

Targeted Reading Remediation and Foundational Literacy Development among Grade 3 Learners

Sherine M. Aggabao^{1*} and Severino T. Morales Jr.^{1,2}

Northeastern College

^{*}sherineaggabao@gmail.com, ²severinomoralesjr@northeasterncollege.edu.ph

Date Submitted:
February 21, 2026

Date Accepted:
May 25, 2026

Date Published:
July 16, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21398193

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of targeted reading remediation on the foundational literacy development of Grade 3 learners at Lupigue Integrated School in the City of Ilagan, Isabela. A quasi-experimental interrupted time-series design with repeated literacy measurements was employed to track changes before, during, immediately after, and following the intervention. Participants were selected through criterion-based purposive sampling based on identified difficulties in decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, and reading comprehension. Data were gathered using a validated Grade 3 Foundational Literacy Progress Battery with an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91. The intervention was implemented for eight weeks through structured small-group sessions

focused on phoneme-grapheme correspondence, decoding, automatic word recognition, guided oral reading, vocabulary, and comprehension. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, segmented linear mixed-effects growth modeling, Hedges standardized mean change, and the Reliable Change Index. Results showed significant and sustained improvement in overall foundational literacy, with the strongest gains observed in decoding and word recognition. Oral reading fluency and reading comprehension also improved, although both remained below the expected instructional benchmark for several learners. Follow-up results indicated that most gains were maintained, but a slight decline emerged after intensive sessions ended. The findings confirmed that targeted and skill-based remediation supported measurable literacy growth among struggling Grade 3 readers. Continued progress monitoring, differentiated instruction, and extended support were recommended, particularly for learners with persistent fluency and comprehension difficulties.

Keywords: *decoding, foundational literacy, Grade 3 learners, reading comprehension, reading remediation, word recognition*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the first academic abilities that children must develop well because it supports learning across language, mathematics, science, and other subject areas. During the primary grades, learners move from recognizing letters and sounds toward reading words, sentences, and connected texts with accuracy and understanding. By Grade 3, they are generally expected to use reading not only as a classroom activity but also as a means of gaining information from lessons. Learners who have not developed adequate reading skills by this stage may have difficulty following written directions, understanding learning materials, and completing tasks that require independent reading. Research on reading acquisition explains that successful reading develops through the coordinated growth of word recognition, language comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, and knowledge of how written symbols represent spoken language (Castles et al., 2018).

Foundational literacy refers to the basic knowledge and abilities that enable children to read meaningful text with increasing independence. These abilities include phonological awareness, letter knowledge, phonics, decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and basic comprehension. They do not develop at the same pace among all learners. Some children require repeated practice and direct explanations before they can connect sounds with letters or blend sounds into recognizable words. Evidence-based guidance for kindergarten through Grade 3 recommends explicit instruction in speech sounds, letter-sound relationships, word analysis, vocabulary, and daily reading of connected text. These practices help learners move from slow and effortful decoding toward accurate and meaningful reading (Foorman et al., 2016).

Automatic word recognition is particularly important because a child who spends too much mental effort identifying individual words has fewer resources available for understanding the message of a sentence or passage. Ehri (2020) explained that beginning readers build secure word knowledge by connecting the letters in written words with the sounds in their pronunciations. Systematic phonics instruction supports this process by teaching learners how written patterns represent spoken sounds rather than asking them to depend mainly on pictures, sentence clues, or guessing. As word recognition becomes more accurate and automatic, learners can direct greater attention to meaning, vocabulary, and comprehension. For Grade 3 learners who still struggle with basic decoding, remediation must therefore address the specific reading skills that remain weak rather than merely requiring them to read the same material repeatedly.

Targeted reading remediation provides additional and focused instruction to learners whose reading performance falls below expected standards. It differs from ordinary classroom review because it begins with an assessment of individual needs and adjusts instruction according to the learner's reading profile. A child who struggles with letter sounds may need a different set of activities from a child who can decode words but reads without fluency or understanding. Meta-analytic evidence shows that primary-grade reading interventions can improve important reading outcomes when instruction is structured, explicit, and matched to identified learning difficulties (Gersten et al., 2020). Research also indicates that interventions combining foundational skill instruction with vocabulary, language, and comprehension activities can support broader reading development among learners who are at risk of reading difficulties (Denton et al., 2022).

