 2022 results showed that the Philippines scored 347 points in reading, considerably below the OECD average of 476. Only approximately 24% of Filipino students reached basic reading proficiency, indicating continuing challenges in reading performance and comprehension. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions and programs that address learning gaps in reading.

At San Vicente National High School, the PHIL-IRI results over the past three years likewise indicate a significant reading difficulty among learners, with approximately 33% of students identified as frustration-level readers. This situation highlights the need to address reading difficulties that may affect learners' academic performance across subjects. Consequently, varied and personalized reading practices that strengthen word recognition, decoding, comprehension, questioning, summarizing, and the use of prior knowledge are necessary to improve learners' reading competence.

Therefore, Project Reading Advancement Through Practices seeks to address the identified reading difficulties of Grade 7 learners at San Vicente National High School. The study aims to determine the effectiveness of reading practices in improving learners' reading competence, particularly their reading skills and comprehension. Through systematic and appropriate reading practices, the study hopes to contribute to the development of more competent, confident, and independent readers.

2. Methodology

The study employed a mixed-method approach using a convergent parallel design, in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem. According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), the purpose of a convergent parallel design is to analyze the quantitative and qualitative strands separately and subsequently integrate their findings during interpretation to determine whether the results converge, complement, or differ from one another. For the quantitative component, the study utilized a single-group pretest-posttest pre-experimental design without a control group. This design involved measuring the reading performance of the same group of participants before and after the intervention to determine whether changes occurred. For the qualitative component, data obtained through semi-structured interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis. Following the qualitative data analysis procedures described by Creswell (2009), the responses were systematically organized, coded, examined, and grouped according to recurring patterns and emerging themes relevant to the participants' experiences.

The respondents consisted of 25 learners selected from a total population of 73 Grade 7 learners enrolled at San Vicente National High School. The reading performance of all 73 learners was initially assessed to identify those reading at or below the expected grade level. Based on the assessment results, 25 learners who

demonstrated difficulties in reading proficiency were identified and purposively selected as participants in the study. The selection focused on learners experiencing difficulties with reading comprehension, decoding, and word recognition, as these learners were considered most relevant to the intervention's purpose. Purposive sampling was therefore employed to deliberately select participants with the characteristics necessary to address the study's objectives.

The study utilized the standardized Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) Graded Passages, particularly Sets A, B, C, and D, as the primary quantitative data-gathering instrument. The assessment included English reading passages accompanied by comprehension questions and was used to assess the learners' word reading, reading comprehension, and overall reading performance. The Phil-IRI Graded Passages were administered as both pretest and posttest measures to determine changes in the participants' reading performance before and after the intervention. A semi-structured interview guide was also used to gather qualitative data concerning the learners' experiences and perceptions. The interview guide underwent content validation prior to its administration to ensure that the questions were clear, relevant, and aligned with the study's objectives. The semi-structured interviews were conducted face-to-face by the researcher with the selected participants, allowing follow-up questions and more detailed responses when necessary.

After data collection was complete, the quantitative data were organized and subjected to appropriate statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participants' pretest and posttest performance, and a paired-samples t-test was used to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed between the mean pretest and posttest scores for the same group of participants. The paired-samples t-test was considered appropriate because the two sets of scores were obtained from the same participants before and after the intervention. The results were used to determine whether the intervention was associated with a measurable change in the respondents' reading performance. The qualitative interview responses were analyzed thematically, and the resulting themes were integrated with the quantitative findings during interpretation in accordance with the convergent mixed-methods design.

3. Results

3.1 Reading Competence of Grade 7 Learners Before the Reading Intervention

Table 1. Pretest comprehension level in silent reading.

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Reading Level
7-8	0	0%	Independent
5-6	1	4%	Instructional
0-4	24	96%	Frustration
Total	25	100%	
Mean	2.48		

The results show that 24 learners (96%) were classified at the frustration level, while only one learner (4%) was at the instructional level. None of the learners reached the independent level. The mean score of 2.48 indicates generally low comprehension performance in silent reading before the intervention.

