



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



READING ABILITY AND ITS DETERMINANTS: A CASE OF ELEMENTARY GRADE LEARNERS

Millie C. Degulacion *

Open University System Graduate Studies, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Sta. Mesa, Manila, Philippines.

* Corresponding Author

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 31(02), 972–984

Publication history: Received on 06 July 2026; revised on 17 August 2026; accepted on 19 August 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.31.2.2160>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

This study examined the reading ability of 221 Grade 4 to Grade 6 learners and six determinants of reading performance: teacher competence, learning resources, parental involvement, school environment, pupil engagement, and socio-economic status. A quantitative descriptive-comparative design was employed using the learners' latest Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) pretest results and a validated researcher-made questionnaire. Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test were used. Results showed that 117 learners (52.94%) were at the Instructional level, 84 (38.01%) at the Independent level, and 20 (9.05%) at the Frustration level. Teacher competence obtained the highest overall mean (4.22, Strongly Agree). Significant differences were found for parental involvement ($H = 12.274$, $p = .002$) and socio-economic status ($H = 12.295$, $p = .002$), whereas teacher competence, learning resources, school environment, and pupil engagement did not differ significantly across the groups. The findings emphasize the importance of family engagement, equitable learning opportunities, and differentiated reading support for learners with varying reading needs.

Keywords: Reading ability; Phil-IRI; Teacher competence; Parental involvement; Learning resources; School environment; Pupil engagement; Socio-economic status

1 INTRODUCTION

Reading ability is a foundational competence for academic learning because learners must decode, comprehend, interpret, and use written information across subject areas. Contemporary literacy research treats reading as a multidimensional process involving word recognition, vocabulary, fluency, language comprehension, background knowledge, motivation, and strategic processing. International assessments likewise show persistent differences in reading performance associated with instructional quality, home literacy support, access to educational resources, and socio-economic conditions.

In the Philippines, the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) is used as a classroom-based diagnostic assessment to identify learners' reading levels and guide appropriate intervention. The revised Phil-IRI classifies learners into Independent, Instructional, and Frustration levels and is intended to support instructional planning rather than simply rank learners. The continued presence of learners who require guided or intensive support makes it necessary to examine not only reading outcomes but also the conditions surrounding literacy development.

The present study focused on six determinants: teacher competence, learning resources, parental involvement, school environment, pupil engagement, and socio-economic status. These factors reflect the interaction of classroom instruction, access to materials, home support, school conditions, learner motivation, and family resources. Rather than examining one determinant in isolation, the study compared learners' ratings of all six determinants across their Phil-IRI classifications.

1.1 Research objectives

The study aimed to: (1) describe respondents' reading ability based on the latest Phil-IRI pretest; (2) determine the extent to which the six identified determinants were evident in respondents' reading experiences; and (3) test whether determinant ratings differed significantly across Phil-IRI reading ability classifications.

1.2 Theoretical and conceptual basis

Scarborough's Reading Rope conceptualizes skilled reading as the increasingly coordinated operation of word-recognition and language-comprehension processes. This perspective supports the use of Phil-IRI results as an indicator of learners' reading performance and helps explain why instruction, materials, and opportunities for practice matters. The broader science of reading similarly emphasizes systematic development of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Bronfenbrenner's ecological perspective, as extended by Neal and Neal, provides a basis for considering the learner within interconnected home, school, and social environments. Teacher competence and school conditions operate within the learner's immediate educational setting, while parental involvement and socio-economic circumstances shape opportunities and support beyond the classroom. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory further emphasizes guided participation and scaffolding in literacy learning.

The Matthew Effect in reading explains how early advantages and difficulties can accumulate over time. Learners who read successfully tend to read more, build vocabulary, and encounter increasingly complex texts, while struggling readers may experience fewer successful literacy opportunities. This framework is particularly relevant to differences in access to resources and support.

The study followed input-process-output logic. Input consisted of the latest Phil-IRI classifications and ratings of the six determinants. The process involved retrieval of school reading records, administration of the validated questionnaire, data organization, and statistical analysis. The output consisted of evidence-based recommendations for minimal, guided, or intensive reading support.

1.3 Related literature and study context

Research consistently indicates that effective reading development depends on multiple interacting conditions. Teachers' knowledge of foundational literacy skills and their capacity to diagnose reading difficulties influence the quality of instruction. Integrated literacy approaches that combine vocabulary, comprehension, and content learning can improve reading outcomes. At the same time, the effect of teacher-related factors may vary by context; Philippine studies have reported instances in which teacher competence did not significantly distinguish pupils' reading levels.