The value of remediation depends not only on the materials used but also on the way instruction is delivered. Learners who are behind in reading often need smaller instructional groups, clear modeling, guided practice, corrective feedback, sufficient instructional time, and regular monitoring of progress. A synthesis of 65 studies involving programs for struggling elementary readers found that well-designed interventions can produce meaningful gains, although the results vary according to program quality, instructional approach, and implementation (Neitzel et al., 2022). This variation shows why remediation cannot be treated as a single activity given to every struggling reader. Teachers need to identify what each learner can already do, determine the skill that requires attention, and use assessment results to decide whether instruction should be maintained, adjusted, or intensified.

The need to strengthen foundational literacy is especially serious in the Philippines. The World Bank's *Philippines Learning Poverty Brief* reported that 91 percent of Filipino children at late primary age were not proficient in reading, after adjusting for children who were out of school. The estimate was based on the latest available pre-pandemic assessment data and showed that the country's learning poverty rate was substantially higher than the averages for East Asia and the Pacific and for lower-middle-income countries (World Bank, 2024). Although national estimates do not describe every school or learner in the same way, they point to a widespread difficulty in ensuring that children acquire basic reading comprehension within the primary years.

National assessment findings also show that many Filipino learners reach Grade 3 without full mastery of foundational competencies. Data analyzed by the Second Congressional Commission on Education indicated that only 30.52 percent of Grade 3 learners assessed through the 2024 Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy Assessment were classified as proficient or highly proficient. This meant that about seven out of ten learners had not yet reached the established proficiency level in foundational competencies, including the recognition of letters and sounds, reading common words, and understanding short passages (Second Congressional Commission on

Education, 2026). These figures are especially concerning because weak reading foundations at Grade 3 can continue to affect performance as texts, vocabulary, and learning tasks become more demanding in the succeeding grade levels.

The Department of Education has strengthened the use of literacy assessment to identify learners who need additional instruction. Memorandum DM-CT-2024-284 directed the administration of the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment to Grades 1 to 3 and described the assessment as a means of determining reading profiles, identifying grade readiness, and designing appropriate intervention activities. The policy reflects an important principle in remediation: teachers need dependable information about learner performance before deciding what support to provide. Assessment results become useful when they lead to focused lessons, suitable reading materials, appropriate grouping, and continued checking of learner progress (Department of Education, 2024).

Philippine experience also provides evidence that focused support can help struggling Grade 3 readers. In 2025, the national Literacy Remediation Program used diagnostic results to identify low-emergent readers and provided intensive instruction through small groups, consistent schedules, and trained teachers. Partial post-assessment results showed substantial movement from the lowest reading level after an 18-day intervention, although many learners still required continued assistance to reach Grade 3 expectations. The Second Congressional Commission on Education also called for remediation to include transitioning readers, or learners who possess some reading ability but remain below grade-level standards. Its findings showed that targeted instruction, smaller groups, sufficient practice time, and teaching at the learner's current level can make remediation more responsive to actual reading needs (Second Congressional Commission on Education, 2025a, 2025b).

These national efforts make school-based studies necessary because the effectiveness of remediation is shaped by learner needs, classroom conditions, instructional practices, available materials, and the consistency with which support is provided. Data gathered within a school can help teachers understand whether remediation activities address the particular difficulties experienced by their learners. It can also show which aspects of foundational literacy have developed adequately and which areas still require closer attention. Without such evidence, reading remediation may be implemented as a general requirement rather than as deliberate instruction guided by the abilities of individual children.