Table 2. Pretest comprehension level in word reading.

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Reading Level
7-8	0	0%	Independent
5-6	2	8%	Instructional
0-4	23	92%	Frustration
Total	25	100%	
Mean	2.52		

The results indicate that 23 learners (92%) were at the frustration level, while two learners (8%) were at the instructional level. No learner was classified at the independent level. The mean score of 2.52 further indicates low word-reading comprehension prior to the intervention.

Table 3. Pretest oral reading level based on number of miscues.

Number of Miscues	Frequency	Percentage	Oral Reading Level
0-4	0	0%	Independent
5-14	2	8%	Instructional
15-134	23	92%	Frustration
Total	25	100%	
Mean Number of Miscues	32.32		

Most learners, representing 92% of the participants, were classified at the frustration level in oral reading. Only 8% were at the instructional level, while none reached the independent level. The mean of 32.32 miscues indicates considerable difficulty in accurate oral reading before the intervention.

3.2 Reading Competence of Grade 7 Learners After the Reading Intervention

Table 4. Posttest comprehension level in silent reading.

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Reading Level
7-8	5	20%	Independent
5-6	10	40%	Instructional
0-4	10	40%	Frustration
Total	25	100%	
Mean	4.96		

After the intervention, 5 learners (20%) reached the independent level, 10 (40%) were at the instructional level, and 10 (40%) remained at the frustration level. The mean score increased to 4.96, indicating higher silent-reading comprehension than on the pretest.

Table 5. Posttest comprehension level in word reading.

Score	Frequency	Percentage	Reading Level
7-8	3	12%	Independent
5-6	6	24%	Instructional
0-4	16	64%	Frustration
Total	25	100%	
Mean	4.52		

The results show that three learners (12%) reached the independent level, while six learners (24%) were classified at the instructional level. Sixteen learners (64%) remained at the frustration level. The posttest mean of 4.52 was higher than the pretest mean of 2.52, indicating improved word-reading comprehension, although the majority of learners remained in the frustration category.

Table 6. Posttest oral reading level based on number of miscues.

Number of Miscues	Frequency	Percentage	Oral Reading Level
0-4	5	20%	Independent
5-14	6	24%	Instructional
15-134	14	56%	Frustration
Total	25	100%	
Mean Number of Miscues	19.48		

Following the intervention, five learners (20%) reached the independent oral reading level, while six learners (24%) were classified at the instructional level. Fourteen learners (56%) remained at the frustration level. The mean number of miscues decreased from 32.32 in the pretest to 19.48 in the posttest, indicating improved oral reading accuracy.

3.3 Difference Between the Pretest and Posttest Reading Performance

Table 7. Paired-samples t-test of pretest and posttest reading performance.

Reading Measure	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>P</i>	Mean Difference	SE Difference	Effect Size (<i>d</i>)
Silent Reading – Comprehension	8.57	24	< .001	2.48	0.289	1.71
Word Reading – Comprehension	7.95	24	< .001	2.00	0.252	1.59
Word Reading – Oral Reading	12.10	24	< .001	12.84	2.46	2.42

The paired-samples *t*-test revealed statistically significant differences between the pretest and posttest scores across all reading measures. Silent-reading comprehension significantly increased, $t(24) = 8.57, p < .001$, with a mean difference of 2.48 points and a large effect size ($d = 1.71$). Word-reading comprehension also significantly improved, $t(24) = 7.95, p < .001$, with a mean difference of 2.00 points and a large effect size ($d = 1.59$). A statistically significant difference was likewise observed in oral reading performance, $t(24) = 12.10, p < .001$, with a reported mean difference of 12.84 miscues and a large effect size ($d = 2.42$). Overall, the findings indicate significant improvements in the learners' reading performance following exposure to the reading intervention.

