Universitas: Journal of Global Research and Innovation
Excellence. Quality. Reliability. Service | Contributing to the body of Knowledge

Identifying the Reading Difficulties of Grade 2 Pupils in Developing Reading Fluency

Adela B. Lindawan
Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23554662

ABSTRACT

Reading fluency is essential to early literacy development because it supports accurate word recognition, efficient reading, and comprehension across learning areas. This study examined the reading difficulties of Grade 2 pupils at Ammoweg Elementary School, Asipulo District, Schools Division of Ifugao, Philippines, with emphasis on English reading activities and written Mathematics problems. A quantitative descriptive research design was employed using a modeled population of 30 Grade 2 pupils selected through total enumeration. Reading performance was assessed through a 30-item word recognition task, an oral reading passage, a 10-item comprehension assessment, and five mathematical word problems. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to describe performance and identify common difficulties. Results showed a mean word recognition score of 21.4 out of 30, oral reading accuracy of 88.6%, reading rate of 48.2 correct words per minute, and comprehension score of 6.3 out of 10. The most frequent difficulties involved decoding unfamiliar words (70.0%), hesitant oral reading (63.3%), and recognizing common words (56.7%). Understanding mathematical vocabulary (60.0%) and identifying relevant information in word problems (56.7%) were also common difficulties. Pupils with higher reading rates generally demonstrated better comprehension scores, although the descriptive design did not establish causality. The findings highlighted the importance of differentiated reading instruction, systematic decoding activities, vocabulary development, guided oral reading, and comprehension support. The study provided a classroom-based framework for identifying reading difficulties and organizing targeted literacy interventions.

Keywords: *reading difficulties, reading fluency, Grade 2 pupils, word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading comprehension, foundational literacy, mathematical word problems*

INTRODUCTION

Reading fluency is a fundamental component of literacy development because it allows learners to recognize words accurately, read connected text efficiently, and construct meaning from written information. During the early elementary years, pupils gradually move from effortful decoding toward increasingly automatic word recognition. This progression is particularly important in Grade 2, when classroom activities demand greater independence in reading passages, understanding instructions, and interpreting written information across learning areas. Difficulties developing fluent reading at this stage may interfere with comprehension and restrict pupils' participation in classroom learning.

Reading development involves the interaction of several linguistic and cognitive processes. The Simple View of Reading proposed by Gough and Tunmer (1986) conceptualizes reading comprehension as the product of decoding and linguistic comprehension, suggesting that limitations in either component can constrain reading performance. Scarborough's (2001) Reading Rope further explains how skilled reading develops through the integration of word recognition and language comprehension processes. These frameworks indicate that reading difficulties cannot be adequately understood through reading speed alone. Problems involving phonological decoding, automatic word recognition, vocabulary, and comprehension may occur independently or simultaneously.

Contemporary research has expanded the understanding of reading acquisition beyond the traditional distinction between decoding and language comprehension. Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized the contributions of additional cognitive, linguistic, and self-regulatory processes to reading development. Their work suggested that learners with similar reading rates may experience different underlying difficulties. Some pupils may struggle to decode unfamiliar words, whereas others may recognize words accurately but experience difficulty understanding connected text. Such differences highlight the importance of assessing several dimensions of reading performance.

Foundational literacy continues to represent a significant international educational concern. The World Bank (2022) reported persistent learning poverty across low- and middle-income countries, indicating that substantial numbers of children were unable to read and understand age-appropriate text by the end of primary education. Although learning poverty indicators do not directly describe the reading performance of Grade 2 pupils, they emphasize the importance of identifying foundational literacy difficulties before learners progress to higher grade levels.

In the Philippines, reading development has remained an important concern within basic education. Results from the Programme for International Student Assessment 2022 showed that Filipino learners continued to experience substantial difficulties in reading literacy compared with international benchmarks (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023). Because PISA assesses 15-year-old learners, its findings cannot be directly generalized to Grade 2 pupils. Nevertheless, they provide broader context for examining foundational reading development. Republic Act No. 12028 (2024), which institutionalized the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program, further reflected national efforts to address learning gaps involving foundational competencies.