The study examine these concerns among Grade 3 learners of Lupigue Integrated School in Cabisera 10, City of Ilagan, Isabela. It will give attention to the reading support provided to learners and the development of the basic abilities needed for accurate, fluent, and meaningful reading. By examining the two areas together, the study seeks to produce evidence that may guide teachers in planning appropriate remediation activities, organizing instruction according to learner needs, and monitoring literacy development more carefully. The findings may also support school-level decisions concerning reading materials, intervention schedules, teacher assistance, and other measures intended to help Grade 3 learners establish a stronger foundation for later academic learning.

Literature Review

Targeted and Tiered Reading Remediation

Targeted reading remediation is most effective when instructional support is organized according to the specific literacy needs of learners rather than delivered as a uniform program. Within a tiered approach, learners who do not make adequate progress during regular classroom instruction receive additional lessons that are more explicit, focused, and intensive. These lessons may be conducted individually or in small groups and commonly address phonological awareness, letter-sound correspondence, word recognition, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The findings of Wanzek et al. (2016) showed that Tier 2 reading interventions produced positive effects on the reading performance of kindergarten to Grade 3 learners who had reading difficulties or were at risk of developing them. The authors also found that interventions were more useful when instruction directly addressed the skills in which learners demonstrated weakness. This supports the need to begin remediation with a careful assessment of each Grade 3 learner's reading performance. Learners who struggle with decoding

should receive instruction that is different from the support given to those who can identify words but have difficulty reading fluently or understanding passages. Targeted remediation therefore requires purposeful grouping, clearly defined reading objectives, suitable learning materials, and regular instructional sessions that allow teachers to respond to observable learner needs rather than relying on general reading exercises

Word Decoding and Differentiated Reading Support

Word decoding is a central part of foundational literacy because it enables learners to translate printed letters and letter combinations into spoken words. Grade 3 learners who continue to read by guessing from pictures, memorizing limited word forms, or depending heavily on sentence clues may experience difficulty when they encounter unfamiliar vocabulary and longer texts. Effective remediation should provide systematic practice in recognizing sound-symbol relationships, blending sounds, separating words into meaningful parts, and reading both familiar and unfamiliar words. Nilvius et al. (2021) examined Tier 2 interventions intended to improve the word-decoding abilities of young learners at risk of reading impairment. Their systematic review and meta-analysis found that small-group interventions could support decoding development, although learner outcomes depended on the design, focus, and delivery of instruction. The findings suggest that remediation should not simply increase the amount of time learners spend reading. Additional instructional time must be used to teach the particular processes that learners have not yet mastered. Teachers may therefore differentiate word lists, reading passages, pacing, modeling, guided practice, and corrective feedback according to assessment results. Such differentiation allows struggling readers to work at a level that is challenging but still manageable, while gradually developing the accuracy and independence expected of Grade 3 learners.

Guided Repeated Reading and Oral Reading Fluency

Reading fluency involves accurate word reading, appropriate pacing, and meaningful expression. It serves as a bridge between decoding and comprehension because learners who recognize words slowly and with considerable effort may lose track of the meaning of a sentence or passage. For struggling Grade 3 readers, fluency development requires more than asking them to read aloud without guidance. They need a clear reading model, opportunities to reread suitable texts, immediate correction of errors, and feedback on accuracy, phrasing, and expression. Lee and Yoon (2017) found through meta-analysis that repeated reading had positive effects on the fluency of learners with reading disabilities, with particularly useful outcomes among elementary-level learners. The findings also indicated that repeated reading was more effective when paired with listening to a fluent model of the passage. This approach gives learners an example of correct pronunciation, phrasing, pace, and expression before they attempt the text themselves. In a targeted remediation program, teachers may select brief passages that match each learner's instructional level, model the reading, guide repeated practice, and record changes in correctly read words and errors. Repeated reading should remain purposeful and supported so that learners improve not only their speed but also their accuracy, confidence, expression, and understanding of what they read.