3.4 Students' Perceptions of Project Reading Advancement

The qualitative findings revealed that students had varied perceptions of the reading strategies used in Project Reading Advancement. Of the 25 participants, 16 (64%) identified Silent Reading as the more effective strategy, while 9 (36%) preferred Word Reading. The students' responses regarding the effectiveness and limitations of the strategies were organized into themes reflecting their learning environment, preferred mode of learning, need for teacher guidance, reading ability, and engagement with learning activities.

3.4.1 Reasons for Perceiving a Reading Strategy as Less Effective

Theme 1: Noise and Learning Environment

Students identified noise and classroom distractions as factors that interfered with their concentration and comprehension. They explained that difficulty focusing while reading made it harder for them to understand the text. Participants stated:

"I find it difficult when there are many of us reading because it is very noisy."

"Because the noise distracts me, and it is difficult to learn."

*“I am not able to learn because my classmates are noisy.”
and “I was not able to learn because I was distracted by the noise.”*

Theme 2: Preference for Individual Learning

Some students perceived the strategy as less effective when reading was conducted simultaneously with their classmates. They expressed that they were able to concentrate and understand the material better when reading independently. Participants stated:

*“Because reading all at the same time is not effective for me, and I cannot understand what I am reading.”
“I do not learn easily when we read all at the same time.”*

Theme 3: Need for Teacher Guidance

Another theme that emerged was the students’ need for teacher guidance and support. Some learners reported difficulty understanding the reading material when they were expected to read independently without assistance. Participants stated:

*“Ma’am, I do not like reading by myself because I am not able to learn when there is no one to guide me.”
“I am not able to learn when I read by myself; there should be a teacher guiding the student.”*

Theme 4: Limited Reading Skills

Students also identified their limited reading ability as a barrier to benefiting from the reading activities. One participant stated:

*“Because I do not know how to read well, I only know a little.”
“I am not very good at reading.”*

3.4.2 Reasons for Perceiving a Reading Strategy as More Effective

Theme 1: Independent Learning and Improved Focus

Several students preferred independent reading because they believed it allowed them to concentrate better and understand the material more effectively. One participant stated:

“Because I prefer reading by myself since I can focus better on what I am reading and understand it more easily.”

Theme 2: Collaborative Learning

Other students preferred collaborative reading, emphasizing the opportunity to learn from their classmates. One participant stated:

“I prefer reading together with others because I can learn from what others are reading.”

Theme 3: Hands-on Learning

Some students expressed a preference for hands-on learning activities, suggesting that physical interaction with learning materials helped them understand lessons more effectively. One participant stated:

“When I can handle things directly, I learn more.”

Theme 4: Visual and Auditory Support

The final theme involved students’ preference for visual and auditory learning support, particularly activities involving letter-sound relationships. One participant stated:

“It helped when our teacher asked us to read, and we learned the sounds of each letter.”

3.4.3 Overall Perception of Project Reading Advancement

Overall, the qualitative findings demonstrate that students have diverse preferences and learning needs. Although Silent Reading was identified by the majority of students (64%) as the more effective strategy, their responses show that reading effectiveness is influenced by several factors, including the learning environment, opportunities for independent and collaborative learning, teacher guidance, students’ foundational reading skills, and the use of visual, auditory, and hands-on activities. Thus, the findings suggest that Project Reading Advancement may be most effective when reading instruction is flexible and responsive to learners’ different needs and preferences.

4. Intervention plan

To improve the intervention plan, individualized reading plans should be developed to address the specific needs of students, particularly those identified as Frustration Readers, through targeted instruction and support. This is supported by Akyol and Boyaci-Altinay (2019), who emphasized that appropriate teaching methods, techniques, and one-to-one activities effectively improve students' reading difficulties. The study also highlights that early intervention and individualized activities that address learners' diverse needs and learning styles are essential for enhancing reading and comprehension skills.

