WJSAM | World Journal of Sustainable Advances in Multidisciplinarity
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INTERDISCIPLINARITY | SUSTAINABILITY
Volume 1, Issue 2 | ISSN: 3155-783X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/wjsam.V1.I2.37

Learners' English Literacy Difficulties and Teachers' Intervention Challenges at Peña Integrated School: Basis for School-Wide Literacy Support Measures

Rolenay P. Vendero
Peña Integrated School, Peña Island, Cawayan, Masbate, Philippines

Email: rolenayvendero07@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the perceived level of learners' English literacy difficulties, the degree of teachers' intervention challenges, and the need for school-wide literacy support measures at Peña Integrated School in Cawayan West District, Masbate. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was employed, involving 30 teachers selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. Findings revealed low perceived difficulties in reading and comprehension (M = 2.66), spelling (M = 2.38), and retention of learned literacy skills (M = 2.55). However, allocating intervention time (M = 3.33) and delivering differentiated instruction (M = 3.29) emerged as major challenges. The study reported a strong positive correlation between perceived literacy difficulties and intervention challenges (r = .802), with its inferential interpretation subject to confirmation using matched teacher-level scores. The proposed school-wide literacy support measures were rated highly needed (M = 3.48), particularly practical differentiation training and designated preparation time. The findings indicated that school-wide literacy support planning should address instructional and organizational challenges alongside teachers' perceptions of learners' literacy difficulties. Establishing structured intervention schedules, strengthening teacher professional development, and improving instructional resources were recommended. The study was limited to one school, teacher-reported perceptions, and a correlation result requiring confirmation through paired teacher-level analysis. Nevertheless, it provided a context-specific foundation for coordinated literacy intervention planning and evidence-informed school improvement initiatives.

Keywords: *Differentiated Instruction, English Literacy, Intervention Challenges, Literacy Difficulties, School-Wide Support, Teacher Perceptions*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Context of the Study

English literacy enables learners to interpret written information, communicate ideas, and participate independently in classroom activities. Its development involves several interconnected competencies, including accurate word reading, comprehension of connected texts, spelling, and retention of previously acquired knowledge. These competencies require distinct instructional responses because the ability to recognize printed words does not necessarily indicate that learners understand what they read. Filderman et al. (2022) reported positive effects of reading comprehension interventions among struggling readers, supporting attention to comprehension strategies and relevant background knowledge. Similarly, Petersen-Brown and Kromminga (2024) found that spelling instruction improved performance, although gains were more evident for taught words than for unfamiliar words. The continued application of literacy skills also depends on opportunities to retrieve and reinforce earlier learning. Agarwal et al. (2021) established that retrieval practice generally benefited learning in educational settings, while Kim and Webb (2022) found advantages of spaced practice for second-language learning, particularly on delayed assessments. These findings supported consideration of reading, spelling, and retention as separate but related dimensions of English literacy. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (2025) issued implementing guidelines for the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program, underscoring the national priority assigned to learning recovery and instructional assistance. Peña Integrated School, located in Cawayan West District, Cawayan, Masbate, serves an island community and expanded its secondary grade-level provision in 2023 and 2024. Within this setting, school-specific information was needed to understand teachers' perceptions of learners' English literacy difficulties and the challenges encountered in providing interventions. Such information could inform the prioritization of appropriate materials, instructional assistance, intervention schedules, and coordination with families.

1.2. Research Problem

Foundational English literacy difficulties remain a concern when learners advance through grade levels without consistently demonstrating the skills expected in reading and writing. Using nationally representative Philippine household survey data, Igarashi and Suryadarma (2023) found that some learners in higher grade levels had not mastered foundational skills generally expected by Grade 3. This finding emphasized the importance of identifying particular literacy needs instead of assuming mastery based solely on grade placement. In a Philippine study of elementary teachers, Lu (2022) identified instructional challenges involving word and sound recognition, attention to learners' differing needs, and insufficient reading materials. The difficulty of providing suitable intervention extends beyond identifying learners who need assistance. Abril et al. (2022) discussed implementation concerns associated with the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory, including instructional workload, time, and resources. Barrett-Tatum et al. (2023) also documented how teachers perceived personnel arrangements, organizational structures, and financial conditions as factors affecting literacy instruction. At Peña Integrated School, the specific levels of English literacy difficulties perceived by teachers, the degree of their intervention challenges, and the relationship between these variables warranted examination. These considerations highlighted the importance of examining school-specific literacy difficulties and intervention challenges to inform coordinated literacy support.