Multicomponent Intervention and Foundational Literacy Growth

Foundational literacy development is not limited to a single reading skill because successful reading requires several abilities to work together. A learner may improve in recognizing letters or reading individual words but still struggle to understand sentences when vocabulary, fluency, oral language, or comprehension remains weak. Reading remediation should therefore include connected activities that address word-level reading and meaning-making. Hall et al. (2023) reviewed four decades of intervention research involving elementary learners with or at risk for dyslexia and found that reading interventions produced positive outcomes across several literacy measures. Their analysis showed the value of explicit instruction while also drawing attention to the need for adequate intervention duration, well-prepared instruction, and attention to differences in learner response. These findings support a multicomponent remediation program in which phonological awareness, decoding, word recognition, spelling, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension are taught as related abilities rather than isolated tasks. For Grade 3 learners, a remediation session may begin with sound and word practice, continue with guided oral reading, and end with vocabulary and comprehension activities based on a short passage. Progress should be

examined across several literacy areas because improvement in one skill does not necessarily indicate complete reading development. A balanced review of learner performance can help teachers determine whether remediation should be continued, modified, or intensified.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a quasi-experimental interrupted time-series design with repeated literacy measurements. This design was selected because it allowed changes in foundational literacy to be examined across several measurement periods rather than relying only on a single pretest and posttest comparison. Literacy performance was measured during three baseline periods before the intervention, at the midpoint of the remediation program, immediately after the intervention, and during a follow-up period. The repeated observations helped determine whether improvements occurred after the targeted reading remediation was introduced and whether the gains were maintained after regular intervention sessions had ended.

The intervention lasted for eight instructional weeks and consisted of four 35-minute remediation sessions per week. Instruction was organized according to the identified reading difficulty of each learner. The remediation activities focused on phoneme-grapheme correspondence, word decoding, automatic word recognition, guided oral reading, vocabulary development, and passage comprehension. Learners were regrouped when progress-monitoring results showed that their instructional needs had changed. This adaptive feature distinguished the design from a standard one-group pretest and posttest procedure because instructional decisions were based on continuing literacy evidence.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Lupigue Integrated School in Cabisera 10, City of Ilagan, Isabela. The school served learners from nearby communities and offered elementary and secondary education. The Grade 3 classes provided an appropriate setting because reading skills at this level were expected to support independent learning across the curriculum. School reading records showed that some learners continued to experience difficulty in decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, and comprehension despite receiving regular classroom instruction.

The remediation sessions were conducted in an available classroom or reading area that provided a quiet environment for small-group instruction. The setting allowed the researcher to administer literacy assessments, organize learners according to identified reading needs, and monitor instructional progress without removing them from their regular classes for extended periods.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants consisted of Grade 3 learners who demonstrated difficulty in at least two foundational literacy areas based on school reading assessment results, classroom reading records, and teacher observations. Learners were included when their performance fell below the Grade 3 instructional benchmark in decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, or passage comprehension.

Criterion-based purposive sampling was used in selecting the participants. This technique was appropriate because the intervention was intended specifically for learners who required focused reading support. All learners who satisfied the inclusion criteria and whose parents or guardians provided consent were considered for participation. Learners who did not complete the required baseline assessments or who had prolonged absences during the intervention period were not included in the final analysis because sufficient repeated measurements were needed for the interrupted time-series model.

Research Instrument

The study used the Grade 3 Foundational Literacy Progress Battery, which was developed to assess the literacy competencies addressed by the remediation program. The instrument contained four components. The decoding component measured knowledge of letter-sound relationships, blending, syllable reading, and the reading of unfamiliar words. The word recognition component measured the accurate and automatic identification of high-frequency and grade-appropriate words. The oral reading fluency component measured reading accuracy, correct words read per minute, phrasing, and expression using controlled passages. The comprehension component measured the ability to identify explicit information, sequence events, determine word meaning, make simple inferences, and identify the main idea of a passage.

The assessment battery was reviewed by a panel composed of specialists in early literacy, elementary education, language teaching, educational measurement, and reading intervention. The validators examined the appropriateness of the content, clarity of directions, grade-level suitability, scoring procedures, and correspondence between the assessment items and the intended literacy competencies. The item-level content validity indices ranged from .83 to 1.00, while the scale-level content validity index based on average agreement was .94. Items that received recommendations concerning vocabulary level, passage length, or scoring clarity were revised before pilot administration.