5. Discussion

The findings demonstrate that Project Reading Advancement, through its reading practices, contributed substantially to improving Grade 7 learners' reading competence. Prior to the intervention, the learners demonstrated considerable reading difficulties. In Silent Reading, 96% were classified as frustration readers and only 4% as instructional readers, with a mean score of 2.48, while no learner reached the independent level. Similarly, in Word Reading, 92% were frustration readers and 8% were instructional readers, with a mean score of 2.52. In oral reading, 92% of the learners were classified as frustration readers, with a mean of 32.32 miscues, indicating difficulties in word recognition, decoding, fluency, and comprehension. These results suggest that the learners entered the intervention with significant gaps in foundational reading skills, supporting the need for systematic and targeted reading practices. This finding is consistent with Steinle et al. (2022), who reported that struggling readers in Grades 6 to 12 commonly exhibit difficulties with reading fluency that require deliberate, structured intervention. Similarly, Sohn et al. (2023), in a meta-analysis involving adolescent learners with reading difficulties, found that targeted reading interventions produced significant positive effects on reading comprehension.

Following exposure to the reading practices, the learners demonstrated noticeable improvement in all areas. In Silent Reading, the mean score increased to 4.96, with 20% of learners reaching the independent level and 40% reaching the instructional level, although 40% remained at the frustration level. In Word Reading comprehension, the mean increased to 4.52, with 12% classified as independent readers and 24% as instructional readers. The improvement was also evident in oral reading, where the percentage of independent readers increased from 0% to 20%, instructional readers from 8% to 24%, while frustration readers decreased from 92% to 56%. Most notably, the mean number of miscues decreased from 32.32 to 19.48, indicating improved word recognition and oral reading performance. These improvements are supported by Washburn (2023), who found that a word-level intervention among adolescents with limited reading proficiency was associated with improvements in word identification and oral reading fluency. Steinle et al. (2022)

likewise reported that fluency interventions, particularly those involving repeated opportunities to read, generally improved the reading fluency of struggling readers in Grades 6 to 12. The decline in miscues observed in the present study may therefore reflect increasing accuracy and automaticity in recognizing and producing words during reading.

The improvement in Silent Reading is likewise supported by literature emphasizing the relationship between silent reading fluency and comprehension. Psyridou et al. (2023), in a longitudinal investigation involving learners from Grades 1 to 9, found that silent reading fluency and reading comprehension were significantly related at the individual level, suggesting that learners who demonstrated stronger skills in one area generally performed better in the other. Moreover, Merke et al. (2024), through a meta-analysis of independent silent reading programs in primary and secondary education, found that instructional additions to independent silent reading produced significant positive effects on reading proficiency, with particularly meaningful benefits for learners at risk of reading failure.

The statistical findings further strengthen the observed improvements. The paired-samples t-test revealed statistically significant differences between the pre-test and post-test results across all reading measures ($p < .001$). Silent Reading obtained $t = 8.57$ and a mean difference of 2.48, while Word Reading in comprehension obtained $t = 7.95$ and a mean difference of 2.00. Word Reading at the Oral Reading Level produced the strongest result, with $t = 12.10$ and a mean reduction of 12.84 miscues. The corresponding effect sizes—1.71 for Silent Reading, 1.59 for Word Reading Comprehension, and 2.42 for Word Reading Oral Reading—indicate very large effects, suggesting that the improvements were not only statistically significant but also educationally meaningful. Among the interventions, Word Reading at the Oral Reading Level appeared to have the greatest impact on learners' reading performance. The overall pattern of improvement is consistent with the meta-analysis of Sohn et al. (2023), which established that reading interventions can significantly improve comprehension outcomes among adolescents with reading difficulties. Peng et al. (2024) further demonstrated that struggling readers benefit from strategically designed comprehension interventions, although no single reading strategy was consistently superior across learners. Their findings highlight the importance of using multiple, appropriately selected reading practices rather than relying on a single strategy when addressing reading difficulties.