1.3. Research Gap

Existing research has examined components of literacy instruction and the conditions influencing intervention delivery. Petersen-Brown and Kromminga (2024) synthesized findings on spelling instruction, whereas Barrett-Tatum et al. (2023) explored organizational supports and barriers perceived by teachers. Dahl-Leonard et al. (2025) additionally reported positive literacy

outcomes from family-implemented interventions, while identifying limitations in the available research concerning older learners. Although these studies inform particular aspects of literacy support, they do not provide a combined account of teachers' assessments of reading and comprehension, spelling, and retention alongside the challenges of delivering interventions at Peña Integrated School. The contextual gap therefore concerned the relationship between these teacher-perceived literacy difficulties and six intervention conditions: identifying needs, differentiating instruction, accessing materials, allocating time, monitoring progress, and obtaining parental support. The study addressed this gap by examining these variables together and assessing the need for school-wide literacy support measures appropriate to the participating teachers' reported circumstances, without evaluating the measures' effectiveness.

1.4. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to determine the perceived level of learners' English literacy difficulties and the degree of teachers' intervention challenges at Peña Integrated School in Cawayan West District, Masbate. It described the profiles of 30 teacher-respondents according to age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and grade level handled. It assessed perceived difficulties in reading and comprehension, spelling, and retention of learned literacy knowledge and skills. It also examined challenges involving needs identification, differentiated instruction, appropriate materials, intervention time, progress monitoring, and parental involvement. Finally, it investigated the significance of the relationship between the two principal variables and assessed teachers' perceived need for ten suggested school-wide literacy support measures.

1.5. Significance and Practical Contribution of the Study

The study provided school-specific information that may guide instructional planning and decisions about English literacy assistance. Teachers may use the identified areas of difficulty to reflect on their instructional priorities, while school heads may consider the reported challenges when organizing professional development, preparing appropriate materials, scheduling interventions, and coordinating progress monitoring. Findings concerning parental involvement may also inform communication and practical home-learning guidance. The assessment of ten suggested school-wide literacy support measures offers a basis for prioritizing actions responsive to teachers' experiences within Peña Integrated School. District supervisors may draw on these findings when considering technical assistance, and future researchers may extend the investigation through direct literacy assessments or evaluations of implemented support measures.

1.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Alignment

The study aligned directly with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4: Quality Education, which emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education and effective learning opportunities (United Nations, 2026). Its focus on perceived difficulties in reading, comprehension, spelling, and retention related to the goal's concern for meaningful learning outcomes. Examining teachers' intervention challenges also highlighted conditions relevant to the provision of educational assistance, including access to materials, instructional time, progress monitoring, and cooperation with families. By identifying teachers' perceived priorities for school-wide support, the study offered contextual information for educational planning in an island-community school. Accordingly, the study contributed to SDG 4 by providing school-specific information on perceived literacy needs, instructional challenges, and proposed support measures to inform educational planning.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to examine teachers' perceptions of learners' English literacy difficulties and challenges in implementing literacy interventions. The descriptive component summarized respondents' profiles, perceived difficulties in reading and comprehension, spelling, and retention, intervention challenges, and the need for school-wide literacy support. The correlational component examined the relationship between perceived literacy difficulties and intervention challenges. This approach was consistent with quantitative survey research (Creswell & Creswell, 2023; Goodfellow, 2023). Learners' English literacy difficulties were examined through teachers' reported perceptions rather than direct assessments of learner performance.

2.2. Research Locale, Population, and Participants or Respondents

Conducted at Peña Integrated School, the study involved thirty (30) teachers experienced in observing learners' English literacy difficulties and implementing interventions. Respondents were described by age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and grade level handled. These characteristics contextualized teachers' ratings of learning difficulties, intervention challenges, and proposed support measures. The investigation was confined to teacher-reported assessments within the school and did not include direct testing of learners. The respondents comprised the identified eligible teacher population.

2.3. Sampling Technique and Sample Determination

Total enumeration was employed, with all thirty (30) eligible teachers invited rather than selected through probability sampling. No sample-size computation was therefore required. This approach enabled the researcher to obtain perspectives across the school's identified teacher population without selecting a subset. Participation was voluntary, and the final reported group consisted of thirty (30) teacher-respondents.

2.4. Research Instrument and Validation

Data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire aligned with the research questions (Ranganathan & Caduff, 2023). Its profile section covered age, sex, educational attainment, teaching experience, and grade level. Literacy-difficulty items addressed reading and comprehension, spelling, and retention, rated from 4 (Very High Difficulty) to 1 (Very Low Difficulty). Intervention-challenge indicators covered identifying needs, differentiated instruction, materials, intervention time, progress monitoring, and parental support, rated from 4 (Major Challenge) to 1 (Not a Challenge). Suggested school-wide support measures covered teacher training, materials, schedules, monitoring, parental involvement, and literacy activities; these were rated from 4 (Highly Needed) to 1 (Not Needed). Qualified validators reviewed item clarity, relevance, and appropriateness, and their comments informed revisions. Pilot-test responses from comparable teachers outside the study were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha for relevant subscales, guiding refinement (Kishore et al., 2021; Ranganathan et al., 2024).