A pilot test was conducted among a separate group of Grade 3 learners from a school with characteristics comparable to the research locale. These learners were not included in the main study. Pilot results were examined for item difficulty, item discrimination, administration time, scoring consistency, and internal reliability. The complete assessment battery obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91, indicating strong internal consistency. The coefficients for the individual components were .88 for decoding, .86 for word recognition, .84 for oral reading fluency, and .89 for comprehension. Interrater reliability for oral reading scoring produced an intraclass correlation coefficient of .95. The results indicated that the instrument provided sufficiently dependable scores for repeated literacy measurement.

A remediation implementation checklist was also used to document lesson duration, instructional content, learner grouping, guided practice, corrective feedback, and completion of planned activities. The checklist helped determine whether the reading sessions were delivered according to the intervention plan.

Data Gathering

Permission to conduct the study was secured from the appropriate school authorities before the assessment and intervention activities began. Parents or guardians received an explanation of the purpose, procedures, expected benefits, possible inconveniences, confidentiality safeguards, and voluntary nature of participation. Written parental consent and learner assent were obtained before data collection.

The initial reading screening results were reviewed to identify learners who met the selection criteria. Eligible learners completed three baseline literacy probes administered at regular intervals before the targeted remediation began. The multiple baseline measurements established the learners' initial performance pattern and reduced the possibility that a single unusually high or low score would determine the starting level.

After baseline measurement, the learners were grouped according to their primary reading needs. Those with difficulty in letter-sound relationships and decoding received explicit sound-symbol instruction and blending exercises. Learners with weak word recognition received structured word reading and repeated exposure activities. Those with fluency difficulty completed modeled reading, assisted oral reading, phrase reading, and guided repeated reading. Learners with comprehension difficulty received vocabulary preparation, questioning, retelling, sequencing, and short passage analysis.

Progress probes were administered throughout the intervention. A formal midpoint assessment was completed after the fourth instructional week, while the posttest was administered after the eighth week. A follow-up assessment was conducted after regular remediation sessions had ended to determine whether the literacy gains were maintained. The researcher recorded attendance, completed the implementation checklist after each session, and checked assessment forms for completeness before encoding the results.

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations were used to summarize learner performance in decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, comprehension, and overall foundational literacy across the measurement periods. Percentage distributions were used to determine the proportion of learners who demonstrated reliable improvement and the proportion who reached the Grade 3 instructional benchmark.

A segmented linear mixed-effects growth model was used as the principal statistical treatment. The model examined the baseline trend, the change associated with the beginning of the remediation period, the rate of improvement during the intervention, and the pattern observed after the intervention. Learners were treated as random effects because repeated measurements were nested within individual learners. Time, intervention phase, follow-up phase, and literacy domain were treated as fixed effects. Random intercepts and random time slopes were included to account for differences in the starting performance and growth rate of the learners.

Restricted maximum likelihood estimation was used because it provided stable estimates for repeated measurements and accommodated incomplete observations when a learner missed one progress probe. Satterthwaite-adjusted degrees of freedom were applied in testing the fixed effects. Holm-adjusted probability values were used for domain comparisons to reduce the risk of declaring significance merely because several literacy outcomes were tested.

Hedges standardized mean change was computed to describe the magnitude of the difference between baseline and post-intervention performance. The Reliable Change Index was also calculated using the reliability coefficient of the assessment battery. A positive reliable change indicated that the improvement was greater than the amount that could reasonably be attributed to measurement error. Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level.

Ethical Consideration

The study followed the principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, fairness, and protection from harm. Participation did not affect the learners' grades, promotion, class standing, or access to ordinary school services. Parents, guardians, and learners were informed that participation could be discontinued without penalty.

Participant names were replaced with identification codes during encoding and analysis. Assessment forms and intervention records were stored securely and were accessed only for legitimate research purposes. Individual reading results were not disclosed publicly. Findings were reported in grouped form to prevent the identification of any learner.

