

Structured Reading Recovery Support and Foundational Literacy Development among Grade 1 Learners

Angelee A. Balubal^{1*} and Michelle S. Morales^{1,2}

¹Northeastern College

*angeleeallapitan@gmail.com, ²michellemorales@northeasterncollege.edu.ph

Date Submitted:
February 22, 2026

Date Accepted:
April 24, 2026

Date Published:
July 18, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21425545

ABSTRACT

This study traced the literacy growth of Grade 1 learners who received structured reading recovery support and determined how implementation fidelity shaped their progress across the intervention period. A prospective repeated-measures cohort design with an embedded fidelity component was used. Learners identified through an initial literacy screening completed assessments at baseline, Week 4, Week 8, and Week 12. The assessment package measured phonological awareness, letter-sound correspondence, blending and segmenting, decoding, word recognition, oral reading accuracy, fluency, vocabulary, and basic comprehension. Piecewise linear mixed-effects modeling, estimated marginal means, standardized mean-change effects, and reliable change indices were applied. Results showed

substantial improvement in overall foundational literacy, with the strongest gains observed in decoding, blending and segmenting, phonological awareness, and letter-sound correspondence. Growth was faster during the first eight weeks and remained significant, though slower, during the consolidation phase. Higher implementation fidelity was associated with steeper literacy growth, particularly when instructional sequencing, teacher modeling, guided practice, feedback, and review were delivered consistently. Most learners demonstrated reliable improvement, yet many remained below expected benchmarks in fluency, automatic word recognition, and comprehension. The findings indicate that structured reading recovery can strengthen early literacy when support is systematic, assessment-informed, and sustained. Continued intervention cycles, stronger cumulative review, smaller instructional groups, and greater emphasis on oral language, repeated reading, and comprehension were recommended for learners who showed limited response.

Keywords: *assessment-informed instruction, foundational literacy, Grade 1 learners, implementation fidelity, reading intervention, structured reading recovery*

INTRODUCTION

Learning to read in the first years of schooling shapes how children participate in nearly every area of education. Once learners can recognize words, understand sentences, and obtain meaning from short texts, they gain access to lessons in mathematics, science, social studies, and other learning areas. When these abilities remain weak, ordinary classroom tasks can become difficult, and the demands placed on learners increase as lessons rely more heavily on written language. The *Philippines Learning Poverty Brief* reported that 91 percent of Filipino children at late primary age were not proficient in reading, after adjustment for children who were out of school. The estimate was based on assessment data collected before the COVID-19 school closures, yet it still presents a serious picture of the literacy difficulties faced by the education system (World Bank & UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2024).

Grade 1 occupies a central place in addressing this concern because it is the stage when children move from emergent literacy toward beginning reading. At this level, learners are expected to connect spoken sounds with written symbols, recognize familiar words, read simple sentences, and begin understanding short texts. The MATATAG Reading and Literacy Curriculum Identifies Grade 1 as the beginning-reading stage and gives attention to oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, word study, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. These areas are closely connected rather than learned as separate classroom requirements. A learner who struggles to hear sounds within words, for example, may also encounter difficulty in decoding and reading connected text. The curriculum therefore places foundational literacy at the center of instruction during Key Stage 1 (Department of Education, 2023).

Effective beginning-reading instruction requires more than allowing children to encounter printed words through exposure alone. Young learners need clear explanations, teacher modeling, guided practice, corrective feedback, and repeated opportunities to apply their skills in meaningful texts. Evidence-based guidance for kindergarten to Grade 3 recommends teaching learners to identify and manipulate segments of sound, connect sounds with letters, decode words, recognize common word parts, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency. Oral language and vocabulary instruction must also accompany word-reading lessons so that children understand the language represented by print. These recommendations support a planned sequence of instruction in which skills are introduced carefully, practiced regularly, and reviewed according to learner performance (Foorman et al., 2016).

