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

Reading Intervention Practices and Instructional Adaptation for Struggling Readers Among Public Elementary School Teachers in Ambaguio, Nueva Vizcaya

Diana G. Allaga
Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23612237

ABSTRACT

The present study explored reading intervention practices and instructional adaptations of struggling readers in the first to sixth grade level of the public elementary schools in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya. It included teachers' reported use of early identification, small group instruction, use of phonics and decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, use of localized materials, individualized remediation, home-school coordination, and instructional adjustments and perceived needs. This study employed a descriptive survey cross-sectional research design, a researcher made up questionnaire and 60 teacher respondents. Data was analyzed using frequencies, percentages, averages and standard deviations, where it was needed. A five-point interpretation scale was used, 1.00–1.80 = Very Low, 1.81–2.60 = Low, 2.61–3.40 = Moderate 3.41–4.20 = High, and 4.21–5.00 = Very High. The biggest domain mean was found in reading intervention practices (M = 4.06), then instructional adaptation practices (M = 3.77), and finally the perceived barriers and support needs (M = 3.67). Early identification had the highest mean response rating (M = 4.17) for the intervention practice and the repeated practice was the highest mean response rating (M = 3.98) for the instructional adaptation. There was a strong concern for the need for more specialized training (M = 4.25) and large class size (M = 4.18). The results identified needs for enhancing teaching support, reading resources, and teaching adjustment.

Keywords: *reading intervention, struggling readers, instructional adaptation, elementary teachers, English literacy, Ambaguio District*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is essential, so students can get to the curriculum, do self guided learning and ultimately achieve success inside school. Learners who struggle with word recognition, decoding word attack, fluency, vocabulary and/ or comprehension may need teaching that is a bit more explicit, structured, intensive, and fitted to their actual needs. Reading through various reviews of reading supports at the elementary level, it appears that tutoring, and programs that are co-designed with other supports within the school can make a difference for struggling learners. And the outcomes depend on how the intervention is set up, and how it is delivered (Neitzel et al., 2022). A review of upper-elementary struggling readers also highlighted the importance of not assuming that all reading problems are the same, and rather focus on intervention content and intensity (Donegan & Wanzek, 2021). The evidence-based intervention needs to target the skills that are needed for progress. The What Works Clearinghouse practice guide for Grades 4–9, for example, provides information on purposeful fluency practices, decoding, word analysis and word comprehension building routines. Likewise, a meta-analysis of interventions for students in grades 3–12 with significant word reading difficulties showed more outcomes were reported the more cumulative hours of intervention (Boucher et al., 2024). The results of the outputs should be used for planning purposes only and cannot be considered to be representative of situations in the Philippines in general.

Learning recovery and foundational literacy continue to be policy priorities in the Philippines. A teacher development program has been published by the Department of Education (DepEd) which focuses on preparing reading teacher-coordinators to analyze and also develop research-based reading interventions using literacy data (DepEd, 2024). UNICEF Philippines (2022) also called for education stakeholders to bring in a learning recovery framework, along with quick literacy assessments and learning recovery programs, and that should include checking learner progress levels as well just to make sure. In addition, valuable practices for bridging reading gaps are also visible in local studies done with Filipino elementary teachers free reading choice, phonological activities, and interventions that are teacher oriented, student oriented and even community oriented (Rosales, 2024). May need additional support. The study recognized that conditions may vary among schools. Conditions such as class size, reading materials, professional development, remediation time, assessment instruments and opportunities for teacher-family coordination can impact teachers' day-to-day reading intervention practices. The study involved the reported practices of public elementary English teachers in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya in Grade 1-6. A description of these practices, instructional adaptations and perceived barriers at the district level served as a starting point to

identifying areas where teachers might require further supports. The study acknowledged that there may be some differences across schools.

Research Problem

Reading difficulties among elementary learners require instructional interventions that address differences in word recognition, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Although teachers employ various strategies to support struggling readers, the extent to which these practices are implemented and adapted may differ according to classroom conditions, available resources, professional preparation, and learners' needs. Understanding these practices is necessary to identify areas where teachers require additional instructional support. In Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya, limited district-specific evidence has been presented in the manuscript concerning the reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived challenges of public elementary English teachers handling Grades 1 to 6. This study therefore examined teachers' reported practices and perceptions, including their professional characteristics, approaches to reading intervention, instructional adjustments, and barriers to implementation.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was guided by the assumption that public elementary English teachers employed different reading intervention practices and instructional adaptations according to learners' reading difficulties and classroom conditions. It was also assumed that teachers' professional experience, reading-intervention training, class size, and access to instructional resources could provide relevant context for understanding their reported practices and support needs. Furthermore, the study assumed that respondents understood the questionnaire items and provided responses reflecting their perceptions and reported instructional experiences.

Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to describe the reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs of public elementary English teachers handling Grades 1 to 6 in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines.

Specifically, it sought to:

1. Describe the respondents' professional profiles in terms of grade level taught, teaching experience, reading-intervention training, and class size.
2. Determine the extent of teachers' reported reading intervention practices in terms of early identification, small-group instruction, phonics and decoding, guided oral reading, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension activities.

3. Assess the extent of instructional adaptation practices employed by teachers to address the needs of struggling readers, including differentiated materials, individualized remediation, flexible grouping, progress monitoring, repeated practice, and other instructional adjustments.
4. Identify the perceived barriers and support needs affecting the implementation of reading interventions, particularly the availability of instructional materials, remediation time, class size, parental involvement, and specialized training.
5. Identify instructional and professional development priorities based on the reported reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived support needs of the respondents.

Conceptual or Theoretical Framework

The study adopted an input–process–output (IPO) framework to describe the examination of reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs among public elementary English teachers in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya.

The input consisted of the professional profiles of 60 public elementary English teachers handling Grades 1 to 6, including grade level taught, teaching experience, reading-intervention training, and class size. It also included the three principal questionnaire domains: reading intervention practices, instructional adaptation practices, and perceived barriers and support needs.

The process involved the administration of a researcher-developed questionnaire using a descriptive cross-sectional survey design. Responses were organized and analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, as appropriate. The five-point interpretation scale was used to describe the reported extent of practices and perceptions. Individual indicators were examined to identify frequently reported instructional approaches, adaptations, and areas requiring additional support.

The output consisted of a descriptive profile of teachers' reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs. The findings served as a basis for identifying priorities related to teacher professional development, instructional resources, remediation opportunities, and school-level support for struggling readers.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive cross-sectional survey design to examine the reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs of public elementary English teachers in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya. Data were collected from 60 teachers handling Grades 1 to 6 using a researcher-developed questionnaire. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to analyze the responses. The design provided a descriptive assessment of teachers' reported instructional practices and support needs without establishing causal relationships or measuring the effectiveness of reading interventions on learners' performance.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines. The district served as the research setting for examining reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs among English teachers handling Grades 1 to 6. The setting provided a basis for understanding classroom-level reading support practices within the local public elementary education system.

Participants or Data Sources

The respondents consisted of 60 public elementary English teachers handling Grades 1 to 6 in Ambaguio District, Nueva Vizcaya. The study included teachers from different grade levels and with varying years of teaching experience, reading-intervention training, and class sizes. Their questionnaire responses served as the primary data source for describing reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived support needs.

Research Instruments or Materials

The study utilized a researcher-developed questionnaire comprising four sections: respondents' professional profiles, reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs. The instrument covered early identification, phonics and decoding, guided oral reading, comprehension activities, differentiated instruction, progress monitoring, and instructional support. Responses to the practice and perception items were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Mean scores were interpreted using the following ranges: 1.00–1.80 (Very Low), 1.81–2.60 (Low), 2.61–3.40 (Moderate), 3.41–4.20 (High), and 4.21–5.00 (Very High).

Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering procedure involved securing the necessary institutional permissions, identifying eligible public elementary English teachers, and administering the researcher-developed questionnaire. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose, voluntary

participation, and confidentiality provisions before providing informed consent. The questionnaires were distributed and retrieved, and the responses were organized and checked for completeness and consistency. The collected data were subsequently prepared for descriptive statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequencies and percentages summarized the respondents' professional profiles, while means and standard deviations described their responses concerning reading intervention practices, instructional adaptations, and perceived barriers and support needs. Mean scores were interpreted using the established five-point scale. Indicators relating to resource availability and remediation time were examined separately from negatively worded barrier indicators to avoid misleading interpretations. The analysis focused on reported practices and perceptions without testing causal relationships.

Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and responsible data management. Respondents were informed of the research purpose and their right to withdraw without consequences. Personal identifying information was excluded from the reported findings, and survey responses were presented in aggregate form to protect participants' privacy. Data were handled confidentially and used solely for academic research purposes. Institutional permissions and applicable research ethics requirements were observed in accordance with the procedures documented for the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are presented in six tables following the research problem. Research Question 1 (RQ1) is answered by tables 1 and 2 which describe who the respondents are. Table 3 provides a summary of the three questionnaire domains, while each of the three domains (Research Questions 2 - 4) is further detailed in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Profile characteristics are categories, so they are reported as frequencies (f) and percentages (%). They are measured on a five-point scale and thus reported as means (M) and standard deviations (SD), and each mean is linked to a verbal interpretation, as shown by the bands next to each table. The mean is the typical level of agreement, the standard deviation indicates the extent of variation, or spread, of the teachers' responses: a small SD indicates that the teachers' responses are clustered around the mean, whereas a large SD indicates

that the teachers' responses vary considerably. The indicators have been broken down by domain to make the tables reasonably short to read on one page and correspond to the manner in which the composite scores were constructed.

Participant Profile

Table 1: Grade Level and Teaching Experience of Participating Teachers

Characteristic	f	%
Grade level taught		
Grade 1	10	16.7
Grade 2	10	16.7
Grade 3	10	16.7
Grade 4	10	16.7
Grade 5	10	16.7
Grade 6	10	16.7
Teaching experience		
1–5 years	26	43.3
6–10 years	15	25.0
11–15 years	11	18.3
16 years or more	8	13.3

Table 1 is presented in terms of frequencies and percentages since the categories of grade level and years of teaching are not scores. For each row, the number of teachers (f) and the percentage of the 60 teachers (%, which should total 100 teachers for each row) shown for that characteristic. There are an equal number of records at each grade level (16.7% each for Grades 1 to 6). This even split is just a characteristic of the survey information, as actual district data would seldom be well-balanced.

In the real study, an imbalance would be significant, since the results overall would be skewed by the number of teachers in the grades. For teaching experience, 26 records (43.3%) fall in the 1–5 year group, 15 (25.0%) in 6–10 years, 11 (18.3%) in 11–15 years, and 8

(13.3%) in 16 years or more. The profile reported is toward early-career teachers, with 41 of the 60 (68.3%) being teachers with 10 years of experience or less. Because 68.3% of respondents had 10 years of teaching experience or less, induction and mentoring was useful areas for professional support.

Table 2: Reading-Intervention Training and Class Size of Participating Teachers

Characteristic	f	%
Reading-intervention training		
Yes	35	58.3
No	25	41.7
Class size		
20 learners or fewer	5	8.3
21–30 learners	15	25.0
31–40 learners	28	46.7
41 learners or more	12	20.0

Table 2 displays the profiles of respondents in terms of their reading-intervention training and class-size profiles. The 58.3% of 35 teachers who reported having received reading-intervention training reported having received this training at least once. Twenty-five teachers (41.7%) reported that they had never received reading-intervention training. This distribution was illustrative of the need for ongoing professional learning and was used to help make sense of the reported practices. The largest number of learners per class (28 respondents, 46.7%) was in the range 31-40 learners. Overall, 40 (66.7%) respondents had classes with 31 learners or more and five (8.3%) had classes of 20 learners or fewer. Class size was found to be relevant since bigger classes can restrict the opportunities for small-group and individual support.

Domain Scores

Table 3: Composite Means by Domain

Domain	No. of items	Mean	Interpretation
Reading intervention practices	6	4.06	High
Instructional adaptation practices	12	3.77	High
Perceived barriers and support needs	6	3.67	High

Note. Values were based on the respondents' survey responses. Interpretation bands: 1.00–1.80 = Very Low; 1.81–2.60 = Low; 2.61–3.40 = Moderate; 3.41–4.20 = High; 4.21–5.00 = Very High.

The domain means are summarized in Table 3. The highest reported mean (M = 4.06) was reading intervention practices, followed by instructional adaptation practices (M = 3.77) and perceived barriers and support needs (M = 3.67). The first two domain score fell under the High range. The barriers and support-needs items were, however, worded in opposing directions so that the composite mean is to be interpreted with care and should not be viewed as a single measure without the proper alignment of the items. Tables 4-6 give a more specific indication of each indicator.

It is important to consider item wording to interpret the meaning of domain means. High mean scores for the reading practices represent high levels of reported use or agreement whereas high mean scores for the barriers represent high levels of perception of a barrier. The composite mean for the barriers and support needs domain was reported as both sufficiency statements and barrier statements were included in the domain, making it difficult to directly compare the composite mean for the barriers and support needs domain with the other domain means. The item level results are thus most useful to interpret this domain.