The remediation activities were age-appropriate and were conducted in a supportive manner. Reading errors were corrected privately and respectfully. Learners were not compared publicly with classmates. Those who continued to demonstrate serious reading difficulty after the intervention were endorsed for continued school-based assistance rather than being denied further support after the study had ended.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Foundational Literacy Performance Before, During, and After Targeted Reading Remediation

Foundational literacy area	Baseline Mean (SD)	Midpoint Mean (SD)	Posttest Mean (SD)	Follow-up Mean (SD)	Adjusted baseline-to-posttest change, 95% CI	Hedges' g
Decoding	46.80 (11.42)	59.70 (10.88)	72.90 (9.75)	71.20 (10.06)	25.68 [21.84, 29.52]	1.32
Word recognition	51.60 (10.96)	64.90 (10.31)	76.40 (9.18)	74.90 (9.64)	24.11 [20.57, 27.65]	1.29
Oral reading fluency	43.90 (12.31)	55.60 (11.74)	66.70 (10.89)	64.80 (11.20)	22.18 [18.12, 26.24]	1.08
Reading comprehension	39.80 (11.85)	48.90 (11.37)	59.30 (10.72)	57.80 (10.98)	19.07 [15.28, 22.86]	0.94
Overall foundational literacy	45.50 (9.44)	57.30 (9.01)	68.80 (8.37)	67.20 (8.65)	22.76 [19.83, 25.69]	1.41

Note. Scores were converted to a 0 to 100 scale. Higher scores indicated stronger literacy performance.

The baseline results showed that the learners experienced weaknesses across all measured foundational literacy areas. Reading comprehension obtained the lowest initial mean of 39.80, followed by oral reading fluency with a mean of 43.90. These results indicated that the learners had difficulty not only in identifying printed words but also in reading connected text smoothly and constructing meaning from passages. Word recognition obtained the highest baseline mean, although the score remained below the expected instructional benchmark.

Performance increased at the midpoint of the intervention in every literacy area. The strongest midpoint performance was observed in word recognition, which increased from 51.60 to 64.90. Decoding also improved from 46.80 to 59.70. The midpoint results suggested that the learners responded more quickly to activities that involved sound-symbol relationships, blending, repeated word exposure, and guided word reading than to tasks that required fluent passage reading and comprehension.

The posttest results showed continued improvement. Word recognition reached a mean of 76.40 and became the only domain whose average score exceeded the established instructional benchmark of 75. Decoding increased to 72.90, while oral reading fluency reached 66.70. Reading comprehension improved to 59.30 but remained the lowest domain. The result showed that the remediation program produced meaningful literacy gains, although it did not eliminate all reading difficulties.

The magnitude of improvement was large across all domains. Decoding obtained a Hedges' g of 1.32, while word recognition produced a Hedges' g of 1.29. Oral reading fluency and comprehension also showed substantial gains, with effect sizes of 1.08 and 0.94, respectively. The overall foundational literacy effect size of 1.41 indicated that the change in total literacy performance was educationally meaningful rather than merely a small numerical increase.

Follow-up means were slightly lower than posttest means. Overall foundational literacy decreased from 68.80 to 67.20 after regular remediation sessions had ended. The decline was limited, and performance remained considerably higher than the baseline level. This pattern suggested that the learners retained most of their gains but still benefited from continued reading practice and teacher support.

Table 2. *Segmented Linear Mixed-Effects Growth Model for Foundational Literacy Scores*

Fixed effect	Estimate	Standard error	t value	Adjusted p value	Interpretation
Baseline weekly trend	0.38	0.22	1.73	.087	Baseline performance was generally stable
Immediate change at intervention onset	1.84	1.27	1.45	.154	No significant immediate increase
Weekly growth during intervention	2.71	0.24	11.29	< .001	Significant positive growth

Follow-up phase slope	-0.84	0.31	-2.71	.009	Small decline after intervention
Word recognition growth relative to decoding	0.18	0.27	0.67	.512	Growth rate did not differ significantly
Fluency growth relative to decoding	-0.46	0.22	-2.09	.041	Fluency improved at a slower rate
Comprehension growth relative to decoding	-0.78	0.24	-3.25	.002	Comprehension improved at the slowest rate

Note. Marginal $R^2 = .61$. Conditional $R^2 = .78$. Adjusted p values were based on the Holm procedure.

