International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies
Volume 1, Issue 4 | ISSN: 3155-6361
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijsis.V1.I4.293

Stories of Planning, Delivering, and Monitoring Aral-Reading Tutorials in SDO Las Piñas: A Narrative Inquiry into Teacher Decision-Making for Learning Recovery

Marie Joy L. Francisco
Master of Arts in Education, Major in Educational Management,
University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Las Piñas City, Metro Manila, Philippines

Email of Corresponding Author: mariejoyfrancisco06@gmail.com

Publication history:
Received: October 15, 2026 Accepted: November 15, 2026
Revised: November 13, 2026 Published: November 16, 2026
International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 1–8, November 2026.

Abstract

This study examined how teacher-tutors in the Schools Division Office of Las Piñas planned, delivered, and monitored ARAL-Reading tutorials for learning recovery. Using qualitative narrative inquiry, eight public elementary school teacher-tutors were selected through purposive maximum variation sampling. Individual narrative interviews and field notes were collected and examined through within-case narrative reconstruction and cross-narrative analysis. Findings revealed a recurring cycle of assessment, planning, instruction, monitoring, and adjustment. Learner performance, confidence, attendance, and participation shaped decisions about pacing, grouping, materials, scaffolding, feedback, and follow-up. Participants also described practical trade-offs arising from workload, limited tutorial time, reporting demands, resource availability, and varying leadership, collaboration, and family support. Although their experiences shared common decision points, teacher-tutors differed in their instructional priorities and responses to school conditions. The study concluded that responsive professional judgment and workable institutional arrangements were central to tutorial implementation. It recommended strengthening assessment-informed planning, accessible instructional resources, simplified monitoring, protected tutorial schedules, professional collaboration, and family participation. The proposed ARAL-Reading Tutorial Support Toolkit should undergo review and pilot testing before broader implementation. Findings were limited to the narrated experiences of eight teacher-tutors in one school division; the study neither directly measured learner achievement nor established causal effects. By documenting how instructional decisions developed within actual school conditions, this inquiry offers contextual guidance for teacher support and educational management. Its contribution aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4, Quality Education, by informing more inclusive and sustainable foundational literacy support. It also highlights the importance of aligning national recovery initiatives with local realities.

Keywords: ARAL-Reading, Instructional Decision-Making, Learning Recovery, Narrative Inquiry, Reading Tutorials, Teacher-Tutors, Tutorial Support

1. Introduction

Learning recovery has become an educational priority following the COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted schooling and intensified existing inequalities in foundational learning. Reading difficulties require particular

attention because inadequate decoding, fluency, and comprehension can affect achievement across learning areas. Addressing these challenges supports inclusive and equitable education and aligns with the Philippine development vision of improving human capabilities and quality of life (Betthäuser et al., 2023; National Economic and Development Authority, 2016; United Nations, n.d.). Structured tutoring has emerged as an important intervention for addressing unfinished learning. Although evidence demonstrates its potential to improve academic achievement, successful implementation depends on instructional alignment, tutor preparation, scheduling, learner participation, and institutional capacity. These conditions emphasize that learning recovery requires sustained instructional and organizational support rather than the mere establishment of tutorial programs (Carbonari et al., 2024; Nickow et al., 2024; Second Congressional Commission on Education, 2025). In the Philippines, the Department of Education established the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program through Department of Education Order No. 018, series of 2025. ARAL-Reading was subsequently prioritized during School Year 2025–2026 to support low-emerging, high-emerging, and frustrated readers. Implementation involved tutor training, learning resources, school readiness, and progress monitoring (Department of Education, 2025a, 2025b, 2026). Within SDO Las Piñas, teacher-tutors translate these policies into instructional decisions involving learner assessment, grouping, pacing, scaffolding, feedback, and follow-up. Planning, delivery, and monitoring are interconnected processes influenced by learner responses, instructional resources, workload, and school conditions. Understanding how teachers negotiate these responsibilities is essential for strengthening reading recovery implementation (Carbonari et al., 2024; Tortorelli et al., 2021).

Learning recovery involves restoring and strengthening competencies affected by interrupted or inadequate learning opportunities. Rather than focusing exclusively on missed lessons, it requires sustained instructional support, attention to learner differences, and school systems capable of responding to unfinished learning. Morse and Nguyen (2025) emphasize recovery as a continuing institutional responsibility, while O'Brien et al. (2023) highlight the importance of coordinated and sustained approaches. Research on structured tutoring establishes its potential to improve foundational learning when instruction is frequent, targeted, and responsive to identified needs. Nickow et al. (2024) demonstrate the general effectiveness of tutoring, while Barnes et al. (2024) emphasize the value of appropriate instructional support in reading interventions. Kortecamp and Peters (2024) further provide evidence of the effects of high-dosage tutoring on the reading achievement of beginning readers. Weiss et al. (2022) and Washburn et al. (2021) similarly identify the importance of structured reading assistance, instructional consistency, and learner-responsive intervention. However, the effectiveness of reading interventions is influenced by implementation conditions. Carbonari et al. (2024) identify challenges involving staffing, scheduling, learner reach, and instructional dosage, while Miles et al. (2022) emphasize the importance of intervention implementation. Hollis and Harkins (2025) and Algee (2025) further illustrate the significance of instructional arrangements and sustained learner support. Teacher decision-making represents another important dimension of reading intervention. Teachers interpret assessment results, determine appropriate instructional strategies, adjust lesson pacing, provide scaffolding, and evaluate learner progress. These judgments are influenced by professional knowledge, learner characteristics, available resources, and organizational expectations. Research emphasizes that instructional responsiveness and professional judgment are essential to effective tutorial delivery (Tortorelli et al., 2021; Zheng & Xiao, 2025). Together, these studies establish that reading recovery depends on the relationship between structured instructional intervention and teachers' capacity to respond to changing learning conditions. Nevertheless, understanding implementation requires examining not only instructional outcomes but also the experiences and decisions of teacher-tutors who deliver the interventions.