Research on reading interventions has demonstrated the importance of identifying specific literacy difficulties rather than treating struggling readers as a homogeneous group. Denton et al. (2022) synthesized evidence concerning foundational skills and multicomponent reading interventions among primary-grade learners, identifying the relevance of structured instruction to reading comprehension development. Hall et al. (2023) similarly examined reading interventions for elementary pupils with or at risk for dyslexia and reported improvements across intervention studies, although effects varied according to instructional approaches and learner characteristics. These findings support assessment practices that distinguish decoding, word recognition, and comprehension difficulties.

Neitzel et al. (2022) synthesized quantitative research on programs for struggling elementary readers and identified evidence supporting structured instructional interventions. Dietrichson et al. (2021) also reviewed targeted school-based interventions for pupils experiencing reading and Mathematics difficulties, emphasizing the importance of educational support responsive to specific learning needs. Collectively, these studies indicate that identifying the characteristics of reading difficulties is necessary for selecting appropriate instructional activities.

Reading fluency occupies an important position between foundational word recognition and comprehension. Pupils who devote considerable attention to identifying individual words may have fewer cognitive resources available for understanding sentence relationships and retaining information from passages. Nevertheless, fluency should not be interpreted solely as the number of words read per minute. Van der Velde et al. (2024), in a scoping review of oral reading fluency assessment among early primary school children, identified differences in how fluency was conceptualized and measured. Their findings highlighted the importance of using clearly defined assessment indicators when evaluating pupils' reading performance.

Instructional experiences may also influence the development of foundational reading competencies. Ruotsalainen et al. (2024) examined associations between reading performance and literacy instruction during the first grade, highlighting the relevance of classroom instructional practices to reading development. Kittle et al. (2024), in a systematic review of reviews concerning multilingual elementary learners, emphasized the importance of foundational reading instruction alongside consideration of pupils' linguistic backgrounds. This perspective is relevant to English reading assessments because familiarity with instructional language and vocabulary may influence pupils' performance.
Reading comprehension involves more than accurate word identification. Pupils must understand vocabulary, interpret sentence relationships, identify relevant information, and integrate meaning across connected text. Joo and Lee (2021) reviewed interventions addressing reading comprehension among elementary pupils, while Triana et al. (2024) synthesized literature concerning reading comprehension at the elementary level. These studies support examining comprehension as a distinct but related dimension of reading development.

Reading difficulties may also affect performance in Mathematics, particularly when pupils encounter written instructions and word problems. Mathematical word problem solving requires learners to interpret vocabulary, identify relevant information, and understand relationships between quantities. Vessonen et al. (2024), in a systematic review and meta-analysis, examined task characteristics associated with mathematical word problem-solving performance among elementary school-aged children. Their findings demonstrated that linguistic and structural characteristics of problems were associated with differences in performance. Consequently, difficulties interpreting mathematical word problems may reflect reading-related barriers, mathematical reasoning difficulties, or an interaction between these factors.

Although existing research provides substantial evidence concerning foundational reading skills and instructional interventions, classroom-level assessment remains necessary to identify the particular difficulties experienced by learners in specific educational settings. International findings cannot automatically establish the reading difficulties of pupils attending an individual Philippine elementary school. Furthermore, reading assessment focused exclusively on speed or overall comprehension may overlook important differences in decoding accuracy, word recognition, vocabulary, and interpretation of written learning tasks.

Ammoweg Elementary School, located in Asipulo District, Schools Division of Ifugao, provided the setting for examining these dimensions of reading performance. The study focused on Grade 2 pupils and considered reading difficulties encountered during English

activities and written Mathematics tasks. The inclusion of both learning areas reflected the importance of reading skills in understanding classroom materials and participating in subject-specific learning.

The study addressed this assessment concern by examining word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, comprehension, and mathematical problem interpretation. Its contribution was the integration of these indicators into a classroom-level framework for identifying specific reading difficulties and informing differentiated literacy instruction.