The findings also indicate that improvement in reading competence involves interconnected reading processes rather than isolated skills. Word identification and decoding provide a foundation for fluent reading, while fluency allows learners to devote more cognitive resources to understanding a text's meaning. Psyridou et al. (2023) emphasized that word recognition, fluency, and comprehension are related components of reading development, although the strength and direction of these relationships may vary across grade levels. Thus, the improvement in word reading and reduction in oral reading miscues observed in the present study may have supported learners in processing texts more efficiently. At the same time, the continued

presence of learners at the frustration level after the intervention indicates that reading development remains gradual and that some learners may require longer, more intensive, or differently structured interventions.

These quantitative findings are also consistent with the learners' perceptions of the intervention. Silent Reading was preferred by 64% of the learners, compared with 36% who preferred Word Reading. Their responses revealed that quiet learning environments, opportunities for independent reading, teacher guidance, collaborative activities, hands-on experiences, and visual and auditory support influenced how effectively they learned. The learners' preference for Silent Reading may be associated with their ability to concentrate and process texts independently, whereas their responses regarding Word Reading demonstrate the ongoing importance of teacher modeling and support, particularly for learners with limited foundational reading skills. Mealings (2022), in a review of classroom acoustics and literacy outcomes, found that unfavorable classroom noise and acoustic conditions can interfere with reading and other literacy-related learning. This supports the learners' preference for quieter reading conditions, particularly among those who may already require greater concentration when decoding and comprehending texts.

The learners' preference for Silent Reading also corresponds with evidence concerning independent reading. Merke et al. (2024) found that well-supported independent silent reading can positively influence reading proficiency, particularly among students who are at risk of reading difficulties. However, their findings also indicate that merely providing time for silent reading is not always sufficient, as struggling learners may still require appropriate texts and structured support. This is particularly relevant to the present findings because some participants valued independent reading, while others emphasized the importance of teacher guidance. Thus, Silent Reading and teacher-supported Word Reading may serve complementary rather than competing functions. Silent Reading can provide learners with time to concentrate, independently process texts, and develop reading stamina, while guided Word Reading can provide explicit assistance in pronunciation, decoding, word recognition, and corrective feedback.

The importance of teacher support is further reinforced by research on reading comprehension interventions. Peng et al. (2024) found that comprehension outcomes among struggling readers were strengthened when reading strategies were combined appropriately and supported by background knowledge instruction. Their findings suggest that effective reading development depends not only on giving learners opportunities to read but also on helping them understand how to approach, process, and make meaning from texts. For Grade 7 learners who remained at the frustration level, explicit teacher guidance may therefore remain important in addressing specific difficulties that cannot yet be resolved through independent reading alone.

The findings suggest that Project Reading Advancement addressed different but related dimensions of reading competence. The quantitative results demonstrated improvement in silent reading comprehension, word reading comprehension, and oral reading performance, while the learners' perceptions highlighted the importance of

concentration, independence, teacher guidance, and supportive learning conditions. These findings are consistent with contemporary evidence indicating that interventions for struggling adolescent readers are more effective when they address multiple components of reading rather than treating reading difficulty as a single problem (Peng et al., 2024; Sohn et al., 2023). The continued presence of frustration readers after the intervention, however, indicates that reading improvement should be viewed as an ongoing developmental process. Learners who continue to struggle may require sustained, differentiated, and increasingly intensive support based on their specific difficulties in decoding, fluency, word recognition, or comprehension.

Moreover, the qualitative findings revealed that students have varying reading preferences and learning needs. Many participants reported that noise and large-group reading negatively affected their concentration and learning, making it difficult to understand the text. Others expressed challenges with simultaneous reading activities, indicating that they learn better when allowed to read at their own pace. These findings are consistent with Sanders (2020), who reported that learners demonstrated greater engagement and more positive reading experiences when provided with a comfortable, quiet environment for silent reading. Similarly, Liu and Saad (2025) found that independent and extensive reading opportunities improve reading comprehension, reading fluency, and learner motivation by allowing students to engage with texts at their own pace. The findings also highlighted the importance of teacher guidance, as several students felt they could not learn effectively without instructional support. This supports the findings of Fisher, Frey, and Hattie (2016), who emphasized that teacher modeling, explicit instruction, and guided practice significantly enhance learning outcomes. Likewise, Wanzek et al. (2016) found that struggling readers benefit from intensive and scaffolded reading interventions that provide continuous feedback and instructional support.