The development of word-reading ability is especially important during Grade 1. Alphabetic writing systems require children to understand that written letters and letter combinations represent sounds in spoken language. This understanding allows them to read unfamiliar words instead of depending only on memorization, pictures, or guesses drawn from a sentence. Explicit phonics instruction contributes to this process, but phonics alone does not represent the whole of reading development. Children also need vocabulary, oral language, knowledge of sentence structures, comprehension strategies, and frequent experience with appropriate texts. Reading instruction is therefore strongest when accurate decoding is taught directly while learners are also guided to understand and respond to what they read (Castles et al., 2018).

Foundational literacy development also depends on how learners coordinate several processes while reading. Word recognition and language comprehension work together, but the relationship between them is not purely mechanical. Children must attend to print, maintain effort, connect ideas across sentences, draw on what they already know, and notice when a passage no longer makes sense. Differences in these processes help explain why two learners with similar decoding ability may show different levels of comprehension. Some children may read words accurately but have limited vocabulary, while others may understand spoken stories but struggle to identify printed words. Reading support must therefore respond to the particular source of difficulty rather than treating all struggling readers as though they have the same instructional needs (Duke & Cartwright, 2021).

Timing is another important consideration. Difficulties that appear during Grade 1 should not be left unaddressed until learners reach later grade levels. Early intervention provides an opportunity to strengthen developing skills before repeated difficulty becomes part of the learner's daily experience. In a multisite investigation involving children at risk for reading disabilities, intervention delivered in the primary grades produced meaningful gains, with findings supporting the value of intensive evidence-based instruction early in schooling. Learner outcomes also differed according to initial skills and the grade in which support began, showing that intervention must be both timely and responsive. Early assistance does not require labeling children as incapable readers. Rather, it recognizes that some learners require additional instructional time, closer guidance, and a more deliberate sequence of practice (Lovett et al., 2017).

Structured support can provide this additional assistance when it is guided by assessment and delivered with consistency. A meta-analysis of interventions for learners at risk of reading difficulty in Grades 1 to 3 found positive effects on word reading, pseudoword reading, passage fluency, and reading comprehension. The findings also indicated that intervention outcomes may vary according to instructional content, group size, duration, and other features of implementation. These results suggest that reading recovery support should not consist of

unrelated worksheets or occasional remediation. It should begin with the identification of specific literacy needs, followed by focused instruction, guided application, progress monitoring, and adjustments based on the learner's response. Such an arrangement allows teachers to determine whether learners are gaining accuracy, independence, and understanding over time (Gersten et al., 2020).

Fluency is one area that benefits from sustained and carefully guided practice. Learners who devote excessive attention to identifying individual words may have little mental capacity left for understanding a sentence or remembering the ideas in a passage. Repeated oral reading, teacher modeling, immediate correction, and practice with suitable texts can help children read more accurately, smoothly, and confidently. A synthesis of fluency interventions for elementary learners with reading difficulties found that repeated-reading procedures were widely used and were associated with improvements in oral reading fluency, with some studies also reporting gains in comprehension. Repetition, however, should serve a clear instructional purpose. Learners need feedback and appropriately selected materials so that practice strengthens accurate reading instead of reinforcing errors (Hudson et al., 2020).

For the present research, structured reading recovery support refers to an organized set of assessment-informed activities intended for Grade 1 learners who require added assistance in beginning reading. Its value lies in the orderly delivery of instruction, the close observation of learner responses, and the adjustment of support when progress is limited. Foundational literacy development, in turn, includes the growth of phonological awareness, letter-sound knowledge, word recognition, decoding, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and basic comprehension. Research on elementary reading interventions has shown that explicit and systematic teaching of foundational skills can improve reading outcomes, although the strength of the results depends partly on the quality and consistency of implementation (Hall et al., 2023).

Against this background, this study examines how organized reading assistance relates to the literacy development of children at the beginning-reading stage. The inquiry is grounded in the need to identify forms of support that are responsive to actual learner performance and workable within the daily conditions of an elementary classroom. By focusing on Grade 1 learners, the research may provide evidence that can guide the planning of focused reading activities, the monitoring of early literacy progress, and the timely provision of assistance to children who have not yet developed the skills expected at their grade level.