Globally, education systems have adopted learning recovery initiatives to address persistent foundational literacy gaps. Structured tutoring has received considerable attention because of its potential to provide individualized support to learners requiring additional instruction. However, differences in staffing, instructional intensity, implementation fidelity, and learner access affect the sustainability of these interventions (Carbonari et al., 2024; Nickow et al., 2024). At the national level, the Philippine Department of Education institutionalized the ARAL Program to provide targeted learning assistance. ARAL-Reading became a priority intervention for learners experiencing significant reading difficulties, emphasizing instructional preparation, tutorial implementation, and progress monitoring (Department of Education, 2025a, 2025b, 2026). Philippine studies have examined remedial reading instruction, individualized intervention, literacy program implementation, and learning recovery activities. These investigations provide evidence concerning instructional practices and program implementation but offer limited narrative accounts of how teacher-tutors make decisions throughout the tutorial process (Cañete & Eswan, 2025; Luana & Siat, 2025; Pelatero, 2024; Tanio, 2025). Within SDO Las Piñas, ARAL-Reading implementation involves teachers working within specific instructional schedules, resource conditions, learner needs, and administrative expectations. Examining their experiences provides localized evidence of how national learning recovery policies are interpreted and implemented in public elementary schools.

The study is anchored in three complementary theoretical lenses: Three-Dimensional Narrative Inquiry Space, Relational Narrative Inquiry, and Thinking with Stories/Restorying. These perspectives explain how teacher experiences unfold across time, relationships, and institutional settings and how their stories can be interpreted while preserving chronology, context, and meaning (Clandinin, 2013; Frank, 2010; Kim, 2016). The Three-Dimensional Narrative Inquiry Space examines experience through temporality, sociality, and place. Temporality considers the development of decisions over time, sociality addresses personal and interpersonal influences, and place recognizes the institutional settings in which experiences occur. These dimensions provide a framework for

understanding how teacher-tutors interpret instructional events, learner responses, and professional responsibilities (Barkhuizen et al., 2024; Clandinin, 2013). Relational Narrative Inquiry emphasizes that participants' stories are shaped through relationships and interactions with researchers. It recognizes the importance of ethical attentiveness, co-construction, and context-sensitive interpretation when examining professional experiences (Kim, 2016; Stephenson et al., 2018). Thinking with Stories/Restorying provides an interpretive approach that preserves the sequence, tensions, and meanings within participants' narratives. Rather than reducing experiences to isolated themes, this perspective enables the reconstruction of coherent accounts that explain how professional decisions develop through significant events (Andrews et al., 2013; Frank, 2010). Conceptually, the study examines three interconnected dimensions of ARAL-Reading implementation: planning, tutorial delivery, and monitoring. Planning involves identifying learner needs, organizing groups, preparing instructional materials, and determining teaching strategies. Delivery includes scaffolding, prompting, feedback, and instructional adjustment. Monitoring involves assessing learner progress, interpreting responses, and determining subsequent instructional actions. These dimensions are influenced by learner participation, instructional resources, workload, school leadership, and system expectations. Their integration provides a contextual framework for understanding teacher decision-making and developing narrative-grounded tutorial support resources.

Existing studies establish the effectiveness of structured tutoring and the importance of responsive instructional practices in learning recovery. Shakeel (2025) found that the effects of high-dosage literacy tutoring differed according to learners' initial achievement levels, underscoring the importance of matching intervention support to learner needs. However, much of the literature emphasizes intervention outcomes, program implementation, and instructional effectiveness rather than teachers' experiences of making decisions during tutorial delivery (Carbonari et al., 2024; Nickow et al., 2024; Tortorelli et al., 2021; Zheng & Xiao, 2025). Narrative research has examined teacher identity, professional development, instructional challenges, and experiences of educational change. These investigations demonstrate how teachers interpret critical events and professional responsibilities but provide limited attention to decision-making within formal reading recovery programs (Atmojo, 2021; Lojdová et al., 2021; Neupane et al., 2022; Zhang & Wu, 2025). In the Philippine context, research on reading interventions has generally employed descriptive, evaluative, and comparative approaches. Although these studies contribute to understanding remedial instruction and literacy improvement, they provide limited evidence concerning how teachers narrate planning, delivery, monitoring, and instructional adjustments within ARAL-Reading (Cañete & Eswan, 2025; Luana & Siat, 2025; Pelatero, 2024; Tanio, 2025). The ARAL Program has been institutionalized as a national learning recovery initiative, but its formal implementation does not fully explain how teacher-tutors interpret learner difficulties, manage instructional trade-offs, and respond to institutional pressures in particular school settings (Department of Education, 2025a). To address these gaps, the present study employs qualitative narrative inquiry to examine the experiences of teacher-tutors in SDO Las Piñas. It focuses on recurring decision points, instructional adjustments, learner responses, practical constraints, institutional supports, and common and contrasting storylines. Through re-storied cases and cross-narrative analysis, the study seeks to generate contextual evidence that can inform tutorial planning, instructional support, monitoring procedures, and division-level implementation.

The study primarily supports Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) by addressing foundational literacy and equitable access to targeted learning interventions. ARAL-Reading provides additional instructional assistance to learners experiencing reading difficulties, while the present research examines the professional decisions and institutional conditions that influence tutorial implementation. Understanding these processes contributes to efforts to improve inclusive educational practices and strengthen learning recovery (United Nations, n.d.). The study also relates to SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) because targeted reading interventions seek to address differences in foundational learning opportunities. Examining how teacher-tutors respond to varying learner needs may inform more equitable instructional planning, assessment, and follow-up practices. Furthermore, SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) is relevant to the collaborative dimensions of ARAL-Reading implementation. Coordination among teacher-tutors, school administrators, division personnel, and families can support instructional continuity, resource availability, and learner monitoring. These educational priorities are consistent with AmBisyon Natin 2040, which recognizes human development and improved quality of life as essential components of long-term national progress (National Economic and Development Authority, 2016).