Access to books, appropriately leveled texts, classroom libraries, and digital resources can expand opportunities for practice. However, materials are most useful when they are accessible, appropriate to learners' reading levels, and integrated meaningfully into instruction. Home literacy interactions are also important. Parent-involved reading, encouragement, shared reading, and language-rich interaction can support comprehension and motivation.

School climate and learner engagement add another layer. Safe, supportive environments and organized literacy programs can sustain participation, while reading enjoyment and persistence are associated with stronger engagement. Socio-economic status may shape access to books, technology, quiet study space, parental time, and other forms of cognitive stimulation. These findings support a multidimensional examination of reading ability in the local school context.

1.4 Scope

The study was conducted at Commonwealth Elementary School, Commonwealth Avenue, Quezon City, during School Year 2024-2025. It involved Grade 4 to Grade 6 learners and was limited to the six determinants identified above. Cognitive ability, health conditions, psychological factors, language proficiency, learning disabilities, and peer influence were outside the scope. Findings therefore describe the participating school context and should not be generalized automatically to other populations.

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Research design

A quantitative descriptive-comparative design was used. The descriptive component summarized learners' Phil-IRI classifications and their ratings of the six determinants. The comparative component examined whether determinant ratings differed across the reading ability groups. This design was appropriate because the study described existing conditions without manipulating variables and compared naturally occurring groups.

2.2 Population, sample and respondents

The school population consisted of 3,049 Grade 4 to Grade 6 learners. The computed target sample was 342; however, the final study included 221 learners who returned signed parental consent forms, provided assent, and completed the required data collection. Thus, all analyses were based on $N = 221$. Respondents represented Grades 4, 5, and 6 and were drawn from selected class sections.

Table 1: Distribution of Class Sections Represented by the Respondents

Grade level	Sections included	Total sections
Grade 4 - AM	9	12
Grade 4 - PM	8	12
Grade 5 - AM	13	13
Grade 5 - PM	7	13
Grade 6 - AM	12	12
Grade 6 - PM	6	12
Total	55	74

Participation was voluntary. The difference between the computed target and final sample reflects consent and completion requirements rather than statistical replacement of non-participants.

2.3 Research instruments and measures

Reading ability was determined from the respondents' latest Phil-IRI pretest results obtained from the school reading coordinator or class advisers with school approval. The Phil-IRI classifications used in the study were Independent, Instructional, and Frustration. These existing school records served as the operational measure of the dependent variable.

A structured researcher-made questionnaire measured teacher competence, learning resources, parental involvement, school environment, pupil engagement, and socio-economic status. Items were presented in English and Filipino to support comprehension. Responses used a five-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The instrument underwent expert validation and reliability testing before administration.

2.4 Interpretation of weighted means

Table 2: Weighted Mean Interpretation

Mean range	Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree
3.41-4.20	Agree
2.61-3.40	Neutral
1.81-2.60	Disagree
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree

The weighted mean summarized the respondents' ratings for each statement and determinant. The scale was used consistently in interpreting the overall means.

2.5 Data gathering procedure

Approval was secured from the appropriate school authorities. Consent was obtained from respondents and their parents or guardians. After the Phil-IRI results were retrieved, the questionnaire was administered during scheduled class periods. The purpose and instructions were explained before distribution, sufficient time was provided, and clarification was offered without influencing responses. Completed questionnaires were checked, encoded, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis.

2.6 Statistical analysis

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the distribution of respondents across Phil-IRI reading levels. Weighted mean was used to summarize the extent of each determinant. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to examine differences in determinant scores across three independent groups because the determinant measures were based on Likert-scale responses. Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level.

The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference in respondents' determinant scores when grouped according to their Phil-IRI reading ability classification. A p-value below .05 resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis for the determinant concerned.

2.7 Ethical considerations

The study used school reading records only with administrative approval and obtained consent from respondents and their parents or guardians before questionnaire administration. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the study purpose. Data was handled for research purposes and reported in aggregate form. No individual learner is identified in this article.

2.8 Methodological limitations

The study relied partly on self-reported perceptions, which may be affected by response tendencies or differences in how pupils interpret questionnaire items. The final sample was smaller than the computed target because only learners with valid consent and complete data participated. The single-school setting also limits external generalization. In addition, the comparative design identifies differences among groups but does not by itself establish causation.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Reading ability based on the Phil-IRI pretest

Table 3: Respondents' Reading Ability from the Latest Phil-Iri Pretest

Reading Level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Independent	84	38.01
Instructional	117	52.94
Frustration	20	9.05
Total	221	100.00

More than half of the respondents, 117 learners (52.94%), were classified at the Instructional level. These learners could read and comprehend texts but still required teacher guidance or structured support. Eighty-four learners (38.01%) were at the Independent level, indicating that they could engage with texts with substantially less assistance. Twenty learners (9.05%) were at the Frustration level and therefore represented the group requiring the most intensive reading support.