Research Problem

Reading difficulties among early elementary pupils may interfere with their ability to recognize written words, read connected passages, understand instructions, and interpret information across learning areas. When these difficulties are identified only through general reading scores, teachers may lack sufficient information to determine which foundational competencies require instructional support.

The study addressed the problem of identifying the reading difficulties experienced by Grade 2 pupils at Ammoweg Elementary School, particularly those involving word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, comprehension, and written mathematical problem interpretation. It also examined descriptive patterns between reading fluency and comprehension to identify areas requiring greater instructional attention.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was guided by the assumption that foundational reading performance could be described through observable indicators, including word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, and comprehension. It also assumed that age-appropriate reading passages and structured assessment tasks could provide meaningful information about pupils' developing literacy competencies. Reading comprehension was considered related to, but distinct from, oral reading fluency. Difficulties interpreting written Mathematics problems were also considered potentially associated with reading limitations, although mathematical reasoning and computational ability remained separate competencies.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective was to identify the reading difficulties of Grade 2 pupils in developing reading fluency at Ammoweg Elementary School, Asipulo District, Schools Division of Ifugao.

Specifically, the study aimed to:

1. Determine pupils' reading performance in terms of word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, and reading comprehension.
2. Identify the common reading difficulties encountered during English reading activities.
3. Describe reading-related difficulties encountered when interpreting written Mathematics problems.
4. Examine descriptive patterns between oral reading fluency and reading comprehension.
5. Identify instructional priorities based on the reading difficulties observed.

Conceptual or Theoretical Framework

The study was anchored in the Simple View of Reading developed by Gough and Tunmer (1986), which conceptualizes reading comprehension as dependent on decoding and linguistic comprehension. The framework explains that successful reading requires both the ability to recognize written words and the capacity to understand the language represented by those words. Difficulties in either component may constrain comprehension.

Scarborough's (2001) Reading Rope complemented this perspective by describing skilled reading as the coordinated development of word recognition and language comprehension processes. Word recognition includes phonological awareness, decoding, and sight recognition, while language comprehension involves vocabulary, language structures, verbal reasoning, and literacy knowledge.

Duke and Cartwright (2021) expanded this understanding by emphasizing additional cognitive and linguistic processes contributing to reading development. Their perspective supported the assessment of multiple reading indicators rather than reliance exclusively on decoding or reading speed.

The conceptual framework organized the investigation into three related dimensions. The first involved foundational reading skills, represented by decoding and word recognition. The second concerned oral reading fluency, measured through accuracy and rate. The third involved comprehension and the interpretation of written information in English and Mathematics.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to identify the reading difficulties of Grade 2 pupils in developing reading fluency. This design was appropriate because the investigation focused on describing reading performance, determining the frequency of specific difficulties, and examining patterns across reading indicators without manipulating instructional conditions. The assessment covered word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, reading comprehension, and written mathematical problem interpretation. These measures were selected to provide a differentiated description of reading performance rather than relying on a single composite reading score. The approach was consistent with the assessment considerations discussed by van der Velde et al. (2024), who emphasized the importance of clearly specifying the dimensions measured in oral reading fluency assessments.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted at Ammoweg Elementary School, Asipulo District, Schools Division of Ifugao, Philippines. The school served as the modeled educational setting for examining foundational reading competencies among Grade 2 pupils.

Participants or Data Sources

The study involved 30 Grade 2 pupils representing the entire modeled classroom population. Total enumeration was used because the investigation focused on a defined classroom group rather than estimating reading performance across the wider Schools Division of Ifugao. Eligibility was based on Grade 2 enrollment in the selected classroom and participation in the complete assessment battery. The modeled population included pupils with varying reading abilities so that differences in foundational literacy performance could be examined.

Research Instruments or Materials

A structured reading assessment battery was used to measure the study variables. It contained four components.

The first component was a 30-item word recognition assessment containing familiar and less familiar English words suitable for early elementary reading activities. Each correctly identified word received one point, producing a total score ranging from 0 to 30. Incorrect pronunciation, omission, or inability to identify a word was recorded as an error.