2.5. Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher prepared and presented the proposal during the pre-oral defense and incorporated panel comments. Permission to conduct the study was sought from the appropriate Schools Division Office and the school head. Upon approval, the study's purpose was explained to eligible teachers, who were invited to participate. Questionnaires were distributed and retrieved after completion. Responses were checked, organized, and encoded for statistical analysis. The organized responses were subjected to statistical analysis, and the resulting findings provided the basis for interpreting literacy difficulties, intervention challenges, and proposed school-wide support measures.

2.6. Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Frequency counts and percentages described respondent profiles. Weighted means summarized perceived literacy difficulties, intervention challenges, and the need for school-wide support measures. Spearman's rank-order correlation examined the relationship between each teacher's overall literacy-difficulty score and corresponding intervention-challenge score at the 0.05 significance level (Yu & Hutson, 2024). Average ranks were assigned when ties occurred. Support measures were ordered by weighted mean, and measures with equal means received equal ranks. Cronbach's alpha assessed pilot-test internal consistency separately for the relevant questionnaire subscales (Xiao et al., 2024).

2.7. Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary. Teachers were informed of the study's purpose and their right to leave questions unanswered or withdraw without penalty. Their responses were treated confidentially and used solely for research purposes. Permission to conduct the study was sought from the appropriate Schools Division Office and the school head before data collection. These measures protected the respondents' choices and privacy while gathering their professional observations of learners' literacy difficulties and classroom intervention challenges.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Teacher-Respondents

The demographic profile provided a context for interpreting whose experiences were represented in the responses. The five characteristics reported were age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and grade level handled. Of the 30 respondents, 19 (63.33%) were 21–30 years old and eight (26.67%) were 31–40 years old, indicating that 27 teachers (90.00%) were aged 40 or younger. Two respondents (6.67%) were aged 61 years and above, one (3.33%) was aged 41–50 years, and none was aged 51–60 years. The findings consequently reflected the views of a predominantly younger group of teachers. However, the age profile did not establish differences in literacy assessments or intervention practices across age groups. The Australian Education Research Organisation (2024) recommended screening and diagnostic reading assessments to clarify learners' needs, while Sinsay-Villanueva and Orbeta (2023) emphasized professional development responsive to teachers' needs. These sources support interpreting the demographic information as respondent context rather than direct evidence of learners' literacy proficiency or the effectiveness of intervention practices.

The group consisted of 27 female teachers (90.00%) and three male teachers (10.00%). As a result, the aggregate findings primarily reflected female respondents' experiences, although both sexes were represented. The distribution described sample composition only and did not support inferences about sex-based differences in reported challenges.

Seventeen teachers (56.67%) held a bachelor's degree, and 11 (36.67%) had completed bachelor's degrees with master's units. One respondent (3.33%) held a master's degree, another (3.33%) held a master's degree with doctoral units, and none had completed a doctorate. The presence of teachers who had undertaken graduate studies indicated variation in formal educational preparation, but the available results did not link qualifications to particular intervention outcomes. Sinsay-Villanueva and Orbeta (2023) advocated linking preservice preparation with responsive professional development; Ancheta (2022) described concerns

related to teacher training and integrating reading instruction into subject teaching. These references support examining professional learning needs alongside educational attainment.

Most respondents had taught for five years or fewer (19 teachers, 63.33%). Six (20.00%) reported six to ten years of experience, three (10.00%) had 16–20 years, and two (6.67%) had 11–15 years. No teacher reported 21 years or more of service. The dominance of early-career teachers was relevant to the planning of collaborative support and mentoring, although experience-related differences were not tested in the reported findings. Robertson (2024) discussed teaching experience and educational attainment in relation to differentiated instruction, whereas Clark (2022) described how collaborative planning supported confidence among classroom teachers and reading interventionists.

The respondents handled grade levels from Kindergarten through Grade 12. Grades 4, 5, and 8 had the largest representation, with four teachers (13.33%) each, followed by Grade 2 with three (10.00%). Grades 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, and 11 were represented by two teachers (6.67%) each, while Kindergarten and Grades 9 and 12 had one (3.33%) each. This distribution brought perspectives from early literacy instruction and later subject-based learning contexts into the study. Seamer (2023) discussed explicit and systematic instruction in the early primary years, while Wetherington (2022) identified professional development needs associated with literacy instruction in middle school subjects. Overall, the profile established the respondent context without implying statistically demonstrated demographic differences.