The distribution shows that the largest group had already developed basic reading skills but had not yet reached consistent independence with grade-level text. This pattern supports the use of differentiated instruction: Independent readers need continued enrichment, Instructional readers need scaffolding and guided comprehension work, and Frustration-level readers require more intensive, closely monitored intervention. The Phil-IRI is specifically intended to provide this kind of diagnostic information for instructional planning.

The presence of a Frustration group, even though numerically smaller, remains educationally important because persistent reading difficulty can compound over time. Early and targeted support is therefore necessary to prevent widening gaps in vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and access to content learning.

3.2 Teacher competence

Table 4: Teacher Competence

Teacher Competence	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
My teacher explains lessons clearly. / Malinaw magpaliwanag ang aking guro.	4.61	Strongly Agree
My teacher encourages me to read. / Hinihikayat ako ng aking guro na magbasa.	4.26	Strongly Agree
My teacher provides reading activities. / Nagbibigay ang guro ng mga gawaing pampagbasa.	4.16	Agree
My teacher supports struggling readers. / Tinutulungan ng aking guro ang mga nahihirapan sa pagbasa.	4.48	Strongly Agree
My teacher encourages questions about the lesson. / Hinihikayat ng guro ang magtanong tungkol sa aralin.	4.42	Strongly Agree
My teacher praises my reading improvements. / Pinupuri ako ng guro sa aking pag-unlad sa pagbasa.	4.18	Agree
My teacher gives feedback on my reading performance. / Nagbibigay ng puna ang guro tungkol sa aking pagbasa.	3.97	Agree
My teacher uses different teaching strategies. / Iba't ibang estratehiya ang ginagamit ng aking guro sa pagtuturo.	4.14	Agree
My teacher assigns reading tasks regularly. / Madalas akong binibigyan ng takdang gawain sa pagbasa.	3.67	Agree
My teacher discusses reading lessons in an engaging way. Kawili-wili ang pamamaraan ng pagtuturo ng guro tungkol sa pagbasa.	4.31	Strongly Agree
Composite Mean:	4.22	Strongly Agree

Teacher competence recorded the highest overall mean of 4.22 (Strongly Agree). The clearest strengths were explanation of lessons, support for struggling readers, encouragement of questions, and engaging discussion. The lower-rated items on regular reading assignments and feedback suggest practical areas for strengthening otherwise positive instructional experiences. The result is consistent with evidence that teachers' foundational literacy knowledge and instructional decision-making are important to reading development.

The findings should nevertheless be interpreted as learner perceptions of teacher competence rather than an independent observation of teaching quality. The later group comparison also shows that teacher competence did not significantly differ across the compared groups, which cautions against treating the high mean as evidence of a direct causal effect on reading classification.

3.3 Learning resources

Table 5: Learning Resources

Reading and Learning Resources	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
My school has enough books for reading practice. / May sapat na aklat sa aming paaralan para sa pagsasanay sa pagbabasa.	4.35	Strongly Agree
I have access to reading materials at home. / Mayroon akong mga babasahing materyales sa bahay.	4.07	Agree
I use digital tools for reading (tablets, apps, etc.). Gumagamit ako ng mga digital na kagamitan sa pagbabasa (tablet, apps, atbp.).	3.75	Agree
My school library has a variety of reading books. / Ang aklatan ng aming paaralan ay may iba't ibang aklat sa pagbabasa.	4.39	Strongly Agree

I can easily borrow books from the library. / Madali akong makahiram ng aklat sa aklatan.	3.82	Agree
My teacher provides reading worksheets. / Nagbibigay ang aking guro ng mga worksheet sa pagbabasa.	3.91	Agree
The reading materials are interesting to me. / Nakakawili ang mga babasahing materyales para sa akin.	3.96	Agree
I have access to a quiet place to read/. Mayroon akong tahimik na lugar upang magbasa.	3.90	Agree
My school offers enough reading activities. / Nagbibigay ang aming paaralan ng sapat na mga gawain sa pagbabasa.	4.16	Agree
I join reading programs or book clubs organized by my school or community. / Ako ay lumalahok sa mga programa sa pagbabasa o mga book club na inorganisa ng aming paaralan o komunidad.	3.67	Agree
Composite Mean:	4.00	Agree

Learning resources were generally rated positively. Learners reported access to school books and other materials, although access and use were not uniformly at the highest level. The result suggests that resources are present, but their educational value depends on fit, accessibility, and purposeful integration into instruction. Research on readability and technology similarly emphasizes appropriate matching of materials to learner needs.