Literature Review

Components of Foundational Literacy Development

Foundational literacy develops through the interaction of word-level reading and language comprehension. For Grade 1 learners, word-level reading requires phonological awareness, letter-sound knowledge, decoding, and rapid recognition of familiar words, while language comprehension draws upon vocabulary, grammar, listening comprehension, inference, and background knowledge. Kim explained that reading comprehension cannot be treated as the simple product of only two isolated abilities because several language and cognitive skills influence comprehension both directly and through word reading and listening comprehension. This view supports the assessment of multiple literacy components when identifying the needs of beginning readers. Longitudinal evidence also showed that decoding had a stronger contribution during the early stages of reading development, while listening comprehension became increasingly important as learners gained greater control over written words. Structured reading support should therefore strengthen decoding without neglecting vocabulary, oral language, and meaning construction, since progress in one area may not compensate fully for weakness in another (Kim, 2017; Lervåg et al., 2018).

Structured and Explicit Reading Support

Structured reading support is characterized by carefully ordered lessons, explicit teacher modeling, guided practice, cumulative review, corrective feedback, and opportunities to apply learned skills in reading and spelling. An intervention conducted with children in their first year of school showed that systematic teaching of phoneme awareness, letter-sound knowledge, decoding, spelling, vocabulary, and oral narrative skills produced significant

gains in foundational literacy. Learners who required added support also benefited from more intensive Tier 2 instruction after their response to classroom teaching had been assessed. Related evidence from the Targeted Reading Intervention indicated that differentiated supplemental instruction delivered by classroom teachers could improve decoding outcomes, particularly for learners who began with limited vocabulary knowledge. These findings suggest that recovery support should be organized around clearly identified literacy needs rather than delivered as a general repetition of whole-class lessons. Instruction becomes more useful when the sequence, pacing, examples, feedback, and amount of practice are adjusted to the learner's existing skills (Gillon et al., 2023; Bratsch-Hines et al., 2020).

Assessment, Progress Monitoring, and Instructional Adjustment

Assessment serves a practical purpose in reading recovery when its results guide decisions about what to teach, how much support to provide, and whether an instructional approach is producing progress. Initial assessment can identify weaknesses in phonological awareness, letter-sound knowledge, decoding, word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension, while brief follow-up measures can show whether these skills are improving. Förster et al. found that combining learning progress assessment with differentiated reading instruction produced stronger growth in reading fluency, with learners who had lower initial reading skills gaining particular benefit. A broader meta-analysis also found a positive effect of learning progress monitoring on academic performance and showed that monitoring was more productive when teachers received assistance in interpreting the data and modifying instruction. Stronger effects were associated with frequent assessment, particularly when measures were administered at least once a week. For Grade 1 learners, progress monitoring should be brief, developmentally appropriate, and directly connected to the skills taught during recovery sessions so that assessment does not become separate from instruction (Förster et al., 2018; Fuchs et al., 2025).

Tiered and Small-Group Reading Intervention

Not every Grade 1 learner requires the same level of reading assistance. A tiered system begins with strong classroom instruction for all learners, followed by focused small-group support for those whose assessment results indicate continuing difficulty. Learners who respond slowly may require increased lesson frequency, smaller instructional groups, additional modeling, and more opportunities for supported practice. A systematic review of interventions from preschool to Grade 2 found that Tier 2 programs commonly addressed oral language, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, decoding, and early reading through supplemental small-group instruction. The review also emphasized the importance of screening, intervention quality, and systematic evaluation of learner response. A separate systematic review and meta-analysis found that small-group Tier 2 interventions could improve word-decoding performance, although the effect was modest and the limited number of qualifying studies called for careful interpretation. These findings indicate that small-group support is not automatically effective because of group size alone. Its value depends on explicit teaching, suitable materials, sufficient intensity, consistent implementation, and instructional decisions grounded in learner progress (Goldfeld et al., 2022; Nilvius et al., 2021).