The baseline weekly trend was not statistically significant, $\beta = 0.38$, $p = .087$. The lack of a clear upward trend before the intervention indicated that the learners were unlikely to have produced the observed posttest improvement through ordinary score fluctuation alone. Their literacy performance remained relatively stable across the baseline probes.

The immediate change at the beginning of the remediation phase was also not significant, $\beta = 1.84$, $p = .154$. This result showed that the learners did not improve simply because they were placed in the program or became familiar with the assessment procedure. Instead, progress developed gradually as they completed structured lessons and repeated practice.

The intervention produced a significant weekly growth rate of 2.71 points, $p < .001$. This was the strongest fixed effect in the model. It indicated that each additional week of targeted instruction contributed to higher literacy performance after baseline differences among learners had been considered. The result supported the use of sustained remediation rather than isolated or occasional reading activities.

The interaction results showed that word recognition and decoding developed at comparable rates. Fluency improved more slowly than decoding, $\beta = -0.46$, $p = .041$, while comprehension demonstrated the slowest rate of progress, $\beta = -0.78$, $p = .002$. These differences were understandable because decoding and word recognition involved more constrained skills that could be practiced directly and repeatedly. Fluency required learners to apply word-level skills while maintaining pace, accuracy, and expression. Comprehension required the additional use of vocabulary, sentence understanding, background knowledge, memory, and inference.

The marginal R^2 value of .61 indicated that the measured intervention phases and literacy domains explained a substantial portion of the score variation. The conditional R^2 value of .78 showed that the model explained more variation when individual differences among learners were also considered. This finding confirmed that the learners entered the study with different starting abilities and responded to the remediation at different rates.

Table 3. *Reliable Improvement and Grade-Level Benchmark Attainment After the Intervention*

Literacy area	Learners with reliable improvement (%)	Learners reaching the instructional benchmark at posttest (%)	Learners maintaining the benchmark at follow-up (%)
Decoding	79	58	54
Word recognition	83	67	63
Oral reading fluency	71	46	42
Reading comprehension	58	38	33
Overall foundational literacy	75	50	46

Note. Reliable improvement was determined through the Reliable Change Index. The instructional benchmark was set at 75 percent.

The Reliable Change Index showed that most learners achieved improvement that exceeded expected measurement error. Word recognition recorded the largest proportion of reliable improvement at 83 percent, followed by decoding at 79 percent. These findings showed that the program was particularly successful in strengthening the learners' ability to identify words and apply letter-sound knowledge.

Reliable improvement in oral reading fluency was observed among 71 percent of the learners. This result was favorable, but only 46 percent reached the fluency benchmark at posttest. The difference between improvement and benchmark attainment meant that many learners made meaningful progress but still performed below the level expected for independent Grade 3 reading.

Reading comprehension remained the most serious concern. Although 58 percent demonstrated reliable improvement, only 38 percent reached the instructional benchmark. The result indicated that gains in decoding and word recognition did not automatically produce equivalent comprehension growth. Some learners continued to read slowly, had limited vocabulary, forgot details from passages, or had difficulty interpreting information that was not directly stated.

Half of the learners reached the overall foundational literacy benchmark at posttest, while 46 percent maintained it during follow-up. This result showed that the remediation program moved a substantial portion of the learners toward grade-level performance, but it did not fully address the needs of all participants. Learners who remained below the benchmark required continued intervention with greater emphasis on oral language, vocabulary, connected-text reading, and comprehension monitoring.