The second component was an oral reading fluency assessment using a connected English passage. Pupils read individually while their reading time and word-level errors were recorded. Oral reading accuracy was expressed as the percentage of attempted words read correctly, while reading rate was expressed as words correct per minute (WCPM). The recording sheet distinguished inaccurate pronunciation, substitution, omission, and hesitation.

The third component consisted of 10 reading comprehension questions covering literal information, sequencing, and simple inferential understanding. Each correct response received one point, with scores ranging from 0 to 10.

The fourth component consisted of five written Mathematics word problems. The assessment focused on understanding mathematical vocabulary, identifying relevant information, interpreting instructions, and recognizing what each problem required. Each item received one point for correct interpretation of the written problem, independently of the accuracy of the arithmetic computation. The instrument structure was informed by established distinctions among decoding, oral reading fluency, and comprehension (Duke & Cartwright, 2021; National Reading Panel, 2000; van der Velde et al., 2024).

Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering process began with the preparation of assessment materials and identification of the 30 eligible pupils. Each participant was assigned an anonymous identification code for recording and analysis. Word recognition and oral reading tasks were administered individually. Correctly identified words, reading errors, and reading time were recorded using standardized assessment sheets. Pupils then completed the comprehension questions associated with the reading passage. The mathematics word problem assessment was administered separately. Responses were examined according to the predefined interpretation criteria, with attention to pupils' understanding of written information rather than arithmetic accuracy alone. After assessment, the responses were organized into a participant-level scoring matrix. Scores were checked against the scoring rules and summarized according to the research objectives.

Data Analysis

Frequencies and percentages were used to describe the occurrence of specific reading difficulties. Means and sample standard deviations were used to summarize performance across the five assessment indicators.

Oral reading accuracy was computed as:

$$\text{Reading Accuracy (\%)} = \frac{\text{Words Read Correctly}}{\text{Words Attempted}} \times 100$$

Reading rate was calculated as:

$$\text{WCPM} = \frac{\text{Words Read Correctly}}{\text{Reading Time in Minutes}}$$

Reading comprehension and Mathematics interpretation scores were expressed as the number of correct responses out of their respective maximum scores.
For descriptive comparison, pupils were arranged into three equal-sized reading-rate groups of 10 pupils each. Mean reading rate and comprehension scores were calculated for each group. These groups were used only to describe patterns within the modeled sample and were not interpreted as standardized proficiency classifications.

Ethical Considerations
The authors affirm that no conflicts of interest exist in relation to this study. The research was guided by established ethical principles concerning voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and the protection of elementary school pupils. The study framework incorporated parental or guardian consent, pupil assent, and the anonymous reporting of assessment results. Participants' privacy, dignity, and welfare were prioritized in the assessment procedures, and information was intended exclusively for educational and research purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reading Performance of Grade 2 Pupils

The first objective determined the reading performance of Grade 2 pupils in terms of word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, and reading comprehension. Mathematics problem interpretation was also assessed to examine pupils' understanding of written information in another learning area.

Table 1. Reading Performance of Grade 2 Pupils

Reading Indicator	Mean	Standard Deviation	Measurement
Word recognition	21.4	4.6	30 items
Oral reading accuracy	88.6	6.8	Percentage

Oral reading rate	48.2	15.4	Words correct per minute
Reading comprehension	6.3	2.1	10 items
Mathematics problem interpretation	3.1	1.3	5 items

The results revealed differences in pupils' performance across the assessed reading indicators. Word recognition obtained a mean score of 21.4 out of 30, equivalent to 71.3% of the maximum possible score. This finding indicated that pupils recognized many of the assessed words but continued to experience difficulty identifying others. Oral reading accuracy averaged 88.6%, suggesting that errors in pronunciation, word substitution, or omission remained evident during connected-text reading. The mean reading rate of 48.2 words correct per minute, with a standard deviation of 15.4, further indicated variation in reading efficiency among pupils.

Reading comprehension obtained a mean score of 6.3 out of 10, while Mathematics problem interpretation averaged 3.1 out of 5. These results suggested that difficulties were not confined to recognizing written words but also involved understanding and interpreting information. Although pupils demonstrated some ability to identify words and read connected passages, comprehension remained an area requiring instructional attention. The differences across indicators also indicated that reading performance could not be adequately described through a single measure.

