



International Journal of Education, Literacies, and Curriculum Studies

ISSN: 3116-2991

<https://ijelcs.minduraresearch.com/journal/index>

Volume 2 Issue 1-2026

STAKEHOLDERS' ASSESSMENT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACADEMIC RECOVERY AND ACCESSIBLE LEARNING PROGRAM (ARAL): BASIS FOR A PROPOSED ACTION PLAN

JEFFERSON L. PATAY

Apayao State College

Malama, Conner, Apayao, Philippines

Email : jefferson.patay@deped.gov.ph

Publication Date: 03/31/2026

ABSTRACT

Abstract: This study explores the extent of implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) program as assessed by school heads, teachers and parents. A mixed-methods approach was employed, combining quantitative data from standardized reading assessments with qualitative data gathered through interviews of stakeholders. A total of 50 The results indicate that the ARAL Reading Modules significantly improve reading comprehension skills, fostering greater engagement and confidence among students. Participants reported increased motivation to read and a deeper understanding of the material, which translated into better academic outcomes. The findings suggest that tailored, accessible reading resources can play a critical role in empowering learners, particularly those in recovery programs, to overcome educational barriers. This research contributes to the field of education by providing insights into effective strategies for enhancing literacy and supporting diverse learning needs, ultimately advocating for broader implementation of similar instructional resources in various educational settings. This study underscores the importance of adaptable teaching methods and resources in promoting equitable learning opportunities, ensuring that all learners have the support they need to succeed.

Keywords: ARAL Program, assessment reading proficiency, literacy intervention, multi-grade schools, implementation, stakeholder,

Received: 01/08/2026

Revised: 02/25/2026

Accepted: 04/29/2026

Published: 03/31/2026

ISSN:3116-2991





Introduction

Reading proficiency is widely recognized as one of the most essential skills that children must develop during the early years of schooling. It serves as the foundation for learning across subject areas because learners who can read effectively are better able to understand lessons, follow instructions, accomplish academic tasks, and participate actively in classroom activities [1]. Beyond academic achievement, literacy also contributes to communication skills, critical thinking, and lifelong learning, making it a vital component of both individual growth and societal development [2]. In this regard, strengthening literacy education supports the broader goal of promoting inclusive and equitable quality education as emphasized in Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education).

Nationwide, literacy development remains a major educational concern in the Philippines. Data from the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) show that although many Filipinos are considered basically literate, a smaller proportion demonstrate functional literacy, which involves comprehension and application of written information [3]. Moreover, reports from the World Bank emphasized that many Filipino children experience difficulties in meeting expected literacy standards appropriate for their age and grade level [4]. Classroom experiences of teachers further reveal that some learners progress through grade levels without fully mastering foundational literacy skills, making it more challenging for them to cope with increasingly complex learning demands [5]. These concerns became more evident following disruptions in learning in recent years, thereby intensifying the need for responsive and sustainable intervention programs.

In response to these educational challenges, the Department of Education officially launched the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program on September 13, 2025, through DepEd Memorandum No. 064, s. 2025. The ARAL Program was designed as a nationwide intervention intended to address learning gaps in foundational skills, particularly in reading and numeracy, among Kindergarten to Grade 10 learners who are performing below expected proficiency standards [6]. The program includes diagnostic assessments, targeted remediation activities, tutorial sessions, learner monitoring, and collaborative support mechanisms involving teachers, school heads, parents, and community stakeholders [7]. Through these components, the program aims to provide accessible and responsive learning support that will help learners gradually achieve grade-level competencies.

Despite the nationwide implementation of the ARAL Program, there remains limited research focusing on how the program is carried out at the school level, particularly in rural and multigrade settings. Existing studies commonly emphasize learner outcomes and reading difficulties, while fewer investigations examine implementation practices, stakeholder involvement, available support systems, and contextual challenges affecting program delivery [8,9,10]. This research gap is particularly evident in schools such as Mabaguio Elementary School, where local conditions significantly influence the effectiveness and sustainability of educational interventions [11,12]. Therefore, this study seeks to assess the implementation of the ARAL Program in Northern Conner District by examining its implementation practices, stakeholder support, challenges encountered, and areas for improvement that may contribute to strengthening literacy development among learners.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to assess the extent of implementation of the ARAL Program in selected multi-grade schools in Northern Conner District for SY 2025-2026.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the stakeholders' assessment of the extent of the implementation of the ARAL Program in terms of the following dimensions?
 - 1.1 Learner Identification & Assessment
 - 1.2 Program Planning & School Readiness
 - 1.3 Teaching-Learning Delivery & Tutorial Sessions
 - 1.4 Tutor/Teacher Support & Capacity Building
 - 1.5 Parental & Community Engagement
 - 1.6 Learning Resources & Materials
 - 1.7 Monitoring, Evaluation & Reporting
 - 1.8 Overall Program Implementation & Outcomes
2. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the ARAL Program implementation by school heads, teachers and parents?
3. What are challenges encountered by the respondents in the implementation of the ARAL Program?