The study contributes to multidisciplinary sustainability through educational improvement, institutional capacity, policy implementation, and community participation. Its primary contribution concerns educational sustainability, particularly the development of reading recovery practices that respond consistently to learners' needs. From an instructional perspective, the study emphasizes the importance of assessment-informed planning, responsive teaching, progress monitoring, and follow-up support. Understanding how teacher-tutors make and adjust instructional decisions may help strengthen the continuity and relevance of reading interventions. From an institutional sustainability perspective, the study highlights the influence of workload, scheduling, instructional resources, administrative support, and professional collaboration. These conditions are important because sustainable learning recovery depends on organizational arrangements that enable teachers to implement interventions effectively. The study also contributes to policy and governance sustainability by examining how national learning recovery directives are translated into school-level practices. The experiences of teacher-tutors may provide division administrators and program implementers with contextual evidence for refining tutorial

guidance, monitoring procedures, and implementation support. From a socio-economic and community perspective, foundational literacy supports learners continued educational participation and long-term development opportunities. Cooperation among schools, teachers, and families further reinforces the shared responsibility required to sustain reading recovery efforts. Overall, the study establishes the importance of understanding teacher decision-making as a contextual and continuous professional process. By examining the experiences of ARAL-Reading teacher-tutors in SDO Las Piñas, it provides a foundation for strengthening instructional practices, institutional support, and evidence-informed educational management. The resulting narrative insights support the development of an ARAL-Reading tutorial support resource intended to improve planning, delivery, monitoring, and follow-up within sustainable learning recovery programs.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study used qualitative narrative inquiry to understand teacher-tutors' experiences, professional judgments, and instructional decisions within actual school conditions. Qualitative research emphasizes meaning, experience, and processes in natural settings (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), while narrative inquiry examines how individuals construct meaning through stories situated across time, relationships, and contexts (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This approach was appropriate for examining how teacher-tutors interpreted learner needs, made instructional adjustments, responded to challenges, and monitored reading progress. Narrative inquiry preserved the chronology, turning points, and contextual influences shaping tutorial decisions. Clandinin (2022) emphasizes experience as lived and told, while Barkhuizen et al. (2024) highlight the relationship among educational actions, meanings, and contexts. The study therefore examined teacher decision-making as a continuous process rather than isolated instructional behaviors. The research followed an interpretive and relational orientation, recognizing that experiences are shaped by social interactions, institutional settings, and participants' interpretations (Chand, 2024; Wei, 2023; Xu et al., 2024). Participants' accounts were understood as narratives developed through dialogue, requiring reflexivity and careful attention to professional identity and representation (Finlay & dela Cruz, 2023; Weiss & Johnson-Koenke, 2023). The methodology integrated narrative analysis and analysis of narratives to preserve individual stories while identifying patterns across participants. These complementary approaches supported coherent case reconstruction and comparative interpretation (Foxall et al., 2021; Neupane & Gnawali, 2023; Younas & Inayat, 2025). Because narrative inquiry emphasizes meaning and contextual understanding, the study did not seek causal explanations or statistical generalization (Andrews et al., 2013; Kim, 2016).

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in public elementary schools under the Schools Division Office of Las Piñas, Philippines, where ARAL-Reading tutorials were implemented to support learners experiencing reading difficulties. These schools provided the natural setting for examining teacher-tutors' decisions regarding instructional planning, tutorial delivery, learner assessment, and progress monitoring. The research considered tutorial schedules, learner needs, instructional resources, workload, coordination requirements, and institutional expectations as conditions influencing participants' experiences. The locale was treated not merely as a geographical setting but as an integral part of understanding professional decisions. Clandinin (2022) emphasizes the importance of time, relationships, and place in narrative inquiry, while Barkhuizen et al. (2024) recognize the significance of professional settings in interpreting educational experiences.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The participants were eight public elementary school teacher-tutors with direct experience planning, conducting, and monitoring ARAL-Reading tutorials within SDO Las Piñas. They served as the primary narrators of their instructional experiences, including learner assessment, grouping, instructional adjustments, tutorial constraints, progress monitoring, and follow-up decisions. Eligible participants had completed at least one cycle of ARAL-Reading tutorial delivery and were willing to share their experiences through individual narrative interviews. Their firsthand involvement provided detailed accounts of instructional decision-making and the school conditions influencing tutorial implementation.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed purposive sampling using maximum variation as its selection strategy. Eight teacher-tutors were selected to represent differences in school conditions, learner needs, tutorial experiences, and implementation contexts. This approach prioritized information-rich participants capable of providing detailed accounts relevant to the research questions. Creswell and Poth (2018) emphasize the importance of selecting qualitative participants based on their experiences and capacity to provide meaningful information. Participants were required to be public elementary school teacher-tutors within SDO Las Piñas, to have completed at least one ARAL-Reading tutorial cycle, to possess direct experience in planning, delivery, and monitoring, and to provide informed consent. Teachers without direct tutorial involvement, personnel performing exclusively administrative or supervisory duties, and teacher-tutors outside the specified division and school setting were excluded. The

sample size was determined by the study's narrative purpose rather than statistical representativeness. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) emphasize that qualitative sampling prioritizes relevance and experiential richness over statistical sample-size formulas.

2.5 Research Instrument

Individual narrative interviews served as the primary data-generation instrument. The researcher used broad, open-ended conversation prompts encouraging participants to recount specific experiences involving tutorial planning, instructional delivery, learner responses, monitoring practices, turning points, and institutional challenges. Narrative interviewing supported detailed accounts of lived experiences rather than brief or predetermined responses (Wei, 2023). The interviews lasted approximately 60–90 minutes per participant, with follow-up interviews of approximately 20–30 minutes when clarification or additional details were necessary. Open but focused prompts allowed participants to explain important events and professional decisions within their original contexts (Barkhuizen et al., 2024). A brief demographic and contextual profile sheet supplemented the interviews by documenting participants' relevant tutorial circumstances. Researcher field notes recorded situational observations, contextual information, reflections, and preliminary analytic insights. With participants' permission, interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim to preserve their accounts. These materials supported the development of coherent narratives and the movement from field texts to research texts (Clandinin, 2022).