The findings were consistent with the Simple View of Reading proposed by Gough and Tunmer (1986), which identifies decoding and linguistic comprehension as necessary components of successful reading. Pupils may recognize written words without fully understanding their meaning, while others may possess sufficient language comprehension but struggle to decode unfamiliar words. Duke and Cartwright (2021) similarly explained that reading development involves interacting linguistic and cognitive processes, emphasizing the importance of examining multiple components when assessing reading difficulties.

Denton et al. (2022) synthesized research on foundational reading skills and multicomponent interventions among primary-grade learners, highlighting the importance of addressing decoding and comprehension together. Hall et al. (2023) also reported evidence supporting structured reading interventions for elementary learners experiencing word-reading difficulties. These studies reinforced the importance of using assessment results to identify the specific reading competencies requiring instructional support.

The variation in reading accuracy and rate further supported the assessment considerations discussed by van der Velde et al. (2024). Their review emphasized that oral reading fluency assessment should distinguish relevant performance indicators rather than relying exclusively on reading speed. In the present study, differences in accuracy, rate, and comprehension suggested that pupils required differentiated instructional support according to their reading profiles.

Common Reading Difficulties Encountered During English Reading Activities

Table 2. Common Reading Difficulties of Grade 2 Pupils

Reading Difficulty	Frequency	Percentage
Decoding unfamiliar words	21	70.0%
Slow or hesitant oral reading	19	63.3%
Recognizing common words	17	56.7%
Understanding passage vocabulary	16	53.3%
Answering comprehension questions	15	50.0%
Word omission or substitution	12	40.0%

The findings showed that decoding unfamiliar words was the most frequently identified difficulty, affecting 21 pupils (70.0%). Slow or hesitant oral reading followed, with 19 pupils (63.3%), while 17 pupils (56.7%) experienced difficulty recognizing common words. These results indicated that foundational word identification and reading automaticity were prominent concerns among the assessed pupils. Difficulty recognizing unfamiliar words may interrupt reading continuity because pupils must devote additional attention to decoding individual words rather than understanding the passage as a whole.

Scarborough (2001) explained that skilled reading develops through the coordination of word recognition and language comprehension processes. Automatic word recognition allows readers to identify familiar words with reduced effort, supporting more efficient processing of connected text. The findings therefore suggested that pupils experiencing decoding and word recognition difficulties required instructional activities that strengthened foundational reading skills before expecting consistently fluent independent reading.

Kittle et al. (2024) reviewed research on reading instruction for multilingual elementary learners and emphasized the importance of systematic foundational reading instruction while recognizing differences in learners' linguistic experiences. This perspective was relevant to English reading activities because pupils' familiarity with English vocabulary could influence their ability to recognize and understand written words. However, the study did not directly measure participants' language backgrounds or proficiency in other languages.

Vocabulary difficulties were identified among 16 pupils (53.3%), while 15 pupils (50.0%) experienced difficulty answering comprehension questions. These findings indicated that reading difficulties extended beyond decoding and oral reading efficiency. Understanding a passage required pupils to recognize word meanings, interpret sentences, and connect information across the text. Consequently, improvements in word recognition alone might not fully address comprehension difficulties.

Joo and Lee (2021) reviewed reading comprehension interventions among elementary pupils, while Triana et al. (2024) synthesized literature on comprehension development at the elementary level. These studies supported the importance of incorporating vocabulary instruction, guided questioning, and meaning-focused reading activities alongside foundational word recognition practice.

Word omission or substitution was the least frequently identified difficulty, affecting 12 pupils (40.0%). Although less common than decoding difficulties, these errors remained instructionally relevant because omissions and substitutions could alter sentence meaning and interfere with comprehension. The findings therefore supported regular monitoring of both reading accuracy and understanding rather than emphasizing speed alone.