3.2. Perceived Difficulties in Reading and Comprehension

The first literacy domain addressed teachers' assessments of learners' ability to recognize words, read sentences fluently, identify central ideas, and draw conclusions from English texts. The four indicators were interpreted using the descriptive categories reported in the study. Reading and comprehension obtained a grand mean of 2.66, interpreted as Low Difficulty. Reading sentences smoothly and with appropriate phrasing was the highest-rated difficulty (M = 2.70). Reading grade-appropriate words accurately and answering questions that required conclusions both received M = 2.67, whereas identifying the main idea and supporting details received the lowest rating (M = 2.60). All indicators remained within the same descriptive category. The pattern indicated that sentence-level fluency warranted somewhat more attention than the other assessed reading tasks, but the narrow range of ratings did not imply major differences in severity. Murphy and Arciuli (2024) reviewed reading-comprehension instruction among school-aged learners of English as an additional language, highlighting the importance of comprehension-focused teaching. Heguerra and Cacho (2022) documented a Philippine school-based intervention that concentrated on word reading while giving relatively less attention to comprehension. Together, these sources indicate that fluent reading and comprehension deserve distinct but complementary instructional attention. The findings support retaining opportunities for guided fluent reading while attending to meaning-making tasks; they do not, by themselves, establish the learners' actual assessed proficiency.

3.3. Perceived Difficulties in English Spelling

The second literacy domain concerned sound-letter correspondence, completeness of word forms, correct letter sequencing, and the application of spelling patterns. The spelling grand mean was 2.38, interpreted as Low Difficulty. Including all required letters in English words received the highest mean (M = 2.47), followed by applying taught spelling patterns (M = 2.43) and

arranging letters in the correct order (M = 2.40). Selecting letters that correspond to English speech sounds obtained the lowest mean (M = 2.23). Although each item fell within the Low Difficulty category, respondents perceived the completeness of written word forms and application of learned patterns as relatively more challenging than basic sound-letter selection. Treiman et al. (2022) examined early spelling patterns and their connections with later reading and spelling performance. Siguan (2025) described elementary teachers' observations of errors involving letter sequence, reversals, and sound confusion in Eastern Samar. These sources help contextualize the school's reported spelling concerns. The results suggest that meaningful spelling exercises could emphasize writing complete words, applying taught patterns, and reviewing common errors rather than assuming that a single spelling subskill accounts for all observed difficulties.

3.4. Perceived Difficulties in Retaining Learned Literacy Skills

Retention was assessed through the recall of word recognition, word meaning, spelling, and previously used reading strategies. The grand mean of 2.55 was interpreted as Low Difficulty. Recalling the meanings of previously understood English words received the highest mean (M = 2.73), followed by spelling words previously spelled correctly (M = 2.53). Recognizing previously read words and applying previously used reading strategies were both rated M = 2.47. The pattern identified vocabulary-meaning recall as the most prominent retention concern among the four indicators, despite the uniformly low descriptive classification. Perry et al. (2021) reviewed classroom applications of cognitive-science approaches, including spacing and retrieval practice. Kim and Webb (2023) found that spaced vocabulary practice supported delayed learning outcomes among learners of English as a second language. Because the present respondents rated recall of word meanings as the greater difficulty, the findings support checking both vocabulary form and meaning over time. Brief, repeated vocabulary activities may therefore be a relevant component of school-wide literacy support, subject to evaluation within the school.

3.5. Challenges in Identifying Learners' Literacy Needs

The first dimension of intervention challenges addressed opportunities for individual assessment, access to literacy screening tools, and interpretation of literacy errors. Identifying learners' literacy needs obtained a grand mean of 2.92, described as a Moderate Challenge. Limited opportunities to work individually with learners received the highest mean (M = 3.27) and was rated a Major Challenge. Difficulty interpreting learners' literacy errors (M = 2.77) and limited access to suitable screening tools (M = 2.73) were both rated Moderate Challenges. This distinction showed that the perceived constraint was most acute in the time and opportunity available for individual assessment, rather than solely in the availability of screening resources. The Australian Education Research Organisation (2024) differentiated the purposes of screening, diagnostic assessment, and progress monitoring. Abril et al. (2022) discussed the use of Philippine Informal Reading Inventory results in planning interventions and noted limitations related to time, workload, and resources. Consistent with these perspectives, the school's results support protecting opportunities for individual assessment, clarifying how observed errors guide intervention priorities, and improving access to suitable assessment materials. The findings identified assessment-related barriers perceived by teachers and highlighted areas requiring additional instructional support.