On the other hand, some students preferred independent reading because it enabled them to focus better and improve comprehension, while others favored group reading because it allowed them to learn from their peers. The findings further emphasized the value of hands-on experiences and teacher-led phonics instruction in enhancing learning. These results are supported by Murphy et al. (2017), who found that collaborative learning and peer-assisted reading activities positively influence reading achievement and learner engagement through social interaction and shared meaning-making. Furthermore, Castles et al. (2018) emphasized that systematic phonics instruction remains a critical component of effective reading instruction because it strengthens word recognition and decoding skills. Similarly, Ehri (2020) explained that phonics knowledge enables learners to form strong connections between letters and sounds, thereby improving reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Overall, the results suggest that effective reading instruction should accommodate diverse learner preferences through differentiated, supportive, and engaging teaching strategies that promote literacy development.

5. Conclusion

The study revealed that Grade 7 learners experienced significant challenges in reading comprehension and oral reading, as evidenced by the high number of learners classified as frustration readers. Following the implementation of the reading practices, notable improvements were observed in learners' reading performance. The posttest results showed higher comprehension scores, an increase in the number of instructional and independent readers, and a substantial decrease in oral reading miscues. Furthermore, statistical analysis revealed significant differences between the pretest and posttest scores across all reading strategies, indicating that learners performed significantly better after participating in the reading activities. The computed effect sizes also indicated substantial improvements in reading competence, with Cohen's *d* values of 1.71 for Silent Reading, 1.59 for Word Reading (Comprehension Level), and 2.42 for Word Reading (Oral Reading Level), the latter showing the greatest improvement. However, because the study employed a one-group pretest-posttest design without a control or comparison group, the observed differences between pretest and posttest results indicate that learners' reading performance improved after the implementation of the reading practices. Although the statistical results showed significant differences between the pretest and posttest scores, these findings should not be interpreted as conclusive evidence that the interventions alone caused the observed improvements. Other factors that may have influenced learners' performance over time cannot be completely ruled out. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that the reading practices were associated with improvements in learners' reading comprehension, word recognition, and oral reading performance. In addition, respondents showed a strong preference for silent reading, highlighting the importance of providing opportunities for independent reading while maintaining appropriate teacher guidance and support. Therefore, teachers are encouraged to foster collaborative learning through group activities and peer-assisted learning and to undergo relevant training to facilitate these approaches effectively. Based on the findings, the development and implementation of an intervention plan to improve reading and comprehension skills among struggling readers are highly recommended.

Acknowledgment

The researcher sincerely expresses her heartfelt gratitude to all those who contributed to the successful completion of this study. She is especially thankful to Dr. Marinel V. Burgos, her adviser, for her invaluable guidance, encouragement, and support; Anna Liza A. Vitto, her method specialist, for her expertise in statistical analysis; and Dr. Alice R. Ramos, Dean of Graduate Studies, for her valuable recommendations and support. Above all, the researcher offers her deepest gratitude

to Almighty God for His guidance, strength, wisdom, and countless blessings that made the completion of this study possible.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares that she has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