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Before data collection, the researcher secured the necessary institutional permissions from the Schools Division Office of Las Piñas and participating public elementary schools. Eligible teacher-tutors were identified using the established inclusion and exclusion criteria and were invited to participate voluntarily. Informed consent was obtained before conducting the interviews. Data were gathered from July to August 2026 through individual narrative interviews, contextual profile sheets, and researcher field notes. Participants described their experiences in planning, delivering, and monitoring ARAL-Reading tutorials, including significant instructional decisions, learner responses, practical constraints, and institutional supports. The researcher encouraged chronological storytelling through open-ended prompts and conducted follow-up conversations when clarification was needed. Interviews were audio-recorded with permission and transcribed verbatim. Field notes documented contextual observations and researcher reflections to support interpretation. These procedures were consistent with narrative inquiry's emphasis on lived experiences and the careful preservation of participants' accounts (Clandinin, 2022). The resulting field texts were organized for individual narrative reconstruction and cross-case comparison. This combined procedure allowed the researcher to examine both the continuity of individual experiences and recurring patterns across participants' accounts (Kim, 2016; Younas & Inayat, 2025).

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis was conducted in September 2026 using two complementary approaches: narrative analysis for reconstructing individual accounts and analysis of narratives for identifying patterns across participants. The researcher initially examined interview transcripts and field notes through repeated reading to understand chronology, context, instructional decisions, learner responses, turning points, and institutional influences. This process preserved the overall meaning of each account before more detailed interpretation (Clandinin, 2022; Younas & Inayat, 2025). For within-case analysis, the researcher reconstructed participants' experiences into coherent re-storied narratives that retained significant events, contextual details, tensions, and professional meanings. These accounts described how teacher-tutors planned tutorials, selected instructional materials, responded to reading difficulties, adjusted teaching strategies, monitored progress, and addressed practical constraints. Restorying required careful interpretation while maintaining fidelity to participants' original accounts (Foxall et al., 2021; Naicker et al., 2020). Cross-case analysis involved comparing participants' narratives to identify recurring decision points, instructional adjustments, learner responses, institutional supports, constraints, and contrasting experiences. Relevant narrative segments were examined for similarities and differences while retaining their original context and meaning. The analysis emphasized the significance of experiences rather than merely counting recurring topics (Ghanbar et al., 2024; Kim, 2016; Neupane & Gnawali, 2023). The integration of within-case and cross-case analysis produced individual re-storied accounts and broader narrative patterns concerning ARAL-Reading implementation. These approaches provided complementary perspectives on teacher decision-making and supported the development of a narrative-grounded tutorial support resource (Barkhuizen et al., 2024; Kim, 2016).

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical safeguards throughout participant recruitment, data collection, analysis, and reporting. Required institutional permissions and ethical clearance were secured before data gathering. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained after explaining the study's purpose, interview procedures, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality provisions, and participants' right to withdraw without penalty. These safeguards reflected the relational and continuing ethical responsibilities of narrative inquiry (Weiss & Johnson-Koenke, 2023). Participants could decline questions or avoid discussing sensitive professional experiences. Pseudonyms

were assigned, and potentially identifying information, including school names, positions, and specific contextual details, was masked when necessary. Interview recordings, transcripts, field notes, and consent documents were securely maintained with access restricted to authorized research personnel. These procedures supported confidentiality and responsible handling of personal narratives (Finlay & dela Cruz, 2023). The study complied with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173, 2012) by limiting the use of personal information to approved research purposes. Participants were invited to clarify selected narrative details when necessary to reduce factual or contextual misrepresentation. The researcher-maintained responsibility for the final interpretation and avoided sensationalizing or distorting participants' professional experiences (Xu et al., 2024). Research materials were retained according to institutional requirements and subsequently subjected to secure disposal. Any limited use of artificial intelligence-assisted tools for language refinement, organization, or document support was disclosed separately and did not replace the researcher's responsibility for analysis, ethical judgment, or narrative interpretation.

2.9 Trustworthiness and Narrative Truth

Trustworthiness was established through sustained engagement with field texts, reflexivity, participant clarification, contextual grounding, transparent analysis, and careful representation. The study emphasized the credibility and experiential faithfulness of participants' narratives rather than treating their accounts as complete objective records of events. Narrative trustworthiness requires methodological clarity, ethical interpretation, and transparent research procedures (Chand, 2024; Wei, 2023). The researcher repeatedly examined interview transcripts and field notes to preserve the overall meaning of participants' experiences. Reflexive memos documented assumptions, interpretive decisions, and emerging insights concerning reading recovery, teacher responsibilities, and institutional pressures. This process helped identify how the researcher's position could influence interpretation (Finlay & dela Cruz, 2023). When necessary, participants clarified the chronology, meaning, or context of selected experiences. Such clarification supported accurate representation without transferring responsibility for the final analysis to participants. Narrative negotiation was treated as a relational process rather than a mechanical verification procedure (Dubnewick, 2024). Narrative truth was assessed through coherence, contextual grounding, experiential faithfulness, and traceability to the original field texts. The researcher recognized that remembered experiences are shaped by time, relationships, and interpretation (Clandinin, 2022; Weiss & Johnson-Koenke, 2023). An audit trail documented interview records, field notes, reflexive and analytic memos, cross-case categorization, and decisions involved in constructing re-storied accounts. This documentation supported transparency and allowed the development of narrative findings to be traced to the original evidence (Ghanbar et al., 2024). The researcher also preserved uncertainty, contrasting experiences, and unresolved tensions rather than forcing consistency across participants' accounts. These procedures strengthened the credibility, ethical integrity, and contextual relevance of the findings while recognizing the interpretive nature of narrative inquiry (Xu et al., 2024).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Recurring Decision Points and Instructional Adjustments

3.1.1 Assessment-Informed Planning and Learner Grouping

Teacher-tutors consistently described assessment results, previous reading performance, and classroom observations as the basis for identifying learners requiring support. These sources guided decisions about learner grouping, instructional priorities, reading materials, and tutorial pacing. However, participants did not treat initial assessment results as fixed instructions. They revised their plans when actual learner performance differed from earlier expectations. These findings indicate that assessment served as a starting point for instructional judgment rather than a rigid prescription. Planning remained connected to subsequent learner responses and monitoring results. This interpretation is consistent with narrative inquiry's emphasis on understanding professional experiences through changing circumstances and decisions over time, as discussed by Lyons and Scull (2024).