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a prospective repeated-measures cohort design with an embedded implementation-fidelity component. This design was selected because foundational literacy development was expected to occur gradually and could not be represented adequately by a single pretest and posttest comparison. Learners' reading performance was assessed at several points before, during, and after the structured reading recovery sessions. The repeated observations made it possible to examine the direction and rate of literacy growth while accounting for differences in the learners' starting abilities. The implementation-fidelity component documented whether the planned lesson sequence, instructional time, teacher modeling, guided reading, corrective feedback, and

cumulative review were delivered as intended. The design therefore examined both learner progress and the consistency of the support provided.

Research Locale

The research was conducted at Sta. Catalina Elementary School in Sta. Catalina, Tumauni, Isabela. The school offered elementary education and implemented beginning-reading instruction for Grade 1 learners under the prescribed basic education curriculum. The locale was selected because it provided an appropriate setting for examining structured reading recovery support within an actual classroom program. Reading activities were carried out in a designated learning area where learners could participate in focused small-group sessions without unnecessary classroom interruption. The school administration coordinated the schedule of the intervention with the Grade 1 teachers to ensure that the sessions complemented regular classroom instruction.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants were Grade 1 learners who demonstrated a need for additional support in beginning reading based on an initial literacy screening. Eligibility was determined through performance in phonological awareness, letter-sound knowledge, word decoding, word recognition, and short-text reading tasks. A criterion-referenced total inclusion technique was used. All learners who met the established screening criteria, obtained parental or guardian consent, and expressed willingness to participate were included in the study. Learners with prolonged absences that prevented completion of the required assessment occasions were excluded from the growth analysis, although they continued to receive appropriate classroom reading assistance. No personal profile variables were gathered because the investigation focused solely on reading recovery support and literacy development.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using the Structured Reading Recovery Support and Foundational Literacy Assessment Package developed for the study. The package contained two complementary measures. The Structured Reading Recovery Implementation Scale documented lesson preparation, instructional sequencing, explicit modeling, guided practice, corrective feedback, cumulative review, learner engagement, and use of assessment results. Each indicator was rated through an observation-based scale with clearly stated performance descriptions. The Foundational Literacy Development Battery measured phonological awareness, letter-sound correspondence, blending and segmenting, decoding of familiar and unfamiliar words, automatic word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading fluency, vocabulary, and basic comprehension. The assessment used short oral tasks, picture-supported items, word lists, and developmentally suitable passages.

The initial instrument was examined by five validators with expertise in early literacy, language education, educational assessment, and elementary teaching. They reviewed the relevance, clarity, developmental suitability, alignment, and cultural appropriateness of the items. The item-level content validity indices ranged from .86 to 1.00, while the scale-level content validity index based on average agreement was .94. Comments from the validators resulted in the replacement of unfamiliar words, simplification of selected directions, adjustment of passage length, and revision of several scoring descriptions.

The revised package was pilot tested with Grade 1 learners from a public elementary school that had conditions comparable to the research locale. The pilot participants were not included in the main investigation. Item analysis was conducted to identify tasks that were excessively easy, excessively difficult, or unable to distinguish differences in beginning-reading performance. The Structured Reading Recovery Implementation Scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .93. The literacy battery yielded an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91, while the coefficients of its component measures ranged from .84 to .90. The dichotomously scored literacy items also obtained a Kuder-Richardson 20 coefficient of .88. These results indicated strong internal consistency and supported the use of the instruments in the main data collection.

Data Gathering

Permission to conduct the research was obtained from the appropriate school authorities before any learner was approached. The researcher met with the Grade 1 teachers and parents or guardians to explain the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the voluntary nature of participation. Written parental or guardian consent and age-appropriate learner assent were secured before the initial screening.

Eligible learners completed baseline literacy assessments under standardized administration conditions. The researcher then organized the learners into small instructional groups based on the specific skills that required support. The reading recovery program was delivered through sequenced sessions that included phonological exercises, explicit letter-sound instruction, word building, guided decoding, repeated oral reading, vocabulary work, and comprehension conversations. Instructional activities progressed from teacher demonstration to guided participation and independent application.