CONCLUSION

The targeted reading remediation significantly improved the foundational literacy development of Grade 3 learners, particularly in decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, and reading comprehension. The strongest gains were observed in word recognition and decoding, while fluency and comprehension improved at a slower rate and remained areas that required sustained instructional attention. The results also showed that most learners maintained much of their progress during the follow-up period, although a slight decline indicated that continued support was necessary to preserve and strengthen literacy gains. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the school continue implementing structured and differentiated reading remediation through small-group instruction, regular progress monitoring, and lessons matched to each learner's specific reading difficulty. Greater emphasis should be placed on vocabulary development, guided oral reading, comprehension questioning, and the use of meaningful connected texts. Teachers should also conduct periodic reassessments, adjust learner groupings when needed, and provide extended intervention for those who remain below the Grade 3 benchmark. School administrators may support the program by allocating suitable reading materials, intervention time, and teacher development activities, while parents or guardians may be encouraged to reinforce reading practice at home through simple and consistent literacy activities.

References

- Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 19(1), 5–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271>
- Denton, C. A., Hall, C., Cho, E., Cannon, G., Scamacca, N., & Wanzek, J. (2022). A meta-analysis of the effects of foundational skills and multicomponent reading interventions on reading comprehension for primary-grade students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 93, Article 102062. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102062>
- Department of Education. (2024, August 20). *Administration of the Rapid Mathematics Assessment (RMA) and Comprehensive Literacy Assessment (CRLA) for Grades 1 to 3 for the beginning of the school year 2024–2025* (Memorandum DM-CT-2024-284). <https://region8.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/MEMO-DM-CT-2024-284.pdf>

- EDCOM 2 Communications. (2025a, May 30). *EDCOM 2 calls on DepEd to focus on transitioning readers, teach at the right level*. Second Congressional Commission on Education. <https://edcom2.gov.ph/edcom-2-calls-on-deped-to-focus-on-transitioning-readers-teach-at-the-right-level/>
- EDCOM 2 Communications. (2025b, July 6). *Summer remediation program boosts literacy for 96% of struggling Grade 3 readers*. Second Congressional Commission on Education. <https://edcom2.gov.ph/summer-remediation-program-boosts-literacy-for-96-of-struggling-grade-3-readers/>
- EDCOM 2 Communications. (2026, January 16). *Student proficiency rates plunge from 30% in Grade 3 to 0.47% in Grade 12*. Second Congressional Commission on Education. <https://edcom2.gov.ph/student-proficiency-rates-plunge-from-30-in-grade-3-to-0-47-in-grade-12/>
- Ehri, L. C. (2020). The science of learning to read words: A case for systematic phonics instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S45–S60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.334>
- Foorman, B. R., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R. K., & Wissel, S. (2016). *Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade* (NCEE 2016-4008). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf
- Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Newman-Gonchar, R., Dimino, J., & Jayanthi, M. (2020). Meta-analysis of the impact of reading interventions for students in the primary grades. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 13(2), 401–427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2019.1689591>
- Hall, C., Dahl-Leonard, K., Cho, E., Solari, E. J., Capin, P., Conner, C. L., Henry, A. R., Cook, L., Hayes, L., Vargas, I., Richmond, C. L., & Kehoe, K. F. (2023). Forty years of reading intervention research for elementary students with or at risk for dyslexia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 58(2), 285–312. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.477>
- Lee, J., & Yoon, S. Y. (2017). The effects of repeated reading on reading fluency for students with reading disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2), 213–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219415605194>
- Neitzel, A. J., Lake, C., Pellegrini, M., & Slavin, R. E. (2022). A synthesis of quantitative research on programs for struggling readers in elementary schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(1), 149–179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.379>
- Nilvius, C., Carlsson, R., Fälth, L., & Nordström, T. (2021). Tier 2 interventions within the RtI-model for developing students' word decoding: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), Article 1994105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1994105>
- Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Scammacca, N., Gatlin, B., Walker, M. A., & Capin, P. (2016). Meta-analyses of the effects of Tier 2 type reading interventions in Grades K-3. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 551–576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9321-7>
- World Bank, & UNESCO. (2024, April). *Philippines learning poverty brief* (Version 2). <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099090524085540633/pdf/P179209-b0057b3a-fd8c-476a-a1c6-271b276117ff.pdf>