3.1.2 Learner Responses as Instructional Turning Points

Participants reported that hesitation, repeated reading errors, weak comprehension, limited participation, declining attention, and slow mastery frequently prompted instructional adjustments. Conversely, improvements in reading accuracy, confidence, and participation encouraged teachers to introduce more challenging activities or progress to subsequent skills. These turning moments influenced pacing, scaffolding, instructional materials, and the amount of guided practice provided. The findings suggest that effective tutorial decisions emerged through continuous observation and interpretation of learner responses. Instructional turning points connected previous assessment evidence, current learner performance, and anticipated instructional needs. Lyons and Scull (2024) similarly emphasized temporality, relationality, and context in understanding how teachers' professional practices develop through experience.

3.1.3 Instructional Adaptation and Progress Monitoring

Teacher-tutors described modifying instruction through repeated practice, simplified reading materials, additional phonics activities, guided reading, comprehension support, regrouping, and individualized feedback. Monitoring

helped determine whether learners were ready to progress or required further reinforcement. These decisions occurred throughout tutorial implementation rather than exclusively at the end of an instructional cycle. The findings demonstrate that planning, delivery, and monitoring operated as interconnected processes. Monitoring was meaningful when it informed subsequent teaching decisions, while instructional flexibility allowed tutors to respond to emerging learner difficulties. This interpretation supports understanding teacher decision-making as a continuous process shaped by learner evidence and classroom circumstances.

3.2 Learner Responses, Tutorial Constraints, and Practical Trade-Offs

3.2.1 Learner Confidence, Participation, and Reading Progress

Participants described reading improvement through increased willingness to participate, stronger confidence, greater independence, and more consistent engagement with reading activities. Some learners began volunteering to read, attempting difficult tasks, or demonstrating pride in their progress. Nevertheless, other learners continued to experience hesitation, reading difficulties, and inconsistent participation, requiring additional support and encouragement. These findings suggest that teacher-tutors considered both reading performance and learner engagement when evaluating instructional progress. Improvements in confidence and participation influenced teachers' decisions about reinforcement, progression, and follow-up. Such experiences highlight the relational dimension of tutorial work, in which instructional decisions respond to learners' academic and emotional needs.

3.2.2 Attendance, Time, and Resource Constraints

Teacher-tutors identified irregular learner attendance, limited tutorial time, competing teaching responsibilities, insufficient instructional resources, and scheduling difficulties as recurring challenges. Absences interrupted learning continuity and required teachers to revisit previous lessons or reorganize activities. Limited preparation time and materials also affected the extent to which instruction could be individualized. These constraints indicate that instructional responsiveness depended partly on the practical conditions surrounding tutorial implementation. Even when tutors recognized specific learning needs, available time, personnel, and resources influenced their ability to respond. Donegan et al. (2026) similarly identified staffing, funding, and instructional materials as factors affecting the feasibility of intensive interventions. Shmoys et al. (2026) likewise identified scheduling difficulties, tutor quality, and implementation barriers across different school-based tutoring models.

3.2.3 Practical Trade-Offs in Tutorial Delivery

Participants described balancing foundational decoding instruction with comprehension activities, individualized support with group instruction, tutorial continuity with preparation demands, and reading interventions with regular school responsibilities. In some circumstances, tutors prioritized learners with greater reading difficulties or repeated essential skills rather than proceeding with planned activities. These choices reflected competing instructional and organizational demands. The findings reveal that practical trade-offs were not necessarily departures from instructional goals but responses to circumstances in which all competing needs could not be addressed simultaneously. Teacher-tutors adjusted both to learners and to implementation constraints. This reinforces the importance of providing realistic instructional guidance supported by adequate time, resources, and coordination.

3.3 School-Level and System-Level Supports and Pressures

3.3.1 School Leadership and Administrative Support

Participants identified school leadership, scheduling arrangements, resource allocation, coordination, and administrative assistance as important conditions influencing ARAL-Reading implementation. Supportive school leaders helped organize tutorial activities, address scheduling concerns, facilitate communication, and provide instructional resources. Conversely, competing responsibilities and unclear arrangements increased implementation difficulties. These findings suggest that leadership support was most meaningful when it addressed the operational requirements of tutorial delivery. Meyer et al. (2023) similarly found that school leaders could strengthen teacher collaboration by establishing clear goals, involving teachers in decisions, supporting professional teams, and providing encouragement. The findings therefore emphasize the role of school leadership in creating workable conditions for sustained instructional support.

3.3.2 Teacher Collaboration and Professional Support

Several participants described collaboration through Learning Action Cell sessions, shared instructional preparation, exchanges of teaching strategies, discussions of learner progress, and coordination among teacher-tutors. These activities helped participants address instructional difficulties, develop materials, and identify possible responses to learner needs. However, the extent of collaboration varied across their experiences. The findings indicate that professional collaboration helped distribute instructional and organizational responsibilities rather than leaving individual tutors to address every difficulty independently. Meyer et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of leadership-supported collaboration in school improvement, while E et al. (2024) associated professional agency with collaborative learning conditions, reflection, and responsive teaching practices.

3.3.3 Workload, Reporting Requirements, and Institutional Pressures

Participants reported that regular teaching assignments, administrative responsibilities, documentation requirements, tutorial schedules, and monitoring expectations competed for their time. These demands affected lesson preparation, instructional continuity, individualized support, and follow-up activities. Teacher-tutors responded by adjusting schedules, simplifying preparations, sharing responsibilities, or prioritizing urgent instructional needs. These findings demonstrate that tutorial implementation depended not only on teacher competence and commitment but also on institutional arrangements. Donegan et al. (2026) highlighted similar tensions between the perceived usefulness of instructional interventions and their feasibility under actual school conditions. The findings support the need for manageable workload arrangements, clear coordination, and monitoring procedures that assist rather than unnecessarily burden teacher-tutors.