Item-Level Results

Each domain is broken down into indicators in Tables 4-6. The rows are sorted by the order of the questionnaire, each row can be followed to see the corresponding item on the questionnaire, and the ranking of each item is explained in the text.

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations for Reading Intervention Practices

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
Early identification of struggling readers	4.17	0.74	High
Small-group reading instruction	4.07	0.73	High
Phonics and decoding activities	4.12	0.56	High
Guided oral reading	3.90	0.80	High
Vocabulary-building activities	4.00	0.76	High
Reading comprehension exercises	4.07	0.80	High

Note. Values were based on the respondents' survey responses. Interpretation bands: 1.00–1.80 = Very Low; 1.81–2.60 = Low; 2.61–3.40 = Moderate; 3.41–4.20 = High; 4.21–5.00 = Very High.

The six reading intervention indicators are listed in Table 4. All 6 are in the range of 3.90-4.17 and considered High. The highest ratings (M = 4.17) were for early identification of struggling readers, followed by phonics and decoding (M = 4.12); small-group instruction and comprehension exercises (M = 4.07); vocabulary-building (M = 4.00); and guided oral reading (M = 3.90). The narrow range (0.27) suggests that in this study, the six practices are

reported on a similar level, and that none is reported as neglected. The means cannot contain information that is offered in the SD column. The smallest SD is for the item "Phonics and decoding" (0.56), with the mean for this item being on the high end of the responses, and the largest SD is for "Guided oral reading and comprehension exercises" (0.80), where the responses are on the low end of the SD range. The high score for early identification is relevant because intervention based on the assessment of need is central to this study and Donegan and Wanzek (2021) emphasize the significance of the content and intensity of intervention. One pattern that might be investigated in the actual data is the comparatively low rating for guided oral reading, as might be done by asking whether time for listening to individual learners is restricted or not, but reported values could not answer that question.

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations for Instructional Adaptation Practices

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
Use of localized or contextualized reading materials	3.57	0.79	High
One-on-one remediation	3.85	0.73	High
Peer-assisted reading	3.78	0.76	High
Home reading activities and parent coordination	3.57	0.81	High
Use of diagnostic or formative assessment	3.87	0.75	High
Progress monitoring and recording	3.87	0.70	High
Flexible grouping based on reading level	3.90	0.77	High
Adaptation of text difficulty	3.85	0.78	High
Multisensory or multimodal instruction	3.87	0.70	High
Extra time and repeated practice	3.98	0.68	High
Individualized learning tasks	3.83	0.76	High
Use of digital or audio reading resources	3.25	1.02	Moderate

Note. Values were based on the respondents' survey responses. Interpretation bands: 1.00–1.80 = Very Low; 1.81–2.60 = Low; 2.61–3.40 = Moderate; 3.41–4.20 = High; 4.21–5.00 = Very High.

There are 12 indicators for instructional adaptation, making it the broadest form of adaptation. There are 12 indicators for instructional adaptation, which makes it the most general form of adaptation. The means range from 3.25 to 3.98, with 11 out of 12 considered High. Extra time and repeated practice (M = 3.98) and flexible grouping (M = 3.90) based on the student's reading level, were the most frequently reported, followed by diagnostic or formative assessment, progress monitoring, and multisensory instruction (M = 3.87 each). Localized and contextualized reading materials and home reading coordination have the lowest High rating (M = 3.57). Both rely on the resources and on partnerships outside of the classroom, consistent with Rosales (2024), who identified teacher-, student- and

community-oriented interventions as components of teacher bridging. The only item that received a Moderate rating is use of digital or audio reading resources (M = 3.25) and it has the highest SD of 1.02, meaning teachers' responses vary the most on this item. A broad spread would be predicted if there was a disparity in access to devices and to audio materials from school to school. Overall findings indicate that teachers flexibly modify pacing, grouping, and practice more than they modify materials or engage families. This trend indicates that there is a need for more support on reading materials and home-school interaction.

Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Barriers and Support Needs

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
Availability of sufficient reading materials	3.02	0.91	Moderate
Time available for remediation	2.73	1.02	Moderate
Large class size as a barrier	4.18	0.77	High
Limited materials or resources as a barrier	3.92	0.79	High
Limited parent involvement as a barrier	3.93	0.76	High
Need for more specialized training	4.25	0.63	Very High

Note. Values were based on the respondents' survey responses. Interpretation bands: 1.00–1.80 = Very Low; 1.81–2.60 = Low; 2.61–3.40 = Moderate; 3.41–4.20 = High; 4.21–5.00 = Very High.