References

- Akyol, H., & Boyaci-Altinay, Y. (2019). Reading difficulty and its remediation: A case study. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(4), 1269–1286. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.8.4.1269>
- Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 19(1), 5–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://archive.org/details/isbn_9781452228372
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/designing-and-conducting-mixed-methods-research/book241842>
- Ehri, L. C. (2020). The science of learning to read words: A case for systematic phonics instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S45–S60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.334>
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Hattie, J. (2016). *Visible learning for literacy, Grades K–12: Implementing the practices that work best to accelerate student learning*. Corwin Press.
- Hwang, H., Cabell, S. Q., & Joyner, R. E. (2022). Effects of integrated literacy and content-area instruction on vocabulary and comprehension in the elementary years: A meta-analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 26(3), 223–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2021.1954005>
- Jang, E., Seo, Y. S., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (2023). Building academic resilience in literacy: Digital reading practices and motivational and cognitive engagement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 58(1), 160–176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.486>
- Kim, Y.-S. G., Quinn, J. M., & Petscher, Y. (2021). What is text reading fluency and is it a predictor or an outcome of reading comprehension? A longitudinal investigation. *Developmental Psychology*, 57(5), 718–732. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001167>
- Li, X., Ahmad, N. K., & Jamil, H. B. (2024). Factors influencing EFL/ESL students' use of reading strategies: A systematic review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(11), 89–112. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.11.5>

- Liu, S., & Saad, M. R. B. M. (2025). Role of extensive reading in vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and reading speed: A systematic literature review. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.11108>
- Mealings, K. (2022). The effect of classroom acoustic conditions on literacy outcomes for children in primary school: A review. *Building Acoustics*, 29(1), 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1351010X211057331>
- Merke, S., Ganushchak, L., & van Steensel, R. (2024). Effects of additions to independent silent reading on students' reading proficiency, motivation, and behavior: Results of a meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 42, 100572. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100572>
- Murphy, P. K., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Soter, A. O., Hennessey, M. N., & Alexander, J. F. (2009). Examining the effects of classroom discussion on students' comprehension of text: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 740–764. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015576>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *PISA 2022 results: Country note – Philippines*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/philippines_a0882a2d-en.html
- Peng, P., Wang, W., Filderman, M. J., Zhang, W., & Lin, L. (2024). The active ingredient in reading comprehension strategy intervention for struggling readers: A Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 94(2), 228–267. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231171345>
- Psyridou, M., Tolvanen, A., Niemi, P., Lerkkanen, M.-K., Poikkeus, A.-M., & Torppa, M. (2023). Development of silent reading fluency and reading comprehension across grades 1 to 9: Unidirectional or bidirectional effects between the two skills? *Reading and Writing*, 36, 1969–1996. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10371-6>
- Sanders, J. R. (2020). *The use of silent reading in the classroom* [Master's thesis, California State University San Marcos]. <https://scholarworks.calstate.edu/downloads/4t64gs89j>
- Sohn, H., Acosta, K., Brownell, M. T., Gage, N. A., Tompson, E., & Pudvah, C. (2023). A meta-analysis of interventions to improve reading comprehension outcomes for adolescents with reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 38(2), 85–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12307>
- Sparks, R. L. (2021). Identification and characteristics of strong, average, and weak foreign language readers: The Simple View of Reading model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 105(2), 507–525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12711>
- Steinle, P. K., Stevens, E., & Vaughn, S. (2022). Fluency interventions for struggling readers in Grades 6 to 12: A research synthesis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 55(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219421991249>
- van der Sande, L., van Steensel, R., Fikrat-Wevers, S., & Arends, L. (2023). Effectiveness of interventions that foster reading motivation: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, Article 21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09719-3>

- Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Scammacca, N., Gatlin, B., Walker, M. A., & Capin, P. (2016). Meta-analyses of the effects of Tier 2 type reading interventions in grades K–3. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 551–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9321-7>
- Washburn, J. (2022). Reviewing evidence on the relations between oral reading fluency and reading comprehension for adolescents. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 55(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194211045122>
- Washburn, J. (2023). Monitoring reading component skills during a word-level intervention for adolescents with limited reading proficiency. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 38(2), 155–172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12308>
- Zhang, S., & Zhang, X. (2022). The relationship between vocabulary knowledge and L2 reading/listening comprehension: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(4), 696–725. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820913998>

Author Contributions: Ñubog, M.; Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, manuscript preparation, review, and editing. The author has read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agrees to be accountable for all aspects of the work.