3.4 Common and Contrasting Storylines in ARAL-Reading Implementation

3.4.1 Common Patterns of Teacher Decision-Making

Across the eight narratives, teacher-tutors described a recurring process of assessing learner needs, preparing instruction, conducting tutorials, observing learner responses, monitoring progress, and adjusting subsequent activities. Participants also shared experiences involving learner difficulties, instructional flexibility, limited resources, workload pressures, and the importance of professional support. Their accounts consistently showed that tutorial decisions evolved through repeated interaction with learners and school conditions. These common patterns suggest that ARAL-Reading implementation was a continuous and responsive professional process. Teacher-tutors used evidence, experience, and practical judgment to determine appropriate instructional responses. E et al. (2024) similarly emphasized professional agency through reflective teaching, collaborative practices, and deliberate instructional modification.

3.4.2 Contrasting Experiences and Professional Priorities

Although participants shared common responsibilities, their narratives differed in emphasis. Some focused-on assessment evidence and systematic skill progression, while others highlighted instructional flexibility, learner confidence, attendance, collaboration, coordination, or professional commitment. Differences also emerged in how tutors managed competing responsibilities, interpreted learner progress, and responded to school conditions. These contrasting storylines indicate that teacher decision-making was shaped by individual experiences and contextual circumstances. The differences did not eliminate the shared instructional process but demonstrated multiple ways of implementing it. Narrative inquiry allows these variations to remain visible, preserving the relationships among professional experience, school context, and instructional judgment.

3.4.3 Professional Commitment and Learner-Centered Practice

Participants frequently described persistence, patience, encouragement, and responsiveness as important aspects of tutorial work. They continued supporting learners despite irregular attendance, slow progress, limited resources, and competing responsibilities. Their narratives also highlighted meaningful learner achievements, including greater confidence, willingness to participate, and increasing independence in reading activities. The findings suggest that professional commitment supported tutorial continuity but did not eliminate institutional limitations. Learner-centered instruction required both responsive teaching and workable implementation conditions. The findings therefore distinguish individual professional effort from the broader organizational support necessary to sustain reading recovery initiatives.

3.5 Narrative-Grounded Development of the ARAL-Reading Tutorial Support Resource

3.5.1 Identified Needs for Instructional Decision Support

The narratives identified recurring needs for assessment-informed planning, appropriate reading materials, differentiated instruction, progress monitoring, learner follow-up, and practical responses to reading difficulties. Teacher-tutors also described the importance of clear instructional guidance, accessible resources, collaboration, and manageable documentation procedures. These findings provided the basis for developing a support resource grounded in actual tutorial experiences. Donegan et al. (2026) similarly identified the importance of considering instructional feasibility alongside intervention strategies. Accordingly, the proposed resource addressed both instructional decision-making and the practical conditions affecting implementation.

3.5.2 Proposed ARAL-Reading Tutorial Support Toolkit

Based on the recurring and contrasting narratives, the study proposed the ARAL-Reading Tutorial Support Toolkit: A Decision Guide for Planning, Delivery, Monitoring, and Follow-Up. The proposed resource organized practical guidance around learner assessment, instructional planning, tutorial implementation, progress monitoring, instructional adjustment, and follow-up support. It also reflected participants' experiences with attendance difficulties, resource limitations, coordination needs, and workload pressures. The proposed toolkit translates narrative findings into a practical resource intended to assist teacher-tutors and school implementers. Rather than prescribing one instructional response for every learner, it emphasizes evidence-informed decisions and flexible teaching approaches. Its proposed use recognizes that instructional support must be adaptable to learner needs and actual school conditions.

3.5.3 Implications for Tutorial Implementation

The findings indicated the need for stronger assessment-informed planning, usable instructional materials, simplified monitoring, protected tutorial time, clearer workload arrangements, professional collaboration, and family participation. The proposed toolkit was intended to support these needs through practical guidance for planning, delivery, monitoring, and follow-up. The study did not establish the toolkit's effectiveness through an intervention trial. These implications emphasize that sustainable tutorial implementation requires coordinated instructional and institutional support. Meyer et al. (2023) highlighted the importance of leadership and collaboration, while Donegan et al. (2026) emphasized the feasibility challenges affecting intensive interventions. Together with the participants' narratives, these perspectives support systematic review and pilot testing of the proposed toolkit before wider implementation.

3.6 Integrated Discussion of Teacher Decision-Making for Learning Recovery

The integrated findings revealed that ARAL-Reading teacher-tutors made instructional decisions through an interconnected process of assessment, planning, delivery, monitoring, and adjustment. Learner performance, confidence, participation, and attendance influenced instructional choices, while workload, scheduling, resources, leadership, collaboration, and family support shaped implementation. Although participants shared recurring decision-making processes, their experiences differed according to professional priorities and school circumstances. Overall, the findings indicate that effective tutorial delivery depended on responsive professional judgment supported by workable institutional conditions. Teacher-tutors did not simply implement predetermined instructional activities; they interpreted learner evidence, responded to emerging difficulties, and adjusted their practices within practical limitations. The study consequently provided a narrative-grounded basis for the proposed ARAL-Reading Tutorial Support Toolkit and highlighted the importance of aligning instructional guidance with the actual experiences of teacher-tutors.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concluded that teacher decision-making in ARAL-Reading tutorials was a continuous, responsive, and context-dependent process shaped by learner needs and actual school conditions. Based on the narratives of eight teacher-tutors from public elementary schools in the Schools Division Office of Las Piñas, assessment guided initial planning, while learner performance, confidence, participation, and attendance influenced subsequent instructional adjustments. Teachers modified pacing, materials, grouping, scaffolding, and monitoring practices according to emerging learning needs. However, tutorial implementation was also affected by workload, scheduling, resources, reporting requirements, leadership support, professional collaboration, and family involvement. Although participants shared a recurring cycle of assessment, planning, instruction, monitoring, and adjustment, their experiences reflected different professional priorities and institutional circumstances. Overall, the findings demonstrated that responsive tutorial delivery required professional judgment supported by workable organizational conditions. The study contributed contextual evidence for understanding teacher decision-making and developing a narrative-grounded ARAL-Reading tutorial support resource.