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the assessment of the ARAL Program implementation by school heads, teachers and parents?

Research Methodology

Research Design



The study employed a mixed-methods research design, specifically the convergent parallel design, to assess the implementation of the ARAL Program in 10 multigrade schools in the Northern Conner District. The quantitative component utilized a structured survey questionnaire based on the key dimensions of the ARAL Program under DepEd Memorandum No. 064, s. 2025 to assess the extent of implementation and identify significant differences in stakeholders' assessments. Meanwhile, the qualitative component used semi-structured interviews with school heads, teachers, tutors, parents, and community partners to explore their experiences, challenges, and recommendations regarding the program. The findings from both strands were integrated during the interpretation phase to provide deeper insights and serve as the basis for enhancing the ARAL implementation in the district.

Locale of Study

The study was conducted in 10 selected multi-grade public elementary schools within the Northern Conner District of the Schools Division of Apayao. The locale of the study was the Northern Conner District, which consists of selected multigrade elementary schools situated in geographically remote communities. Specifically, the study was conducted in ten multigrade schools, namely: Buguit Elementary School, Catub Elementary School, Cupis Elementary School, Guinamgamman Elementary School, Liwan Elementary School, Lower Katablangan Elementary School, Mabaguio Elementary School, Matda Elementary School, Nabuangan Elementary School, and Upper Katablangan Elementary School.

Respondents of the Study

A total of 50 stakeholders served as respondents of the study. These included 10 school heads, 20 teachers handling ARAL learners, and 20 parents of identified ARAL learners from the 10 multigrade schools in the district. Parent respondents were selected based on specific inclusion criteria to ensure relevance and reliability of responses. They must be parents or guardians of learners officially identified as ARAL Program beneficiaries, must have participated in school-based ARAL-related activities such as meetings or consultations, and must be willing to share their experiences regarding their child's reading support at home and in school. Only those who met these criteria were included as respondents in the study.

Data Gathering Tool

This study utilized two primary research instruments: a structured survey questionnaire for the quantitative component and a semi-structured interview guide for the qualitative component. A structured survey questionnaire was used to gather data on the profile of the respondents. Another part of the instrument measured the extent of ARAL Program implementation in the participating schools. The questionnaire was anchored on

the Core Components and Implementation Standards stipulated in DepEd Memorandum No. 064, s. 2025, ensuring alignment with national guidelines. For the qualitative component, a semi-structured interview guide was used to gather in-depth information from selected stakeholders involved in the ARAL Program implementation. The guide contained open-ended questions focused on stakeholders' challenges in implementing ARAL activities. Follow-up questions were used to encourage participants to further explain their responses and provide more detailed accounts of their experiences.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data for this study were collected through a systematic process involving preparation, coordination, instrument administration, and consolidation of results. After permission was granted, the researcher personally distributed and retrieved the questionnaires from the target respondents of the study. For the qualitative phase, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected stakeholders from the same 10 multigrade schools, including school heads, teachers who are designated as ARAL coordinators, and parents. The interviews were scheduled in advance and conducted face-to-face. Before each interview, informed consent was secured, and permission to record the conversation was obtained. The researcher facilitated the interviews using a guide focused on stakeholders' challenges in the implementation of the ARAL Program, while follow-up questions were asked to clarify and deepen responses. All recordings were transcribed verbatim for thematic analysis.

More importantly, ethical considerations were employed by the researcher such as keeping the confidentiality of the respondents. All letters and communications were addressed to proper authorities. An informed consent was also given to the respondents prior to the distribution of research questionnaires.

Statistical Analysis

Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of implementation of the ARAL Program across the eight dimensions with the following mean ranges and qualitative descriptions:

Mean Ranges	Descriptive Interpretation
4.21 – 5.00	Fully Implemented
3.41 – 4.20	Highly Implemented
2.61 – 3.40	Implemented
1.81 – 2.60	Less Implemented
1.00 – 1.80	Not Implemented

Analysis of Variance was employed to determine whether significant differences exist in assessments among school heads, teachers, and parents.