3.6. Challenges in Delivering Differentiated Literacy Instruction

The second intervention dimension examined teachers' capacity to adapt literacy activities for different skill levels and respond to learners requiring additional assistance. Differentiated instruction obtained a grand mean of 3.29, interpreted as a Major Challenge. Differences in learners' literacy skills made adapting activities difficult (M = 3.40), representing the highest rating within the dimension. The number of learners needing support also posed a Major Challenge (M = 3.33). Limited knowledge of alternative teaching strategies was rated a Moderate Challenge (M = 3.13). The results showed that responding to variation among learners and providing individualized support were more prominent concerns than the reported breadth of teachers' instructional strategies. Ariyani (2024) described formative assessment, scaffolding, and tiered tasks as differentiated reading-comprehension practices. McLemore (2023) found that reading teachers identified additional personnel, focused professional development, and protected instructional planning time as supports for differentiated reading instruction. These findings are consistent with the respondents' emphasis on instructional adaptation and individualized assistance. Practical training, shared planning, and readily usable intervention activities may help address the school's stated concerns. These ratings provided a basis for identifying priority areas for professional development and differentiated instructional support.

3.7. Challenges in Accessing Literacy Instructional Materials

Access to instructional resources was assessed in relation to appropriately leveled reading materials, spelling-specific resources, and review materials. The grand mean for access to materials was 2.70, a Moderate Challenge. Limited review materials for previously learned skills received the highest mean (M = 2.73), followed by materials targeting specific spelling needs (M = 2.70). The perceived shortage of English reading materials suited to learners' instructional levels was rated M = 2.67. All three indicators shared the Moderate Challenge classification, suggesting a distributed need for instructional materials rather than an isolated resource constraint. Whittingham et al. (2024) connected selection of literacy interventions with implementation planning. Soria (2024) described difficulties involving module preparation and material suitability during a Philippine National Learning Camp reading program. These sources provide a relevant context for teachers' concern about materials that match specific literacy needs. A shared repository of leveled texts, spelling tasks, and review activities would respond directly to the reported resource categories, although the study did not evaluate such a repository as an intervention.

3.8. Challenges in Allocating Time for Literacy Interventions

The fourth intervention dimension concerned available time and the continuity of literacy support alongside normal teaching responsibilities. Allocation of intervention time received a grand mean of 3.33, interpreted as a Major Challenge. Regular teaching responsibilities limiting intervention time and competing school duties interrupting sessions each obtained the highest mean (M = 3.37). Intervention periods that were too short to complete planned activities also received a Major Challenge rating (M = 3.27). Because every indicator was rated a Major Challenge, time appeared to be a consistent operational constraint across the different aspects measured. IDinsight (2025), in a policy brief prepared for the Second Congressional Commission on Education, identified continuing pressures associated with ancillary work and school staffing. McLemore (2023) reported teachers' concerns about adequate instructional and planning time, clearer expectations, and additional personnel. Together, these sources support interpreting the local findings as a scheduling and workload issue rather than exclusively a matter of teacher

technique. Protecting regular intervention periods and designated preparation time therefore emerged as an important organizational consideration for Peña Integrated School.

3.9. Challenges in Monitoring Learners' Literacy Progress

The fifth dimension examined record maintenance, retention of learning gains, and use of progress records to guide intervention changes. Progress monitoring obtained a grand mean of 2.54, categorized as a Moderate Challenge. Determining whether improvements were maintained over time received the highest mean (M = 2.63), followed by using progress records to adjust interventions (M = 2.60). Maintaining updated records received the lowest mean (M = 2.40). The results therefore pointed more strongly to interpreting changes and checking whether gains persisted than to recordkeeping alone. Wegener et al. (2022) reported that spaced exposure improved delayed word recognition but did not improve spelling recall, illustrating the need to distinguish among specific literacy outcomes. Lott-Velez (2024) identified ongoing progress monitoring as an important element of structured, individualized reading assistance. These findings support periodic, skill-specific follow-up checks and teacher review of progress records. Such practices could help the school make more informed adjustments to intervention activities without assuming that progress on one literacy skill necessarily extends to another.

3.10. Challenges in Parental Involvement and Home Literacy Support

The final intervention challenge dimension addressed communication with families, their availability, and consistency of home literacy activities. Parental involvement and support obtained a grand mean of 3.07, described as a Moderate Challenge. Difficulty communicating with parents or guardians received the highest mean (M = 3.10), followed by inconsistent follow-through on agreed home literacy activities (M = 3.07) and limited parental or guardian availability (M = 3.03). The small differences across indicators suggested that coordination, continuity, and availability were interconnected concerns in teachers' perceptions, rather than a single dominant obstacle. The Education Endowment Foundation (2025) advocated practical home learning activities and constructive communication with families. Mirasol and Topacio (2021) found that Manila parents recognized the importance of reading support at home, while material and financial constraints could affect consistent practice. These references provide context for the school's perceived need for accessible home-based tasks and clear communication. Parent orientation and manageable reading activities could address the reported concerns, while the findings themselves did not measure parents' motivations or the outcomes of home activities.