3.4 Parental involvement

Table 6: Parental Involvement

Parental Involvement	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
My parents encourage me to read at home. / Hinikayat ako ng aking mga magulang na magbasa sa bahay.	4.09	Agree
My parents read with me. Nagbabasa ang aking mga magulang kasama ako.	3.48	Agree
My parents provide me with books. / Binibigyan ako ng aking mga magulang ng mga aklat.	4.00	Agree
My parents check my reading assignments. / Sinusuri ng aking mga magulang ang aking mga takdang pagbabasa.	3.81	Agree
My parents help me understand difficult words. / Tinutulungan ako ng aking mga magulang na maunawaan ang mahihirap na salita.	4.34	Strongly Agree
My parents limit my screen time to encourage me in reading. / Nililimitahan ng aking mga magulang ang aking oras sa screen upang ako ay mahikayat magbasa.	3.93	Agree
My parents ask about what I read. / Tinatanong ako ng aking mga magulang tungkol sa aking binasa.	3.95	Agree
My parents attend school meetings about reading progress. Dumadalo ang aking mga magulang sa mga pagpupulong ng paaralan tungkol sa aking pag-unlad sa pagbabasa	3.75	Agree
My parents support my reading interests. Sinusuportahan ng aking mga magulang ang aking interes sa pagbabasa	4.23	Strongly Agree
My parents encourage me to read before bedtime. / Hinikayat ako ng aking mga magulang na magbasa bago matulog	3.31	Neutral
Overall Mean:	3.89	Agree

Parental involvement was rated positively overall, but individual items indicate variation in the intensity of home literacy participation. Encouragement may be more common than shared reading or direct supervision. This distinction matters because home literacy support can operate through multiple pathways, including conversation, shared reading, motivation, and help with school tasks.

The group comparison reported below is especially important for this determinant because parental involvement was one of only two variables with a statistically significant difference. This suggests that the home-support experiences represented by the questionnaire were not distributed uniformly across the compared groups.

3.5 School environment

Table 7: School Environment

School Environment	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
My school is safe and comfortable for reading. / Ang aking paaralan ay ligtas at kumportable para sa pagbasa.	4.19	Agree
My classroom is quiet enough for reading. /Ang aking silid-aralan ay tahimik para sa pagbasa.	3.33	Neutral
My school promotes reading activities. / Ang aking paaralan ay nagpapalakas ng mga aktibidad sa pagbasa.	4.08	Agree
My classmates help me improve my reading. /Ang aking mga kaklase ay tumutulong sa akin upang mapabuti ang aking pagbasa.	3.51	Agree
The school provides a space for reading practice. / Ang paaralan ay nagbibigay ng lugar para sa pagsasanay sa pagbasa	4.17	Agree
I feel confident reading in school. / Ako ay may kumpiyansa sa pagbasa sa paaralan.	3.93	Agree
There are posters and materials that encourage reading. / May mga poster at materyales sa paaralan na humihikayat sa pagbasa	3.95	Agree
My teacher gives rewards for good reading skills. / Ang aking guro ay nagbibigay ng gantimpala para sa mahusay na pagbasa.	3.81	Agree
I participate in school reading contests. / Ako ay lumalahok sa mga paligsahan sa pagbasa sa paaralan.	3.26	Neutral
My school encourages reading outside the classroom. / Ang aking paaralan ay humihikayat ng pagbasa kahit nasa labas ng silid-aralan	3.67	Agree
Composite Mean:	3.79	Agree

The school environment was generally viewed as supportive of reading. However, neutral ratings for classroom quietness and participation in reading contests point to specific environmental and program-related gaps. A supportive climate can provide continuity for literacy learning, but physical conditions and opportunities for organized participation remain relevant.

3.6 Pupil engagement

Table 8: Pupil Engagement

Pupil Engagement	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I enjoy reading. / Nasiyahan ako sa pagbasa	4.34	Strongly Agree
I read books even beyond school hours. / Ako ay nagbabasa ng mga libro kahit nasa labas ng paaralan.	3.63	Agree
I like to discuss what I read. / Gusto kong pag-usapan ang aking binabasa.	3.83	Agree
I find reading fun. / Natutuwa ako sa pagbasa.	4.09	Agree

I read every day. / Ako ay nagbabasa araw-araw.	3.60	Agree
I raise questions about what I read. / Ako ay nagtatanong tungkol sa aking binasa.	3.81	Agree
I participate in school reading programs. / Ako ay lumalahok sa mga programa sa pagbasa ng paaralan.	3.35	Neutral
I prefer reading over watching TV/videos. / Mas gusto ko ang magbasa kaysa manood ng TV/video.	3.49	Agree
I like reading aloud in class. / Gusto kong magbasa nang malakas sa klase.	3.05	Neutral
I finish the books I start reading. / Natatapos ko ang mga librong sinisimulan kong basahin.	3.78	Agree
Composite Mean:	3.70	Agree

Pupil engagement had the lowest overall mean, 3.70 (Agree). Enjoyment of reading was strong, but participation in school reading programs and reading aloud in class were weaker. This pattern suggests that positive attitudes do not always translate into frequent or public reading behavior. Engagement research emphasizes behavioral, emotional, and cognitive participation rather than enjoyment alone.