Reading-Related Difficulties Encountered in Mathematics

Table 3. Reading-Related Difficulties in Mathematics

Reading Difficulty	Frequency	Percentage
Understanding mathematical vocabulary	18	60.0%
Identifying relevant information	17	56.7%
Interpreting written instructions	16	53.3%
Recognizing the question being asked	14	46.7%
Reading multisentence problems independently	13	43.3%

The results revealed that understanding mathematical vocabulary was the most frequently identified difficulty, affecting 18 pupils (60.0%). Difficulty identifying relevant information followed at 56.7%, while 53.3% experienced difficulty interpreting written instructions. These findings suggested that reading-related challenges were also evident when pupils encountered mathematical problems presented through written language. Mathematical word problems required pupils to understand subject-specific vocabulary, identify relationships between quantities, and determine the information necessary to solve a problem. When pupils struggled to interpret words or sentences, their ability to understand the problem could be affected even when they possessed the mathematical knowledge required for computation. The findings therefore highlighted the importance of distinguishing difficulties in reading mathematical statements from difficulties in mathematical reasoning.

Vessonen et al. (2024) examined task characteristics associated with mathematical word problem-solving performance among elementary school-aged children. Their systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrated that linguistic and structural characteristics of word problems were associated with differences in pupils' performance. This evidence supported the interpretation that written mathematical problems involve language-processing demands alongside numerical reasoning.

Difficulty recognizing the question being asked was identified among 14 pupils (46.7%), while 13 pupils (43.3%) experienced difficulty reading multisentence problems independently. These findings indicated that longer written problems and unfamiliar instructions could create additional comprehension demands. Pupils who struggled to identify the main question or organize information from several sentences might require guided interpretation before attempting mathematical operations. Dietrichson et al. (2021) reviewed targeted interventions for elementary pupils experiencing reading and Mathematics difficulties and identified evidence supporting instructional approaches responsive to learners' academic needs. In relation to the present findings, explicit mathematical vocabulary instruction, guided reading of problem statements, and opportunities to restate questions in familiar language were appropriate instructional priorities.

Descriptive Patterns Between Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension

Table 4. Reading Rate and Comprehension Performance by Group

Reading-Rate Group	Number of Pupils	Mean WCPM	Mean Comprehension Score
Lower-rate group	10	32.0	4.7
Middle-rate group	10	47.0	6.3
Higher-rate group	10	65.6	7.9
Overall	30	48.2	6.3

The results showed progressively higher comprehension scores across groups with higher oral reading rates. Pupils in the lower-rate group obtained a mean reading rate of 32.0 WCPM and a comprehension score of 4.7. The middle-rate group recorded 47.0 WCPM and a comprehension score of 6.3, while the higher-rate group obtained 65.6 WCPM and a comprehension score of 7.9. The difference of 3.2 comprehension points between the lower- and higher-rate groups suggested that more efficient oral reading was accompanied by stronger comprehension performance within the assessed sample. Pupils who read connected text more efficiently may have been better positioned to focus on understanding its meaning. However, this interpretation remained descriptive because the study did not establish the direction or cause of the observed relationship. The pattern was consistent with the Simple View of Reading, which recognizes decoding as an essential component of reading comprehension (Gough & Tunmer, 1986). When pupils experience difficulty identifying written words, comprehension may become more demanding because attention must be divided between decoding and constructing meaning. Duke and Cartwright (2021), however, emphasized that reading comprehension cannot be explained exclusively by decoding efficiency. Vocabulary knowledge, language comprehension, cognitive processes, and other learner characteristics also contribute to reading performance. Consequently, higher reading rates should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of adequate comprehension. The findings were also consistent with Denton et al. (2022), whose synthesis examined the effects of foundational skills and multicomponent interventions on primary-grade reading comprehension. Their work supported the instructional relevance of strengthening foundational reading skills while continuing to provide explicit comprehension instruction.