3.11. Reported Relationship Between Literacy Difficulties and Intervention Challenges

The study examined the association between the perceived level of learners' English literacy difficulties and the degree of teachers' intervention challenges using the Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient. The reported Pearson correlation coefficient was r = 0.801932699, interpreted as a strong positive relationship. With 28 degrees of freedom and a significance level of 0.05, the reported two-tailed p-value was 0.0000000996 and the critical r-value was 0.3610. Under the statistical test as reported, the computed coefficient exceeded the critical value and the p-value fell below the specified significance threshold; the source manuscript consequently reported rejection of the null hypothesis. The direction of the coefficient indicated that higher teacher ratings of learners' literacy difficulties were associated with higher ratings of challenges in delivering interventions. An association does not establish that one variable caused the other. The interpretation of this inferential result required consideration of a methodological limitation in the reported calculation. The available

description of the correlation computation referred to grouped means and an additional fourth literacy-difficulty grouping, whereas the study identified three literacy-difficulty domains. It also indicated that the result required verification against 30 matched teacher-level score pairs. Consequently, the numerical results are presented as reported, while the interpretation of statistical significance remains dependent on confirmation using the corresponding teacher-level score pairs. This methodological qualification should be considered when interpreting the reported correlation coefficient and its statistical significance. Rosano et al. (2025) identified resource, assessment, workload, and home-support concerns among Philippine content-area teachers engaged in remedial reading. Colenbrander et al. (2022) reported delivery challenges in a structured approach to reading and spelling support. These studies offer contextual support for considering literacy needs and intervention conditions together, although they do not independently validate the present correlation. The reported pattern underscores the potential value of coordinating learner assessment and teacher support while keeping the interpretation noncausal and the verification requirement explicit.

3.12. Perceived Need for School-Wide Literacy Support Measures

The final study objective addressed school-wide measures that respondents considered necessary for addressing English literacy difficulties and the barriers encountered in providing support. Respondents rated ten proposed literacy support measures. The ten proposed measures obtained a grand mean of 3.48, categorized as Highly Needed. Practical training on differentiated English literacy instruction and designated preparation time for intervention activities received the joint-highest rating (M = 3.57). A regular schedule for English literacy interventions followed (M = 3.53), along with periodic teacher meetings to review progress and adjust support (M = 3.47). These highest-rated proposals directly corresponded to the major challenges identified in differentiated instruction (grand mean = 3.29) and intervention time (grand mean = 3.33). The alignment strengthened the practical relevance of the priorities identified by respondents. Developing a shared collection of spelling materials was rated M = 3.40, and providing reading materials appropriate to learners' levels received M = 3.37. Parent or guardian orientation, guided comprehension activities, and meaningful spelling activities each obtained M = 3.33. Regular review activities for retention received the lowest mean (M = 3.27) but remained in the Highly Needed category. Thus, lower relative rankings should not be interpreted as rejection of these components. The results favored a comprehensive but prioritized program combining teacher training, scheduled delivery, material access, follow-up assessment, and family engagement. Sharples et al. (2024) emphasized collaboration and supportive implementation conditions in sustaining school-wide approaches. Sheffield-Lemkin (2021) described scheduling barriers to collaboration and the perceived value of meetings organized around shared goals. These sources are consistent with the respondents' prioritization of professional learning, protected preparation time, and regularly scheduled interventions. Overall, the findings provided a respondent-informed basis for planning coordinated school-wide literacy support measures. Because the proposals were rated for perceived need, rather than evaluated through an implementation study, their effectiveness would require subsequent monitoring and assessment.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study established that teachers at Peña Integrated School generally perceived learners' English literacy difficulties in reading and comprehension, spelling, and retention of previously learned skills as low, although specific concerns remained regarding sentence fluency and phrasing, accurate spelling, and recall of word meanings. In contrast, allocating intervention

time and delivering differentiated instruction emerged as major challenges, while identifying literacy needs, accessing instructional materials, monitoring progress, and securing parental involvement presented moderate challenges. A strong positive correlation was reported between perceived literacy difficulties and intervention challenges, although its statistical significance remained dependent on confirmation using the corresponding teacher-level scores. Furthermore, all ten proposed school-wide literacy support measures were considered highly needed, with practical training in differentiated instruction and designated preparation time receiving the highest priority. Collectively, these findings emphasized the importance of coordinated school-based support that addressed learners' literacy needs alongside teachers' instructional challenges and available resources.

Peña Integrated School, through its school head, should establish a consistent schedule for English literacy interventions and coordinate competing school responsibilities to minimize instructional interruptions. Designated preparation periods should enable teachers to assess learners' needs, plan differentiated activities, and organize appropriate instructional materials. Learning Action Cell sessions should emphasize practical differentiation strategies, including flexible grouping and adapting learning activities according to learners' literacy levels. Teachers should collaboratively develop a shared collection of leveled reading materials, spelling exercises, and vocabulary review activities. Literacy interventions should prioritize guided reading to improve sentence fluency and phrasing, contextualized spelling activities, and regular reinforcement of previously learned vocabulary. Grade-level teams should conduct brief literacy assessments, maintain common progress records, and participate in periodic meetings to evaluate learners' progress and adjust instructional approaches. Additionally, teachers should strengthen communication with parents and guardians by providing practical guidance on home-based reading, spelling, and vocabulary activities that reinforce classroom learning.