3.7 Socio-economic status

Table 9: Socio-Economic Status

Socio-Economic Status	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
I have my own books at home. / May sarili akong mga libro sa bahay.	4.15	Agree
My family can afford to buy reading materials. / Kayang bumili ng aking pamilya ng mga babasahing materyal.	3.99	Agree
We have internet access for reading. / May internet kami para sa pagbasa.	4.15	Agree
My parents have stable jobs. / Ang aking mga magulang ay may matatag na trabaho.	4.17	Agree
My family values education. / Pinahahalagahan ng aking pamilya ang edukasyon.	4.46	Strongly Agree
I have a quiet study space at home. / May tahimik akong lugar sa bahay para sa pag-aaral.	4.10	Agree
I have school supplies for reading practice. May mga gamit ako sa eskwelahan para sa pagsasanay sa pagbasa.	4.18	Agree
My parents spend time helping me learn. / Ang aking mga magulang ay gumugugol ng oras upang matulungan akong matuto	3.90	Agree
My home environment supports learning. / Ang kapaligiran sa aking bahay ay nakakatulong sa pag-aaral.	3.91	Agree
My family encourages educational activities. / Ang aking pamilya ay humihikayat ng mga gawaing pang-edukasyon.	4.15	Agree
Composite Mean:	4.12	Agree

Socio-economic status obtained an overall mean of 4.12 (Agree), the second-highest determinant. Learners generally perceived their families as valuing education and reported access to books and internet resources, but the overall pattern did not indicate unrestricted access for everyone. Socio-economic conditions can shape literacy through material resources, parental education, language exposure, and opportunities for cognitive stimulation.

As with parental involvement, socio-economic status showed a significant group difference in the Kruskal-Wallis analysis. This result supports attention to equity in access to learning opportunities while avoiding the assumption that socio-economic status determines any individual learner's reading outcome.

3.8 Differences in determinants across groups

Table 10: Test of Significant Differences in the Determinants According to PHIL-IRI Reading Ability Classification

Determinant	H	p-value	Interpretation
Teacher Competence	4.017	.134	Not Significant
Learning Resources	1.109	.574	Not Significant
Parental Involvement	12.274	.002	Significant
School Environment	4.622	.099	Not Significant
Pupil Engagement	1.549	.461	Not Significant
Socio Economic Status	12.295	.002	Significant

Teacher competence ($H = 4.017$, $p = .134$), learning resources ($H = 1.109$, $p = .574$), school environment ($H = 4.622$, $p = .099$), and pupil engagement ($H = 1.549$, $p = .461$) did not show statistically significant differences. The null hypothesis was therefore not rejected for these four determinants. This indicates that the compared groups reported broadly comparable experiences in these areas.

In contrast, parental involvement ($H = 12.274$, $p = .002$) and socio-economic status ($H = 12.295$, $p = .002$) showed statistically significant differences. The null hypothesis was rejected for these two determinants. The findings indicate that family support and socio-economic conditions varied across the groups in ways not observed for the four school- and learner-related determinants.

The parental involvement result is consistent with research emphasizing shared reading, encouragement, homework supervision, and language-rich interaction, although other local work has reported nonsignificant relationships. The socio-economic finding is consistent with literature linking household resources, parental education, books, technology, and cognitive stimulation to literacy opportunities. These are group-level associations and should not be interpreted as deterministic effects on individual pupils.

4 INTEGRATED DISCUSSION

Taken together, the findings show a school context in which learners generally reported positive instructional and environmental support, yet reading independence remained uneven. The majority were at the Instructional level despite a high-rating for teacher competence. This is not contradictory: reading development reflects accumulated experiences across school and home and cannot be reduced to a single current classroom factor.

The nonsignificant differences for teacher competence, learning resources, school environment, and pupil engagement suggest that these conditions were experienced relatively consistently across the compared groups. Their importance to literacy development is not disproved by no significance; rather, the present data did not show sufficient evidence that the groups differed on those measures. This distinction is important because the study's design compares ratings across groups rather than estimating a causal effect of each determinant.

The significant results for parental involvement and socio-economic status place particular attention on the home context. Family encouragement, shared literacy activity, educational values, material access, and internet or book availability may create different opportunities for practice outside school. Schools cannot control household circumstances, but they can reduce barriers through accessible reading materials, structured family engagement, targeted interventions, and equitable opportunities to participate in literacy programs.