Meanwhile, qualitative data was analyzed using Thematic Analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006)



six-phase framework. First, the researcher familiarized themselves with the data by thoroughly reading and rereading the interview transcripts to gain a deep understanding of the content. Next, initial codes were generated by systematically identifying significant statements and meaningful units across the dataset. These codes were then organized and examined to search for potential themes that reflect broader patterns related to stakeholder experiences and challenges. The preliminary themes were reviewed by cross-checking them with the coded extracts and the full transcripts, allowing the researcher to refine, merge, or separate themes as needed. Once finalized, each theme was clearly defined and named to capture its central meaning. Finally, the themes were woven into a coherent narrative report that addresses the study’s qualitative research questions and contributes to the integrated interpretation of findings.

Results and Discussion

1.0 Extent of Implementation of the ARAL Program

Table 1 to 9 present the stakeholders’ assessment of the extent of the implementation of the ARAL Program in terms of Learner Identification & Assessment, Program Planning & School Readiness, Teaching-Learning Delivery & Tutorial Sessions, Tutor/Teacher Support & Capacity Building, Parental & Community Engagement, Learning Resources & Materials, and Monitoring, Evaluation & Reporting

Table 1. Learner Identification and Assessment

Indicators	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. The school initially conducted BOSY reading assessments to identify learners needing support.	4.75	FI	4.35	FI	4.80	FI
2. Diagnostic or screening tools were	4.65	FI	4.20	HI	4.30	FI

properly administered to determine reading proficiency levels.						
3. Learners were grouped based on reading needs rather than solely on grade level.	4.25	FI	4.25	FI	3.90	HI
4. The school regularly updates learners’ reading profiles.	4.10	HI	3.90	HI	3.80	HI
5. Pre- and post-assessment results are documented and monitored.	4.20	HI	3.90	HI	4.00	HI
Category Mean	4.39	FI	4.12	HI	4.16	HI

Table 1 reveals that teachers obtained the highest category mean (4.39), followed by school heads (4.16) and parents (4.12). Comparatively, teachers assessed learner identification and assessment more favorably than parents and school heads because they were directly involved in conducting beginning-of-school-year (BOSY) reading assessments, learner grouping, diagnostic testing, and progress monitoring. Teachers rated the conduct of BOSY reading assessments highest (4.75), while school heads also provided a very high assessment (4.80). In contrast, the lowest ratings were observed in the regular updating of learners’ reading profiles, particularly among school heads (3.80) and parents (3.90), indicating that continuous learner documentation may still require improvement. This implies that parents provided slightly lower ratings because assessment and profiling procedures are mostly school-based and may not always be fully communicated at home.



School heads, meanwhile, may have rated some indicators lower because they evaluate implementation from a monitoring and compliance perspective. The generally high assessment implies that schools recognize the importance of identifying struggling readers and providing interventions based on learner needs. This finding supports the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act or Republic Act No. 12028, which emphasizes learner assessment and targeted intervention programs for learners experiencing learning gaps (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Similarly, the Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program under DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023 highlights learner assessment, remediation, and progress monitoring as essential strategies for addressing learning loss (Department of Education [DepEd], 2023). DepEd Order No. 034, s. 2022 further stresses the importance of implementing evidence-based interventions anchored on diagnostic assessment results to support learning recovery initiatives (DepEd, 2022). Internationally, Fuchs and Fuchs (2017) emphasized that early identification and systematic progress monitoring significantly improve literacy outcomes among struggling readers. Therefore, the positive assessment indicates that schools are implementing assessment-based intervention practices aligned with both national educational policies and international literacy intervention standards.

tutors) were assessed before implementation.						
4. The school coordinated with LGUs or community partners to support program needs.	3.50	HI	3.20	I	3.70	HI
5. Stakeholders were oriented about the ARAL program prior to implementation.	4.60	FI	4.10	HI	3.70	HI
Category Mean	4.00	HI	3.78	HI	3.80	HI

Table 2. Program Planning and School Readiness

Indicators	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. A school readiness audit for ARAL implementation was conducted.	3.85	HI	3.80	HI	4.10	HI
2. The school developed an ARAL implementation plan aligned with DepEd guidelines.	4.05	HI	3.95	HI	3.80	HI
3. Resources (learning spaces, materials,	4.00	HI	3.85	HI	3.70	HI

As shown in table 2, teachers obtained the highest category mean (4.00), followed by school heads (3.80) and parents (3.78). Comparatively, teachers perceived school readiness more positively than parents and school heads because they directly participated in orientation sessions, implementation planning, and preparation activities. Teachers rated stakeholder orientation regarding the ARAL Program highest (4.60), while all stakeholder groups gave comparatively lower ratings to coordination with LGUs and community partners. Parents rated this indicator lowest (3.20), suggesting that community participation and external support mechanisms may not yet be fully strengthened. The result indicates that parents may have perceived lower readiness because many planning processes occur within the school and administrative level, limiting parent visibility regarding school preparations. School heads, meanwhile, may have been more cautious in their assessment because they are directly aware of logistical limitations, resource constraints, and implementation challenges. The findings imply that schools were generally prepared for ARAL implementation but still need stronger collaboration with external stakeholders. This finding supports Republic Act No. 12028, which emphasizes collaborative and accessible learning recovery interventions