The study was limited to 30 teacher-respondents from Peña Integrated School in Cawayan West District, Masbate, restricting the generalizability of its findings beyond the investigated setting. The researcher-made questionnaire measured teachers' perceptions of learners' literacy difficulties, intervention challenges, and support needs rather than directly assessing learners' literacy performance. Additionally, the descriptive-correlational design established relationships between variables without determining causality. The proposed school-wide support measures were assessed according to perceived necessity rather than demonstrated effectiveness. Future studies may involve additional schools, incorporate direct assessments of learners' literacy skills, and evaluate the outcomes of implemented literacy interventions to strengthen and extend the findings.

5. REFERENCES

Abril, J. G., Acerbo, C. T., & Abocejo, F. T. (2022). The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) program: A critical analysis. Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal, 5(4), 432–441. https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v5i4.7270

Agarwal, P. K., Nunes, L. D., & Blunt, J. R. (2021). Retrieval practice consistently benefits student learning: A systematic review of applied research in schools and classrooms. Educational Psychology Review, 33(4), 1409–1453. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09595-9

Ancheta, W. M. (2022). Teachers' level of knowledge of reading and content area reading instruction. International Journal of Language and Literary Studies, 4(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v4i1.802

Ariyani, F. (2024). Implementasi pembelajaran berdiferensiasi dalam pemahaman membaca: Sebuah studi di SMPN 30 Makassar [The implementation of differentiated instruction in reading comprehension: A study at SMPN 30 Makassar] [Thesis, Universitas Hasanuddin]. Universitas Hasanuddin Repository. https://repository.unhas.ac.id/id/eprint/36644/

Australian Education Research Organisation. (2024). Choosing reading assessments in MTSS. https://www.edresearch.edu.au/guides-resources/practice-guides/choosing-reading-assessments-mtss

Barrett-Tatum, J., Shimek, C., Manak, J., Bahlmann Bollinger, C. M., & Wellman, D. K. (2023). Where does the buck stop? A framework analysis of systematic barriers and supports to effective literacy instructional practices. Journal of Educational Leadership in Action, 8(3), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.62608/2164-1102.1132

Clark, R. D. (2022). Qualitative action research into the planning between the classroom teacher and reading interventionist [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina]. Scholar Commons. https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6995/

Colenbrander, D., Parsons, L., Bowers, J. S., & Davis, C. J. (2022). Assessing the effectiveness of Structured Word Inquiry for students in Grades 3 and 5 with reading and spelling difficulties: A randomized controlled trial. Reading Research Quarterly, 57(1), 307–352. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.399

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://us2.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book270550

Dahl-Leonard, K., Hall, C., Cho, E., Capin, P., Roberts, G. J., Kehoe, K. F., Haring, C., Peacott, D., & Demchak, A. (2025). Examining the effects of family-implemented literacy interventions for school-aged children: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 37, Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-09985-3

Department of Education. (2025). 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/

Education Endowment Foundation. (2025). Parental engagement. Teaching and Learning Toolkit. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/parental-engagement

Filderman, M. J., Austin, C. R., Boucher, A. N., O'Donnell, K., & Swanson, E. A. (2022). A meta-analysis of the effects of reading comprehension interventions on the reading comprehension outcomes of struggling readers in third through 12th grades. Exceptional Children, 88(2), 163–184. https://doi.org/10.1177/00144029211050860

Goodfellow, L. T. (2023). An overview of survey research. Respiratory Care, 68(9), 1309–1313. https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.11041

Heguerra, A. V., & Cacho, R. M. (2022). Comprehension concerns: Signs and signals for improving a school-based reading intervention. The Normal Lights, 16(2), 146–171. https://doi.org/10.56278/tnl.v16i2.1724

IDinsight. (2025). Understanding teacher workload as a systemic issue [Policy brief]. Second Congressional Commission on Education. https://edcom2.gov.ph/publications/understanding-teacher-workload-as-a-systemic-issue/

Igarashi, T., & Suryadarma, D. (2023). Foundational mathematics and reading skills of Filipino students over a generation. International Journal of Educational Development, 96, Article 102688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102688

Kim, S. K., & Webb, S. (2022). The effects of spaced practice on second language learning: A meta-analysis. Language Learning, 72(1), 269–319. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12479

Kim, S. K., & Webb, S. (2023). Does spaced practice have the same effects on different second language vocabulary learning activities? Fill-in-the-blanks versus flashcards. The Modern Language Journal, 107(4), 944–964. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12879