The results therefore support a combined approach: sustain strong teaching, improve consistency of feedback and reading tasks, strengthen access to appropriate resources, expand engaging school literacy activities, and provide additional support where home resources or family participation are limited.

5 CONCLUSION

Most respondents were classified at the Instructional level, showing that guided reading support remained necessary for a substantial proportion of the Grade 4 to Grade 6 learners. Teacher competence was the most highly rated determinant, while pupil engagement received the lowest overall mean among the six determinants. Four determinants—teacher competence, learning resources, school environment, and pupil engagement—did not differ

significantly across the compared groups. Parental involvement and socio-economic status did show significant differences.

The study concludes that reading ability in this setting should be addressed through coordinated school and home support rather than through a single-factor explanation. The significant family-related differences warrant particular attention, while the generally positive ratings of school-related determinants should be maintained and strengthened.

Recommendations

Schools should continue differentiated reading interventions based on Phil-IRI classifications. Learners at the Frustration level should receive intensive support in decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension; Instructional-level learners should receive guided practice and scaffolding toward independence; and Independent readers should receive enrichment and increasingly complex reading opportunities.

Teachers are encouraged to provide more regular reading tasks and timely feedback while sustaining clear explanation, support for struggling readers, and engaging discussion. Schools may strengthen family literacy initiatives by providing practical home-reading guidance and accessible materials. Parents are encouraged to maintain regular reading opportunities at home, provide encouragement, and participate in literacy activities within their available time and resources. Future research may include multiple schools, additional learner variables, and designs capable of examining predictive or longitudinal relationships.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Acknowledgments

The author expresses sincere appreciation to Dr. Evangelina S. Seril for research guidance; to Dr. Mely M. Padilla, Dr. Norberto V. Caturay, Dr. Rodulfo Anthony A. Lacerna, and Dr. Desserie T. Maynes-Blanco for scholarly guidance and evaluation; and to the Schools Division Office of Quezon City, Commonwealth Elementary School administrators, teachers, parents, and learners for their cooperation in the study.

Funding Source

This study was self-funded by the author using funds from the author's own salary. No external financial support, grant, or sponsorship was received for the conduct of this research

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Statement of ethical approval

School approval was obtained before retrieval of Phil-IRI records and administration of the questionnaire.

Statement of informed consent

Consent was obtained from respondents and their parents or guardians. Participation was voluntary, and results are reported in aggregate form.

Statement on data and source integrity

This article is a condensed journal-format version of the author's 2026 Master in Education Management thesis. Numerical results, sample characteristics, statistical tests, and study limitations were retained from the source manuscript; no new empirical data were introduced in preparing this version.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abalos, R. L. (2025). Teachers' competence and strategies as correlates of reading levels of Grade 5 pupils in Roxas East District. *Salettinian Open Academic Review*. vol 7. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=27136>
- [2] Abril, J. G., Acerbo, C. T., & Abocejo, F. T. (2022). The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) program: A critical analysis. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education Journal*, 5(4).