Literacy assessments were administered at predetermined intervals to document changes in performance. Implementation observations were also completed during selected sessions to determine whether the instructional procedures were delivered consistently. Errors were recorded immediately and used to adjust the following lessons. Assessment results were checked, coded, and entered into a password-protected data file. A second review of the encoded records was conducted to verify accuracy before statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed through piecewise linear mixed-effects growth modeling. This treatment was selected because the study contained repeated literacy scores nested within individual learners. The model estimated the rate of change during the initial support period and the rate of change during the later consolidation period. Assessment occasion and implementation-fidelity score were entered as fixed effects, while learner-specific random intercepts were included to account for differences in baseline reading performance. Random slopes were retained when they improved model fit and produced stable estimates.

Restricted maximum likelihood estimation was applied because it provided less biased variance estimates for repeated-measures data. Model assumptions were examined through residual plots, normality checks, and influence diagnostics. Competing models were compared using the Akaike information criterion and Bayesian information criterion, with lower values indicating better relative fit. Missing observations were handled through the mixed-model estimation procedure, provided that sufficient assessment data remained available for each learner.

Estimated marginal means and 95 percent confidence intervals were reported for every assessment occasion. Standardized mean-change effect sizes were computed to describe the magnitude of literacy improvement. A reliable change index was also calculated for each learner to determine whether the observed progress exceeded the amount of change that could reasonably be attributed to measurement error. The relationship between implementation fidelity and literacy growth was tested through the interaction between fidelity scores and assessment occasion. Statistical decisions were evaluated at the .05 level of significance, but interpretation also considered effect sizes, confidence intervals, individual growth patterns, and educational importance.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed the principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, learner protection, confidentiality, fairness, and responsible data management. Parents or guardians were informed that participation could be withdrawn at any time without penalty. The purpose and activities were explained to the learners using language appropriate for their age, and no learner was forced to continue when discomfort or unwillingness was observed.

The screening results were not used to label learners publicly or to separate them in a manner that could cause embarrassment. Reading recovery sessions were presented as additional learning opportunities rather than punishment for low performance. Participation and assessment results did not affect grades, class standing, promotion, or access to regular instruction. Learners who required continued assistance after the data collection period were referred to the Grade 1 teachers for appropriate follow-up support.

Names were replaced with identification codes in the database, assessment sheets, and statistical files. Printed materials were stored in a secured location, while digital records were protected by passwords and limited access. Results were reported in combined form so that individual learners could not be identified. The instruments, procedures, and interpretation of findings were used only for legitimate educational and research purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Foundational Literacy Scores Across the Four Assessment Periods*

Foundational Literacy Area	Baseline M (SD)	Week 4 M (SD)	Week 8 M (SD)	Week 12 M (SD)	Mean Change	Hedges' g _{rm}	Magnitude
Phonological awareness	48.72 (11.46)	62.81 (10.78)	74.96 (9.54)	81.38 (8.77)	32.66	2.21	Large
Letter-sound correspondence	53.14 (12.02)	68.65 (10.83)	80.42 (9.17)	85.67 (8.65)	32.53	2.36	Large
Blending and segmenting	42.63 (12.88)	56.92 (12.06)	69.88 (10.86)	77.46 (10.12)	34.83	2.17	Large
Word decoding	38.91 (13.41)	51.76 (12.37)	65.43 (11.74)	73.82 (11.06)	34.91	2.03	Large
Automatic word recognition	44.57 (13.07)	56.38 (12.66)	68.14 (11.81)	75.29 (11.29)	30.72	1.84	Large
Oral reading accuracy	62.08 (10.94)	69.44 (9.85)	76.51 (8.92)	81.73 (8.47)	19.65	1.47	Large
Oral reading fluency	13.42 (7.66)	18.51 (8.42)	24.37 (8.71)	28.64 (9.02)	15.22	1.61	Large
Vocabulary	55.29 (11.85)	62.33 (11.28)	68.75 (10.42)	73.56 (10.06)	18.27	1.21	Large
Basic comprehension	46.84 (12.73)	54.11 (12.26)	61.95 (11.54)	67.42 (10.91)	20.58	1.29	Large
Overall literacy score	49.16 (11.94)	60.41 (11.13)	71.28 (10.06)	77.93 (9.48)	28.77	2.08	Large

Note. Scores were expressed as percentage scores except oral reading fluency, which was measured in correct words per minute. Hedges' g_{rm} represented the standardized repeated-measures change from baseline to Week 12.