Instructional Priorities Based on Identified Reading Difficulties

Table 5. Instructional Priorities for Reading Fluency Development

Identified Difficulty	Recommended Instructional Strategy	Intended Learning Focus
Decoding unfamiliar words	Explicit phonics and guided blending	Word decoding accuracy
Slow or hesitant oral reading	Guided repeated reading with corrective feedback	Reading automaticity
Limited recognition of common words	Structured word recognition practice	Automatic identification of familiar words
Vocabulary difficulties	Contextual vocabulary instruction	Understanding word meanings
Reading comprehension difficulties	Guided questioning, retelling, and text discussion	Understanding connected text
Mathematical word problem interpretation	Mathematical vocabulary instruction and guided paraphrasing	Understanding written mathematical problems

The identified difficulties indicated that instructional support needed to address several components of reading development. Pupils experiencing decoding difficulties required explicit instruction in letter–sound relationships and word blending, while those demonstrating slow or hesitant reading required opportunities to practice connected-text reading with appropriate guidance and feedback.

The National Reading Panel (2000) identified evidence supporting systematic foundational reading instruction and guided oral reading. Neitzel et al. (2022) also synthesized quantitative research concerning programs for struggling elementary readers, highlighting the importance of structured instructional interventions. These findings supported the selection of instructional activities according to pupils' assessed reading needs.

Guided repeated reading was identified as a possible strategy for pupils experiencing slow or hesitant oral reading. Through supported practice, pupils could develop familiarity with written words and improve the continuity of their reading. However, repeated reading should not be treated as universally effective across all learners and materials. Ehlert et al. (2025) examined repeated reading using different materials and found that outcomes varied according to instructional conditions and pupils' reading abilities. This evidence suggested that repeated reading activities should be matched to pupils' needs and monitored for

progress. Structured word recognition practice was also relevant because more than half of the pupils experienced difficulty recognizing common words. Activities involving repeated exposure to familiar words, explicit decoding support, and reading words in meaningful contexts could help address these difficulties. For pupils experiencing vocabulary and comprehension difficulties, instruction needed to extend beyond accurate pronunciation. Guided questioning, discussion of unfamiliar words, and retelling activities could provide opportunities to examine meaning and develop comprehension strategies. Yen (2024) examined a structured reading comprehension intervention among elementary learners, providing additional evidence concerning organized comprehension activities.

Technology-supported reading activities could supplement classroom instruction when appropriate materials and resources were available. Dahl-Leonard et al. (2024) conducted a meta-analysis of technology-delivered literacy instruction among elementary pupils and reported a small positive average effect on literacy outcomes. Their findings suggested that digital reading activities could provide additional instructional opportunities when aligned with specific learning objectives. The reading-related difficulties identified in Mathematics also indicated the need for integrated literacy support across learning areas. Teachers could introduce mathematical vocabulary before presenting word problems, guide pupils in identifying relevant information, and encourage them to explain problem statements using their own words. The instructional strategies presented in Table 5 were derived from the assessed difficulties and supporting literature. Their effectiveness was not directly evaluated in the study. Accordingly, the table represented recommended instructional priorities rather than evidence of completed intervention outcomes.

General Discussion

The study identified several reading difficulties among Grade 2 pupils at Ammoweg Elementary School, Asipulo District, Schools Division of Ifugao, Philippines. The findings revealed that decoding unfamiliar words, slow or hesitant oral reading, and limited recognition of common words were the most frequently observed difficulties. Challenges in vocabulary and reading comprehension were also evident, indicating that pupils' reading needs extended beyond accurate word identification to understanding connected text. Reading-related difficulties were likewise identified in Mathematics, particularly in understanding mathematical vocabulary, identifying relevant information, and interpreting written instructions. These findings indicated that difficulties in processing written language were evident across learning areas. The descriptive results further showed that pupils with higher oral reading rates generally obtained higher comprehension scores. However, this pattern did not establish a causal relationship between reading fluency and comprehension. Overall, the findings indicated that reading fluency development required

attention to interconnected skills, including decoding, word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, vocabulary, and comprehension. The study provided a basis for recommending differentiated reading instruction, systematic assessment, guided oral reading, explicit vocabulary development, and comprehension-focused activities. Addressing these identified difficulties through targeted classroom support may help strengthen pupils' foundational reading skills and their ability to understand written learning materials across subjects.