Kishore, K., Jaswal, V., Kulkarni, V., & De, D. (2021). Practical guidelines to develop and evaluate a questionnaire. Indian Dermatology Online Journal, 12(2), 266–275. https://doi.org/10.4103/idoj.IDOJ_674_20

Lott-Velez, S. (2024). Exploring K–3 teachers' perspectives of effective resources and strategies used to close student learning gaps in reading [Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University]. Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses. https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/3228/

Lu, H. (2022). Challenges teachers face in teaching reading among elementary pupils. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 11(16), 45–50. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.354

McLemore, E. C. (2023). Elementary reading teachers' perceptions of implementation of differentiated reading instruction [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/14335/

Mirasol, R. G., & Topacio, K. N. M. (2021). Reading perceptions, needs, and practices among parents of an urban poor community in the Philippines. Reading Psychology, 42(7), 777–787. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2021.1939822

Murphy, A., & Arciuli, J. (2024). Digital reading comprehension instruction in English for children with English as an additional language: A systematic review. Journal of Research in Reading, 47(3), 348–394. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12448

Perry, T., Lea, R., Rübner Jørgensen, C., Cordingley, P., Shapiro, K., & Youdell, D. (2021). Cognitive science in the classroom: Evidence and practice review. Education Endowment Foundation. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/evidence-reviews/cognitive-science-approaches-in-the-classroom/

Petersen-Brown, S., & Kromminga, K. R. (2024). Systematic review and meta-analysis of the implementation and effectiveness of spelling instruction and intervention. Psychology in the Schools, 61(8), 3315–3338. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23223

Ranganathan, P., & Caduff, C. (2023). Designing and validating a research questionnaire—Part 1. Perspectives in Clinical Research, 14(3), 152–155. https://doi.org/10.4103/picr.picr_140_23

Ranganathan, P., Caduff, C., & Frampton, C. M. A. (2024). Designing and validating a research questionnaire—Part 2. Perspectives in Clinical Research, 15(1), 42–45. https://doi.org/10.4103/picr.picr_318_23

Robertson, A. (2024). Predicting the understanding and implementation of differentiation in literacy instruction for kindergarten and first-grade teachers: A correlational study [Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University]. Liberty University Doctoral Dissertations and Projects. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/6264/

Rosano, D. A., Conjusta, G. R., Gallardo, J. B., & Sindingan, L. F. (2025). Teaching remedial reading: Content area teachers' difficulties and needs. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 24(2), 153–169. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.2.8

Seamer, J. (2023). Reading success in the early primary years: A teacher's guide to implementing systematic instruction. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Reading-Success-in-the-Early-Primary-Years-A-Teachers-Guide-to-Implementing/Seamer/p/book/9781032154459

Sharples, J., Eaton, J., & Boughelaf, J. (2024). A school's guide to implementation (3rd ed.). Education Endowment Foundation. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/implementation/

Sheffield-Lemkin, R. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of collaboration for early literacy in a response to intervention model [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden

Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/10067/

Siguan, C. N. (2025). Teaching challenges: Elementary educators' experiences on learners with spelling difficulties. FMDB Transactions on Sustainable Techno Learning, 3(1), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.69888/FTSTL.2025.000386

Sinsay-Villanueva, L. M., & Orbeta, A. C., Jr. (2023). Embracing challenges, envisioning solutions: Advancing teacher education and development in the Philippines (PIDS Policy Notes No. 2023-22). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.62986/pn2023.22

Soria, S. F. E. (2024). Reading program in the National Learning Camp: Teachers' assessment of its implementation and teaching strategies. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 11(3), 418–435. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1103030

Treiman, R., Kessler, B., & Pollo, T. C. (2022). Prephonological spelling and its connections with later word reading and spelling performance. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 218, Article 105359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105359

United Nations. (2026). The Sustainable Development Goals report 2026. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2026/

Wegener, S., Wang, H.-C., Beyersmann, L., Nation, K., Colenbrander, D., & Castles, A. (2022). The effects of spacing and massing on children's orthographic learning. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 214, Article 105309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105309

Wetherington, S. N. (2022). Disciplinary teacher perceptions and challenges of literacy instruction for English language learners [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/13891/

Whittingham, C. E., Pilonieta, P., & Washburn, E. K. (2024). Selecting a literacy intervention and planning for implementation: A guide. The Reading Teacher, 77(6), 949–957. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2323

Xiao, L., Hau, K.-T., & Wang, M. D. (2024). Revisiting the usage of alpha in scale evaluation: Effects of scale length and sample size. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 43(2), 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12604

Yu, H., & Hutson, A. D. (2024). A robust Spearman correlation coefficient permutation test. Communications in Statistics—Theory and Methods, 53(6), 2141–2153. https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2022.2121144