Table 1 presents the performance of the Grade 1 learners at baseline, Week 4, Week 8, and Week 12. All literacy areas showed progressive improvement. The largest gains were recorded in decoding, blending and segmenting, phonological awareness, and letter-sound correspondence. Fluency and comprehension also improved, although their endpoint results remained lower than those of the other literacy areas.

The overall foundational literacy mean increased from 49.16 at baseline to 77.93 at Week 12, representing an improvement of 28.77 points. Word decoding produced the greatest mean increase at 34.91 points, followed closely by blending and segmenting at 34.83 points. Letter-sound correspondence obtained the highest endpoint mean of 85.67. Basic comprehension had an endpoint mean of 67.42, while oral reading fluency increased from 13.42 to 28.64 correct words per minute. These results indicated that learners made substantial progress, but the development of fluent and meaning-oriented reading remained less advanced than the acquisition of sound-symbol and word-reading skills.

Table 2. *Piecewise Linear Mixed-Effects Model for Overall Foundational Literacy*

Fixed Effect	Estimate	SE	95% CI	t	p
Intercept at baseline	49.16	1.78	[45.66, 52.66]	27.62	<.001
Weekly growth during Weeks 0 to 8	2.77	0.18	[2.42, 3.12]	15.39	<.001
Change in slope after Week 8	-1.11	0.27	[-1.64, -0.58]	-4.11	<.001
Weekly growth during Weeks 8 to 12	1.66	0.21	[1.25, 2.07]	7.90	<.001
Implementation fidelity	0.09	0.07	[-0.05, 0.23]	1.29	.201

Fixed Effect	Estimate	SE	95% CI	t	p
Time × implementation fidelity	0.05	0.02	[0.01, 0.09]	2.72	.009

Model Component	Variance	SD
Learner-specific random intercept	68.64	8.28
Learner-specific random slope	0.38	0.62
Residual	16.48	4.06

Model Fit Indicator	Value
Akaike information criterion	1042.67
Bayesian information criterion	1075.12
Marginal R ²	.76
Conditional R ²	.89

Note. Implementation fidelity was centered around its overall mean. The Week 8 to Week 12 slope was derived by combining the initial slope and the estimated change in slope.

The model estimated an average increase of 2.77 literacy points per week during the first eight weeks, $p < .001$. Growth continued during the consolidation period at 1.66 points per week, $p < .001$. The reduction of 1.11 points in the weekly slope was statistically significant, $p < .001$. Thus, the learners continued to improve after Week 8, but at a slower rate.

The random intercept variance showed meaningful differences in baseline literacy performance. The random slope also indicated that learners did not progress at exactly the same rate. The fixed effects accounted for 76 percent of the variation in the literacy scores, while the complete model, including learner-level differences, accounted for 89 percent. These results supported the use of a mixed-effects growth model instead of treating the assessment scores as independent observations.

Table 3. *Implementation Fidelity of the Structured Reading Recovery Support*

Implementation Component	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Lesson preparation	92.47	4.82	High fidelity
Instructional sequencing	90.63	5.17	High fidelity
Explicit teacher modeling	91.28	5.06	High fidelity
Guided learner practice	89.41	5.74	High fidelity
Corrective feedback	87.56	6.08	High fidelity
Cumulative review	82.73	7.12	Adequate fidelity
Learner engagement	88.64	5.91	High fidelity
Assessment-informed adjustment	84.29	6.76	Adequate fidelity
Completion of planned instructional dosage	86.18	6.34	High fidelity
Overall implementation fidelity	88.13	5.24	High fidelity

Note. Scores from 85.00 to 100.00 indicated high fidelity, while scores from 70.00 to 84.99 indicated adequate fidelity.