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that Grade 2 teachers at Ammoweg Elementary School implement differentiated reading instruction that addresses pupils' identified difficulties in decoding, word recognition, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Explicit phonics instruction, guided word recognition activities, and repeated oral reading with corrective feedback may be incorporated into regular classroom instruction to support pupils experiencing difficulties in reading unfamiliar words and maintaining reading accuracy and continuity. Reading comprehension activities should be integrated with fluency instruction through vocabulary development, guided questioning, passage retelling, and structured text discussions. Teachers are also encouraged to conduct periodic assessments of word recognition, oral reading accuracy, reading rate, and comprehension to monitor individual progress and adjust instructional strategies according to pupils' learning needs. In Mathematics, teachers should provide explicit instruction in mathematical vocabulary and guide pupils in identifying relevant information, interpreting written instructions, and understanding word problems before performing computations. Collaboration between teachers handling English and Mathematics may help establish consistent approaches to addressing reading-related difficulties across learning areas.
School administrators are encouraged to support teachers by providing appropriate reading materials, assessment resources, and professional development opportunities focused on foundational literacy instruction. Parents and guardians may also be encouraged to support reading development through regular, age-appropriate reading activities at home. Future researchers may examine the effectiveness of specific reading interventions using larger samples, additional assessment measures, and longitudinal or experimental research designs. Further investigation of the relationship between reading fluency, comprehension, and mathematical word problem performance may provide additional evidence for developing targeted literacy interventions among elementary school pupils.

REFERENCES

Dahl-Leonard, K., Hall, C., & Peacott, D. (2024). A meta-analysis of technology-delivered literacy instruction for elementary students. Educational Technology Research and Development, 72, 1507–1538. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10354-0

Denton, C. A., Hall, C., Cho, E., Cannon, G., Scammacca, 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

Dietrichson, J., Filges, T., Seerup, J. K., Klokker, R. H., Viinholt, B. C. A., Bøg, M., & Eiberg, M. (2021). Targeted school-based interventions for improving reading and mathematics for students with or at risk of academic difficulties in Grades K–6: A systematic review. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 17(2), Article e1152. https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1152

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. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411

Ehlert, M., Beck, J., Förster, N., et al. (2025). Continuous texts or word lists? Exploring the effects and the process of repeated reading depending on the reading material and students' reading abilities. Reading and Writing, 38, 745–764. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-024-10536-5

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. Remedial and Special Education, 7(1), 6–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193258600700104

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

Joo, H., & Lee, Y. (2021). Reading comprehension interventions among elementary school students.

Kittle, J. M., Amendum, S. J., & Budde, C. M. (2024). What does research say about the science of reading for K–5 multilingual learners? A systematic review of systematic reviews. Educational Psychology Review, 36, Article 108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09942-6

National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/Pages/smallbook.aspx

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

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I and II): Country notes—Philippines. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/philippines_a0882a2d-en.html

Republic Act No. 12028. (2024). Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2024/ra_12028_2024.html

Ruotsalainen, J., Pakarinen, E., Poikkeus, A.-M., et al. (2024). Associations between students' reading performance and literacy instruction in first grade: A cross-lagged study. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 39, 2223–2244. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-023-00784-4

Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), Handbook of early literacy research (pp. 97–110). Guilford Press.

Triana, P. M., Pradana, A. B. A., & Wardana, A. E. (2024). Reading comprehension in elementary levels: A systematic literature review. Jurnal Bidang Pendidikan Dasar, 8(2), 114–121. https://doi.org/10.21067/jbpd.v8i2.10278

van der Velde, M., Molenaar, B., Veldkamp, B. P., Feskens, R., & Keuning, J. (2024). What do they say? Assessment of oral reading fluency in early primary school children: A scoping review. International Journal of Educational Research, 128, Article 102444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102444

Vessonen, T., Dahlberg, M., Hellstrand, H., Widlund, A., Korhonen, J., Aunio, P., & Laine, A. (2024). Task characteristics associated with mathematical word problem-solving performance among elementary school-aged children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 36, Article 117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09954-2

World Bank. (2022). The state of global learning poverty: 2022 update. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/state-of-global-learning-poverty