- [3] Andal, J. D., & Villenes, R. M. (2024). Home learning support and reading performance of the primary pupils in Alat-Alatin ES: Basis for reading intervention program in distance learning settings. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 3(1), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.17613/f8y4-6v68>
- [4] Avvisati, F., Wuyts, C., & Keslair, F. (2024). The measurement of socio-economic status in PISA (OECD Education Working Paper No. 321). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/0c5b793c-en>
- [5] Berkowitz, R. (2021). School climate and the socioeconomic literacy achievement gap: Multilevel analysis of compensation, mediation, and moderation models. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 130, 106238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2021.106238>
- [6] Borman, G. D., & Yang, H. (2026). Cumulative access to print books improves literacy achievement: Evidence from a five-year randomized trial in high-poverty schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 123(17), Article e2521416123. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2521416123>
- [7] Cabral-Gouveia, C. C., Menezes, I., & Neves, T. (2023). Educational strategies to reduce the achievement gap: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1155741. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1155741>
- [8] Cabusog, C. V., & Cañedo, L. C. (2025). Reading proficiency of Grade 4 learners in relation to their academic performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 2(6), 246–259. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15631532>
- [9] Çalışkan, E. F., & Ulaş, A. H. (2022). The effect of parent-involved reading activities on primary school students' reading comprehension skills, reading motivation, and attitudes towards reading. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 14(4), 509–524. <https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2022.260>
- [10] Capin, P., Dahl-Leonard, K., & Hall, C. (2024). Reading comprehension instruction: Evaluating our progress since Durkin's seminal study. *Scientific Studies of Reading*.
- [11] Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 19(1), 5–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271>
- [12] Castro, C., Barata, M. C., Alexandre, J., et al. (2026). Placing social and emotional support at the center of school climate: A scoping review of measures for middle and secondary schools. *Educational Psychology Review*, 38, 90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-026-10192-x>
- [13] Claes, R., Laga, J., Denies, K., Bleukx, N., Dockx, J., Van Keer, H., & Aesaert, K. (2024). The interplay between students' home literacy environment, reading attitudes and comprehension: A serial mediation analysis using PIRLS 2021 data. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, 12, Article 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-024-00233-8>
- [14] Department of Education. (2018a). Policy guidelines on the administration of the revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) (DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2018). Department of Education.
- [15] Department of Education. (2018b). The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) Manual 2018. Bureau of Learning Resources, Department of Education.
- [16] Dewitz, P., & Graves, M. F. (2021). The science of reading: Four forces that modified, distorted, or ignored the research findings on reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S131–S144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.389>
- [17] Dixon, M., Oxley, E., Gellert, A. S., Nash, H., & Joshi, R. M. (2024). Exploring teachers teaching reading comprehension. *Education* 3–13. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2024.2357884>
- [18] 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>
- [19] Guetterman, T. C. & Creswell, J. W. (2021). *Educational Research Planning, Conducting, And Evaluating Quantitative And Qualitative Research*. 6th Edition. Pearson. https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9781292337852_A39573381/preview-9781292337852_A39573381.pdf
- [20] Ho, S. K., & Gan, Z. (2023). Instructional practices and students' reading performance: A comparative study of 10 top-performing regions in PISA 2018. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13, Article 48. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00261-1>
- [21] Hudson, A. K., Moore, K. A., Han, B., Koh, P. W., Binks-Cantrell, E., & Joshi, R. M. (2021). Elementary teachers' knowledge of foundational literacy skills: A critical piece of the puzzle in the science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S287–S315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.408>

- [22] Hwang, H., Cabell, S. Q., & Joyner, R. E. (2022). Effects of integrated literacy and content-area instruction on vocabulary and comprehension in the elementary years: A meta-analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 26(3), 223–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2021.1954005>
- [23] Imperial, J. M. R., & Ong, E. (2021a). Application of lexical features towards improvement of Filipino readability identification of children's literature. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2101.10537>
- [24] Imperial, J. M. R., & Ong, E. (2021b). Diverse linguistic features for assessing reading difficulty of educational Filipino texts. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computers in Education*. Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education.
- [25] Imperial, J. M. R., & Ong, E. (2021c). Under the microscope: Interpreting readability assessment models for Filipino. In *Proceedings of the 35th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation* (pp. 1–10). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [26] Jagannathan, R., Camasso, M. J., & Delacalle, M. (2022). Growing up poor but doing well: Contextual factors that predict academic success. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 31, 2178–2193.
- [27] Kim, J. S., Burkhauser, M. A., Relyea, J. E., Gilbert, J. B., & Scherer, E. (2022). A longitudinal randomized trial of a sustained content literacy intervention from first to second grade: Transfer effects on students' reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(6), 1195–1217.
- [28] Lee, Y., Jang, B. G., & Conradi Smith, K. (2021). A systematic review of reading-engagement research: What do we mean, what do we know, and where do we go? *Reading Psychology*, 42(5), 540–576.
- [29] Leino, K., Nissinen, K., & Sirén, M. (2022). Associations between teacher quality, instructional quality and student reading outcomes in Nordic PIRLS 2016 data. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, 10, Article 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-022-00146-4>
- [30] Li, P., Yan, Z., Xu, L., Wang, R., Li, D., & Ye, Y. (2026). Overcoming early reading challenges: The crucial roles of home literacy environment, school environment, and approaches to learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 475–495. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.70032>
- [31] Mauya, V. R. N. (2025). E-reading coach on enhancing oral reading fluency. *SARIRIT: The University Research Journal*, 14(1, Special Issue).
- [32] McGeown, S., Osborne, C., Warhurst, A., Norgate, R., & Duncan, L. G. (2024). Reading engagement matters: A new scale to measure and support children's engagement with reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 77(5), 587–599. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2267>
- [33] Metsala, J. L., & Kalindi, S. C. (2022). The effects of a computer-based early reading program on the literacy skills of kindergarten students. *Early Education and Development*, 33(8), 1375–1394.
- [34] Miksza, P., et. al. (2023, February 23). 12. 'Quantitative Descriptive and Correlational Research', *Music Education Research: An Introduction* (New York, 2023; online edn, Oxford Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197639757.003.0012>
- [35] Misanes, C. H., & Pascual, E. (2023). Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) performance of Grade 8 students: Basis for a reading intervention program. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 13(3), 276–290. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=22099>
- [36] Mullis, I. V. S., & Martin, M. O. (Eds.). (2021). PIRLS 2021 assessment frameworks. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College. <https://pirls2021.org/frameworks/home/reading-assessment-framework/overview/index.html>
- [37] Mullis, I. V. S., von Davier, M., Foy, P., Fishbein, B., Reynolds, K. A., & Wry, E. (2023). PIRLS 2021 international results in reading. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
- [38] Neal, J. W., & Neal, Z. P. (2013). Nested or networked? Future directions for ecological systems theory. *Social Development*, 22(4), 722–737. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12018>
- [39] Obar, M. J. A. (2023). Reading proficiency levels in English among the intermediate graders in Manito District SY 2022–2023. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 54(1), 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v54i1.869>
- [40] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023a). PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>
- [41] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023b). PISA 2022 results: Philippines country note. OECD.
- [42] Petscher, Y., Cabell, S. Q., Catts, H. W., Compton, D. L., Foorman, B. R., Hart, S. A., Lonigan, C. J., Phillips, B. M., Schatschneider, C., Steacy, L. M., Terry, N. P., & Wagner, R. K. (2020). How the science of reading informs 21st-century education. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S267–S282. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rq.352>