The overall fidelity mean was 88.13, showing that most intervention procedures were delivered consistently. Lesson preparation obtained the highest rating, followed by explicit teacher modeling and instructional sequencing. The weakest components were cumulative review and assessment-informed adjustment. These areas still reached an adequate level, but their lower scores indicated that previously taught skills were not revisited with equal consistency and that assessment results were not always translated immediately into instructional modifications.

Although the direct effect of fidelity on literacy scores was not significant, $\beta = 0.09$, $p = .201$, the interaction between fidelity and time was significant, $\beta = 0.05$, $p = .009$. This meant that fidelity was associated with the rate of improvement rather than with the learners' starting scores. Sessions implemented with greater consistency were linked to steeper literacy growth.

Table 4. *Model-Estimated Literacy Growth at Selected Levels of Implementation Fidelity*

Fidelity Level	Representative Fidelity Score	Estimated Baseline Score	Estimated Week 12 Score	Estimated Improvement
Adequate implementation	82.00	49.14	74.21	25.07
Mean implementation level	88.13	49.16	77.93	28.77
Very high implementation	94.00	49.18	81.52	32.34

The model estimated a 25.07-point improvement when fidelity was at 82.00 and a 32.34-point improvement when fidelity reached 94.00. The estimated difference of 7.27 points indicated that learners exposed to more complete instructional sequencing, guided practice, review, and feedback were expected to gain more across the intervention period.

Table 5. *Classification of Learners According to Reliable Literacy Change*

Classification	Percentage of Learners
Demonstrated reliable improvement	68.42
Improved but did not exceed the reliable change criterion	24.56
Showed no reliable change	7.02
Demonstrated reliable decline	0.00
Total	100.00

Most learners, representing 68.42 percent, demonstrated improvement that exceeded the reliable change criterion. A further 24.56 percent obtained higher endpoint scores, but the amount of change was not sufficiently large to be distinguished from measurement error. The remaining 7.02 percent showed little or no measurable progress. No learner experienced a reliable decline.

Table 6. *Learners Meeting Foundational Literacy Benchmarks at Baseline and Week 12*

Foundational Literacy Area	Baseline (%)	Week 12 (%)	Percentage-Point Increase
Phonological awareness	12.28	78.95	66.67
Letter-sound correspondence	17.54	84.21	66.67
Blending and segmenting	7.02	68.42	61.40
Word decoding	5.26	61.40	56.14
Automatic word recognition	8.77	57.89	49.12
Oral reading accuracy	26.32	73.68	47.36
Oral reading fluency	3.51	45.61	42.10
Vocabulary	19.30	66.67	47.37
Basic comprehension	10.53	50.88	40.35
Overall foundational literacy	7.02	59.65	52.63

Table 6 compares the percentages of learners who met the established performance benchmark at baseline and Week 12.

The proportion of learners meeting the overall foundational literacy benchmark increased from 7.02 percent to 59.65 percent. Letter-sound correspondence recorded the highest endpoint benchmark attainment at 84.21 percent, followed by phonological awareness at 78.95 percent and oral reading accuracy at 73.68 percent. Fluency had the lowest benchmark attainment at 45.61 percent. Basic comprehension also remained a concern because only 50.88 percent met its expected level by Week 12.

CONCLUSION

The structured reading recovery support contributed to substantial gains in the foundational literacy development of Grade 1 learners, particularly in phonological awareness, letter-sound correspondence, blending and segmenting, word decoding, and oral reading accuracy. Literacy growth was strongest during the first eight weeks and continued at a slower but significant rate during the consolidation period, indicating that early code-based skills developed more rapidly than fluency and comprehension. High implementation fidelity was associated with steeper literacy improvement, although weaknesses in cumulative review and assessment-informed adjustment limited the progress of some learners. While most participants demonstrated reliable improvement, a considerable proportion remained below the expected benchmarks in oral reading fluency, automatic word recognition, decoding, and basic comprehension. It was therefore recommended that the school sustain the structured reading recovery program beyond a single intervention cycle, increase the frequency of cumulative review, use assessment results immediately to modify instructional groupings and activities, and provide smaller or more individualized sessions for learners who showed limited response. Teachers should also strengthen vocabulary, oral language, phrase reading, repeated oral reading, and comprehension conversations to support the transition from accurate decoding to fluent and meaningful reading. Regular progress monitoring, fidelity checks, parental involvement, and follow-up assessment should be maintained to ensure that gains are sustained and that learners with persistent difficulties receive timely and appropriate support.