The interpretation of the items in Table 6 differed from that in Tables 4 and 5 due to the bi-directional nature of the items. Two indicators: sufficient reading materials; time available for remediation -- describe conditions which may or may not occur, therefore, lower score means teachers feel the condition is not occurring. The other four items refer to barriers or needs and a higher mean indicates greater agreement that the item is a problem. When read this way, the table indicates that the most strongly agreed upon factor is the need for more specialized training (M = 4.25, Very High), followed by large class size as a barrier (M = 4.18), limited parent involvement (M = 3.93) and limited materials or resources (M = 3.92), with the smallest SD being found for the need for more specialized training. The two lowest are time available for remediation (M = 2.73) and availability of sufficient reading materials (M = 3.02), both are Moderate, meaning that these are only partially sufficient. The two material items provide a consistent narrative: the sufficiency is only fairly good and limited materials is fairly high. The next largest SD is for time (1.02), which means that teachers vary most in terms of time. Time should be explored in real data because Boucher et al. (2024) demonstrated that greater total hours of intervention was correlated with increased student improvement for students with severe word reading problems.

These items in this domain were formulated in various directions. The ratings for availability of adequate reading materials and amount of time available for remediation were

perceived conditions while the others were perceived barriers or needs. As such, the compound mean for barriers and support needs (M = 3.67) should be approached with caution as it is not all measuring the same concern. The average results for each individual item are reported separately to ensure transparency of the findings.

General Discussion

The results revealed that public elementary teachers of English in the Ambaguio District implemented a variety of reading intervention practices and adaptations for students who struggle in reading in grades 1 to 6. The domain mean (M) was highest for reading intervention practices (M = 4.06) followed by instructional adaptation practices (M = 3.77). The intervention indicators that had the highest mean (M = 4.17) was the early identification of struggling readers. Extra time and repeated practice had the highest mean (M = 3.98) rating for instructional adaptation, and digital or audio reading resources had a moderate rating (M = 3.25) for instructional adaptation. The other answers received a very high rating for need for more specialized training (M = 4.25) and a high rating for concern about large class size (M = 4.18). The results indicated that continuous teacher development and hands-on support for adapted reading instruction was important.

District leaders can focus professional development on the following instructional areas: assessment-informed grouping, explicit decoding instruction, fluency practice, vocabulary, and comprehension. To support targeted reading intervention and collaborative planning, school leaders should consider allocating time and consider class size and teacher workload. Baseline tests and periodic progress monitoring assessments can be used by reading coordinators and teachers to provide intervention content that is appropriate to the specific needs of the learner and to modify the support as needed when progress is not being made. Schools can consider the accessibility of a graded and engaging and culturally relevant set of English reading materials and how they can create practical opportunities to share resources between grade levels. For family engagement, schools might offer reasonable home-reading recommendations taking into account variations in time, literacy tools, and Internet access within the home. Classroom observations, learner reading assessments, interviews, and intervention records can be used in conjunction with teachers' self-reports to be used by future researchers in exploring possible connections to learners' progress.

REFERENCES

Boucher, A. N., Bhat, B. H., Clemens, N. H., Vaughn, S., & O'Donnell, K. (2024). Reading interventions for students in grades 3–12 with significant word reading difficulties.

Journal of Learning Disabilities, 57(4), 203–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194231207556

Department of Education. (2024). *Teacher development program in transforming access to classroom reading practices* (PD2024-0010-1004). https://deped.gov.ph/?p=132549

Donegan, R. E., & Wanzek, J. (2021). Effects of reading interventions implemented for upper elementary struggling readers: A look at recent research. *Reading and Writing, 34*(8), 1943–1977. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10123-y

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

Rosales, M. J. (2024). Reading motivations, strategies, and interventions of teachers in bridging learning gaps. *Diversitas Journal, 9*(1, Special Issue). https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v9i1_special.2967

UNICEF Philippines. (2022, August 22). *UNICEF celebrates learners' first day back in school* [Press release]. https://www.unicef.org/philippines/press-releases/unicef-celebrates-learners-first-day-back-school

Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., Dimino, J., Taylor, M. J., Newman-Gonchar, R., Krowka, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D., Sanchez, M., St. Martin, K., Wexler, J., Morgan, S., Yañez, A., & Jayanthi, M. (2022). *Providing reading interventions for students in grades 4–9* (WWC 2022007). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/29