The study recommends strengthening assessment-informed instructional planning, differentiated reading instruction, progress monitoring, and professional collaboration among ARAL-Reading teacher-tutors. School heads and program coordinators should provide accessible reading materials, protect scheduled tutorial periods, clarify tutor assignments, and establish manageable documentation and monitoring procedures. Professional development should focus on phonics, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, learner grouping, and appropriate instructional adjustments based on observed progress. Collaborative case discussions and sharing of instructional resources should be encouraged to address recurring learner difficulties and reduce individual preparation demands. Schools should also strengthen communication with parents or guardians through realistic home-reading activities and attendance support. Division-level implementers should consider adaptable planning and monitoring tools that accommodate different school conditions. The proposed ARAL-Reading Tutorial Support Toolkit should undergo expert review, revision, pilot testing, and usability evaluation before wider implementation. Future research may examine its practical application and potential contributions to tutorial delivery.

The study was limited to eight purposively selected teacher-tutors from public elementary schools in the Schools Division Office of Las Piñas, restricting the transferability of findings to other educational settings. Its qualitative narrative inquiry design relied primarily on participants' retrospective interview accounts and supporting field notes, making interpretations dependent on recalled experiences and contextual perspectives. The investigation did not directly measure learner achievement, establish causal relationships, or evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed toolkit. Consequently, the findings cannot be statistically generalized. Future studies may involve additional school divisions, broader participant groups, direct instructional observations, and systematic evaluation of the proposed resource.

5. Compliance with ethical standards

The study adhered to established ethical research standards by securing institutional permissions and ethical clearance before data collection. Participation was voluntary, with informed consent obtained from all eight teacher-tutors, who were informed of their right to withdraw without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity safeguards were maintained through pseudonyms, the removal of identifying information, and secure data storage in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173, 2012). Participants' dignity, privacy, and professional identities were respected throughout data collection, analysis, and reporting. Research narratives were presented responsibly to prevent misrepresentation, while any artificial intelligence assistance was subject to separate disclosure and researcher oversight.

REFERENCES

Algee, V. (2025). A qualitative study of kindergarten through grade 6 tutors' experiences implementing synchronous, one-on-one online tutoring as literacy intervention. *Online Learning, 29*(2), 188–212. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v29i2.4469

Andrews, M., Squire, C., & Tamboukou, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Doing narrative research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402271

Atmojo, A. E. P. (2021). From a pre-service to an in-service tertiary EFL teacher: An autobiographical narrative inquiry. *EDULANGUE, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.20414/edulangue.v4i2.4159

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2024). *Narrative inquiry in language teaching and learning research* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003356394

Barnes, M. A., Clemens, N. H., Simmons, D., Hall, C., Fogarty, M., Martinez-Lincoln, A., Vaughn, S., Simmons, L., Fall, A.-M., & Roberts, G. (2024). A randomized controlled trial of tutor- and computer-delivered inferential comprehension interventions for middle school students with reading difficulties. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 28*(4), 411–440. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2024.2331517

Betthäuser, B. A., Bach-Mortensen, A. M., & Engzell, P. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence on learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Human Behaviour, 7*(3), 375–385. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01506-4

Cañete, S. M., & Eswan, J. G. (2025). Reading performance of Grade 1 learners: Basis for remedial program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 33*(1), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.330108

Carbonari, M. V., Davison, M., DeArmond, M., Dewey, D., Dizon-Ross, E., Goldhaber, D., Hashim, A. K., Kane, T. J., McEachin, A., Morton, E., Muroga, A., Patterson, T., & Staiger, D. O. (2024). The impact and implementation of academic interventions during COVID-19: Evidence from the road to recovery project. *AERA Open, 10*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584241281286

Chand, G. B. (2024). Narrative inquiry: A critical examination of its theoretical foundations and methodological applications. *Far Western Review, 2*(1), 135–152. https://doi.org/10.3126/fwr.v2i1.70514

Clandinin, D. J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315429618

Clandinin, D. J. (2022). *Engaging in narrative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003240143

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506330204

Department of Education. (2025a, June 13). *Implementing guidelines of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program (DepEd Order No. 018, s. 2025)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/06/13/june-13-2025-do-018-s-2025-implementing-guidelines-of-the-academic-recovery-and-accessible-learning-program/

Department of Education. (2025b, September 13). *DepEd, naglunsad ng ARAL Program para palakasin ang pagbasa at pagkatuto*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/09/13/deped-naglunsad-ng-aral-program-para-palakasin-ang-pagbasa-at-pagkatuto/

Department of Education. (2026, January 7). *DepEd ARAL program, promising ang initial result sa learning recovery; plano pa palakasin sa 2026*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2026/01/07/deped-aral-program-promising-ang-initial-result-sa-learning-recovery-plano-pa-palakasin-sa-2026/

Donegan, R. E., Casale, E. G., & Torelli, J. (2026). Teachers' self-reported knowledge and perceptions of intensive interventions: An initial investigation. *Reading and Writing, 39*(4), 1261–1282. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-025-10650-y

Dubnewick, M. (2024). Exploring the relational commitments of negotiating narrative accounts in narrative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004241295744

E, L., Toom, A., Pietarinen, J., Soini, T., Haverinen, K., & Pyhältö, K. (2024). Professional agency in the classroom and burnout among early career teachers in China. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, Article 1412446. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1412446

Finlay, J., & dela Cruz, A. (2023). Reflexivity and relational spaces: Experiences of conducting a narrative inquiry study with emerging adult women living with chronic pain. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research, 10*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/23333936231190619

Foxall, F., Sundin, D., Towell-Barnard, A., Ewens, B., Kemp, V., & Porock, D. (2021). Revealing meaning from story: The application of narrative inquiry to explore the factors that influence decision-making in relation to the withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment in the intensive care unit. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 20*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211028345

Frank, A. W. (2010). *Letting stories breathe: A socio-narratology*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226260143.001.0001

Ghanbar, H., Cinaglia, C., Randez, R. A., & De Costa, P. I. (2024). *A methodological synthesis of narrative inquiry research in applied linguistics: What's the story? International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 34*(4), 1629–1655. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12591

Hollis, H., & Harkins, M. J. (2025). Exploring the Orton-Gillingham approach to teaching reading from the perspective of tutors at the Scottish Rite Learning Centre for Children - Halifax. *Language and Literacy, 27*(1), 91–110. https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29681