- [43] Rakesh, D., Lee, P. A., Gaikwad, A., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2025). Associations of socioeconomic status with cognitive function, language ability, and academic achievement in youth: A systematic review of mechanisms and protective factors. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 66(3), 268–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.14082>
- [44] Reynolds, K. A., Gallo, A., & Komakhidze, M. (2024). PIRLS 2026 contextual framework. In M. von Davier & A. Kennedy (Eds.), *PIRLS 2026 assessment frameworks*. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
- [45] Romeo, R. R. (2022). Socioeconomic status and reading outcomes. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 63, 223–254.
- [46] Romeo, R. R., Uchida, L., & Christodoulou, J. A. (2022). Socioeconomic status and reading outcomes: Neurobiological and behavioral correlates. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2022(183–184), 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cad.20475>
- [47] Rowe, M. L. (2022). Environmental influences on early language and literacy development: Social policy and educational implications. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 63, 103–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2022.04.001>
- [48] Segura, J. B., & Alcuizar, R. M. (2026). Parental involvement and reading proficiency among learners. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 9(2), 497–510. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v9-i2-11>
- [49] Smith, R., Snow, P. C., Serry, T. A., & Hammond, L. (2023). Elementary teachers' perspectives on teaching reading comprehension. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 54(3), 795–811. https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_LSHSS-22-00118
- [50] Theobald, R. J., Goldhaber, D. D., Holden, K. L., & Stein, M. L. (2022). Special education teacher preparation, literacy instructional alignment, and reading achievement for students with high-incidence disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 88(4), 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00144029221081236>
- [51] Torppa, M., Vasalampi, K., Eklund, K., & Niemi, P. (2022). Long-term effects of the home literacy environment on reading development: Familial risk for dyslexia as a moderator. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 215, Article 105314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105314>
- [52] Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 21. 360-407. 10.1598/RRQ.21.4.1.
- [53] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.
- [54] UNESCO Institute for Statistics, UNICEF, & World Bank. (2022). *From learning recovery to education transformation: Insights and reflections from the fourth survey of national education responses to COVID-19 school closures*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- [55] UNESCO. (2022). *Transforming education: Philippine national statement of commitment*. UNESCO.
- [56] UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education: A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO.
- [57] UNICEF. (2022). *Are children really learning? Exploring foundational skills in the midst of a learning crisis*. UNICEF.
- [58] Urfalı Dadandı, P., & Dadandı, İ. (2022). The relationships among teachers encourage students' reading engagement, reading enjoyment, reading self-efficacy and reading success. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(3), 98–110. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.56.9.3>
- [59] Villaflor, R., & Baguio, J. B. (2026). Administrative support and professional compliance in reading instruction among public elementary school teachers. *International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies*, 2(1). <https://www.ejournals.ph/article.php?id=34366&>
- [60] World Bank, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, UNESCO, UNICEF, & United States Agency for International Development. (2022). *Guide for learning recovery and acceleration: Using the RAPID framework to address COVID-19 learning losses and build forward better*. World Bank.
- [61] World Bank. (2022a). *The state of global learning poverty: 2022 update*. World Bank.
- [62] World Bank. (2022b). *Philippines learning poverty brief*. World Bank.
- [63] Ye, W., Teig, N., & Blömeke, S. (2024). Systematic review of protective factors related to academic resilience in children and adolescents: Unpacking the interplay of operationalization, data, and research method. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1405786. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1405786>