References

- Al Otaiba, S., McMaster, K., Wanzek, J., & Zaru, M. W. (2023). What we know and need to know about literacy interventions for elementary students with reading difficulties and disabilities, including dyslexia. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 58(2), 313–332. doi:10.1002/rrq.458
- Bratsch-Hines, M., Vernon-Feagans, L., Pedonti, S., & Varghese, C. (2020). Differential effects of the Targeted Reading Intervention for students with low phonological awareness and/or vocabulary. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 43(4), 214–226. doi:10.1177/0731948719858683
- 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. doi:10.1177/1529100618772271
- Department of Education. (2023). *MATATAG curriculum: Reading and literacy, Grade 1*.
- Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S25–S44. doi:10.1002/rrq.411
- Foorman, B., 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., & 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.
- Förster, N., Kawohl, E., & Souvignier, E. (2018). Short- and long-term effects of assessment-based differentiated reading instruction in general education on reading fluency and reading comprehension. *Learning and Instruction*, 56, 98–109. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.04.009

- Fuchs, A., Radkowsch, A., & Sommerhoff, D. (2025). Using learning progress monitoring to promote academic performance? A meta-analysis of the effectiveness. *Educational Research Review*, 46, Article 100648. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100648
- 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. doi:10.1080/19345747.2019.1689591
- Gillon, G., McNeill, B., Scott, A., Arrow, A., Gath, M., & Macfarlane, A. (2023). A better start literacy approach: Effectiveness of Tier 1 and Tier 2 support within a response to teaching framework. *Reading and Writing*, 36(3), 565–598. doi:10.1007/s11145-022-10303-4
- Goldfeld, S., Beatson, R., Watts, A., Snow, P., Gold, L., Le, H. N. D., Edwards, S., Connell, J., Stark, H., Shingles, B., Barnett, T., Quach, J., & Eadie, P. (2022). Tier 2 oral language and early reading interventions for preschool to Grade 2 children: A restricted systematic review. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 27(1), 65–113. doi:10.1080/19404158.2021.2011754
- 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. doi:10.1002/rq.477
- Hudson, A., Koh, P. W., Moore, K. A., & Binks-Cantrell, E. (2020). Fluency interventions for elementary students with reading difficulties: A synthesis of research from 2000–2019. *Education Sciences*, 10(3), Article 52. doi:10.3390/educsci10030052
- Jiménez, J. E., Gutiérrez, N., & de León, S. C. (2021). Analyzing the role of fidelity of RTI Tier 2 reading intervention in Spanish kindergarten and first grade students. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 71(1), 28–49. doi:10.1007/s11881-021-00221-5
- Kim, Y.-S. G. (2017). Why the simple view of reading is not simplistic: Unpacking component skills of reading using a direct and indirect effect model of reading (DIER). *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 21(4), 310–333. doi:10.1080/10888438.2017.1291643
- Lervåg, A., Hulme, C., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2018). Unpicking the developmental relationship between oral language skills and reading comprehension: It's simple, but complex. *Child Development*, 89(5), 1821–1838. doi:10.1111/cdev.12861
- Lovett, M. W., Frijters, J. C., Wolf, M., Steinbach, K. A., Sevcik, R. A., & Morris, R. D. (2017). Early intervention for children at risk for reading disabilities: The impact of grade at intervention and individual differences on intervention outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(7), 889–914. doi:10.1037/edu0000181
- 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. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2021.1994105
- Wanzek, J., Stevens, E. A., Williams, K. J., Scammacca, N., Vaughn, S., & Sargent, K. (2018). Current evidence on the effects of intensive early reading interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 51(6), 612–624. doi:10.1177/0022219418775110
- World Bank, & UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2024, April). *Philippines learning poverty brief* (Version 2). World Bank.