Kim, J.-H. (2016). *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802861

Kortecamp, K., & Peters, M. L. (2024). The impact of a high-dosage tutoring program on reading achievement of beginning readers: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 29*(3), 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2023.2179056

Lojdová, K., Vlčková, K., & Nehyba, J. (2021). Stories of teachers' identity: Between personal and professional experience. *Studia Paedagogica, 26*(2). https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2021-2-6

Luana, M. C. E., & Siat, G. O. (2025). The experiences of learners on the implementation of National Learning Camp (NLC) impacting to their reading performance. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 5*(5), 936–951. https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2025.v05i05.063

Lyons, D., & Scull, J. (2024). Critiquing narrative inquiry's epistemological pillars within a large-scale study into the teaching of phonics. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 47*(2), 114–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2023.2196066

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119003618

Meyer, A., Hartung-Beck, V., Gronostaj, A., Krüger, S., & Richter, D. (2023). How can principal leadership practices promote teacher collaboration and organizational change? A longitudinal multiple case study of three school improvement initiatives. *Journal of Educational Change, 24*, 425–455. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-022-09451-9

Miles, K. P., McFadden, K. E., Colenbrander, D., & Ehri, L. C. (2022). Maximizing access to reading intervention: Comparing small group and one-to-one protocols of Reading Rescue. *Journal of Research in Reading, 45*(3), 299–323. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12383

Morse, T. E., & Nguyen, G.-N. T. (2025). Improving K-12 schooling in response to the COVID-19 pandemic through tutoring: One step forward in addressing an ongoing public health concern. *COVID, 5*(4), 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/covid5040059

Naicker, I., Pillay, D., & Blose, S. (2020). Restorying lived lives in educational research: Storyboarding as a creative space for scholarly thinking in narrative analysis. *Journal of Education, 80*, 126–141. https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i80a07

National Economic and Development Authority. (2016). *AmBisyon Natin 2040: Frequently asked questions*. https://2040.neda.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Ambisyon-FAQ-1.pdf

Neupane, B. P., Gnawali, L., & Kafle, H. R. (2022). Narratives and identities: A critical review of empirical studies from 2004 to 2022. *TEFLIN Journal, 33*(2), 330–348. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i2/330-348

Neupane, B., & Gnawali, L. (2023). Narrative analysis in English language teachers' professional identity research: A review. *Journal of NELTA, 28*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v28i1.61371

Nickow, A., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2024). The promise of tutoring for PreK–12 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *American Educational Research Journal, 61*(1), 74–107. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312231208687

O'Brien, C., Boudah, D. J., Lopuch, J., & Nance, A. (2023). How do we best support adolescents with low academic performance and learning disabilities in the era of pandemic learning loss? The importance of intensive learning strategy interventions. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, Article 1215007. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1215007

Pelatero, L. H. (2024). Project AKAY approach: A reading intervention for non-readers. *Education Reform and Development, 5*(1), 24–33. https://doi.org/10.26689/erd.v5i1.5386

Republic Act No. 10173, Data Privacy Act of 2012. (2012). Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. https://officialgazette.gov.ph/2012/08/15/republic-act-no-10173/

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2025). *Fixing the foundations: A matter of national survival—EDCOM II year two report*. Congress of the Philippines. https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2025/01/EDCOM-2-Year-2-Report-Fixing-the-Foundations-2025.pdf

Shakeel, A. (2025). *Beyond the classroom: Impact of a high-dosage tutoring program on student literacy achievement* (EdWorkingPaper No. 25-1348). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. https://doi.org/10.26300/e6nm-kl21

Shmoys, R. J., McCormick, S. G., Bretas, S. S., Ready, D. D., McCarty, G. A., & Matulewicz, E. (2026). The dosage dilemma: Implementation evidence on the barriers to high-dosage tutoring. *Educational Researcher, 55*(7), 432–441. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X261437761

Stephenson, L., Harold, B., & Badri, R. (2018). *Leading learning: Women making a difference*. Brill Sense. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004372948

Tanio, J. (2025). Implementation of reading literacy programs in selected public secondary schools in the Division of Catanduanes: An analysis. *Pedagogy Review: An International Journal of Educational Theories, Approaches and Strategies, 5*(1), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.5.1.SC-0725-009

Tortorelli, L. S., Lupo, S. M., & Wheatley, B. C. (2021). Examining teacher preparation for code-related reading instruction: An integrated literature review. *Reading Research Quarterly, 56*(S1), S317–S337. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.396

United Nations. (n.d.). *The 17 goals*. https://sdgs.un.org/goals

Washburn, E. K., King, B., & Vintinner, J. (2021). Zooming into summer: Key takeaways from a virtual summer reading intervention. *The Reading Teacher, 74*(6), 775–785. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2000

Wei, L. (2023). Narrative inquiry: A research method in the education field. *World Journal of Education, 13*(6), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v13n6p35

Weiss, C. R., & Johnson-Koenke, R. (2023). Narrative inquiry as a caring and relational research approach: Adopting an evolving paradigm. *Qualitative Health Research, 33*(5), 388–399. https://doi.org/10.1177/10497323231158619

Weiss, Y., Yeatman, J. D., Ender, S., Gijbels, L., Loop, H., Mizrahi, J. C., Woo, B. Y., & Kuhl, P. K. (2022). *Can an online reading camp teach 5-year-old children to read? Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 16*, Article 793213. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.793213

Xu, S., Connelly, M., & Chi, C. (2024). Narrative inquiry in China. *Frontiers in Education, 8*, Article 1327421. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1327421

Younas, A., & Inayat, S. (2025). Choosing an analytical approach in narrative inquiry. *Creative Nursing, 31*(3), 315–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/10784535251360782

Zhang, H., & Wu, X. (2025). A narrative inquiry into the role of emotional experience in novice secondary school English teachers' identity construction. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 35*(3), 1585–1596. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12740

Zheng, L., & Xiao, Y. (2025). Unpacking the influence of teachers' reading instruction strategies on primary school students' reading achievement: Evidence from PIRLS 2021. *Reading Research Quarterly, 60*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.70064