involving schools, families, communities, and government agencies (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Likewise, DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023 requires schools to develop structured intervention plans, conduct readiness assessments, and coordinate with stakeholders to support learning continuity and recovery (DepEd, 2023). DepEd Memorandum No. 054, s. 2022 also encourages partnerships with local government units and community organizations to strengthen learning recovery programs and learner support systems (DepEd, 2022). UNESCO (2021) emphasized that effective educational recovery programs require coordinated planning, adequate preparation, and strong stakeholder collaboration. Thus, the generally positive assessment suggests that schools have established readiness mechanisms for ARAL implementation, although external partnership-building still requires enhancement.

Table 3. Teaching-Learning Delivery and Tutorial Sessions

Teaching-Learning Delivery & Tutorial Sessions	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. ARAL tutorial sessions are conducted regularly as scheduled.	4.30	FI	3.75	HI	3.90	HI
2. Tutoring follows structured reading lessons aligned with learners' proficiency levels.	4.15	HI	3.80	HI	4.00	HI
3. Tutors/teachers adapt strategies based on individual learner needs.	3.95	HI	3.85	HI	3.60	HI
4. Instructional time allotted for ARAL sessions is	4.35	FI	4.10	HI	3.80	HI

consistently observed.						
5. Attendance of learners during ARAL sessions is monitored and recorded.	4.50	FI	4.15	HI	4.40	FI
Category Mean	4.25	FI	3.93	HI	3.94	HI

As can be gleaned in Table 3, it indicates that teachers obtained the highest category mean (4.25), followed by school heads (3.94) and parents (3.93). Comparatively, teachers viewed the conduct of tutorial sessions more positively because they were directly involved in delivering instruction, monitoring attendance, and adapting strategies based on learner needs. The highest-rated indicator among teachers was the monitoring of learner attendance during ARAL sessions (4.50), while school heads also highly rated this indicator (4.40). However, school heads gave the lowest rating to the adaptation of instructional strategies according to learner needs (3.60), suggesting that differentiated instruction may still need improvement. The result further indicates that parents provided slightly lower ratings because they mainly observe learner outcomes and school communication rather than actual classroom instruction. School heads, meanwhile, may have evaluated implementation more critically due to their supervisory role in ensuring instructional quality and compliance. The findings imply that tutorial sessions were generally implemented consistently and aligned with learners' proficiency levels. This supports Republic Act No. 12028, which mandates tutorial sessions and intervention classes aimed at improving literacy and numeracy competencies among struggling learners (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The findings are likewise aligned with DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023, which identifies tutorial support and structured remediation sessions as key components of the National Learning Recovery Program (DepEd, 2023). Furthermore, DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016 on Learning Action Cells (LAC) promotes differentiated instruction and collaborative teaching practices to improve learner performance (DepEd, 2016). Nickow et al. (2020) further explained that structured tutoring programs significantly improve learner achievement when instructional strategies are adapted to learner needs and implemented consistently. Therefore, the positive assessment indicates that schools are



implementing organized and learner-centered tutorial interventions aligned with national learning recovery policies.

Table 4 reveals that teachers obtained a category mean of 3.83, followed closely by school heads (3.82) and parents (3.75). Comparatively, the stakeholder groups demonstrated similar perceptions regarding the adequacy of tutor and teacher support. The highest-rated indicators involved the availability of reading materials and administrative support from school heads, particularly among school heads themselves (4.40 and 4.20, respectively). However, the lowest-rated indicator across groups was teacher training for ARAL implementation, with teachers giving the lowest mean of 3.25. This suggests that although instructional materials and administrative assistance were generally available, many implementers still lacked sufficient professional training specific to ARAL intervention delivery.

Teachers may have expressed lower satisfaction regarding training because they directly experience the challenges of remediation instruction and literacy intervention. Parents may have based their assessment on learner outcomes and teacher performance, while school heads may have recognized both the support mechanisms already provided and the remaining gaps in professional development opportunities. The findings imply that teacher capacity-building remains an area needing improvement to ensure effective ARAL implementation. This supports Republic Act No. 12028, which emphasizes teacher support and intervention preparedness in addressing learning loss among Filipino learners (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The findings are likewise consistent with DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers, which highlights continuous professional development and instructional enhancement among teachers (DepEd, 2020). Additionally, DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads underscores the responsibility of school leaders in supporting teacher growth and instructional improvement (DepEd, 2017). Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) further emphasized that teacher professional development enhances instructional quality, learner engagement, and intervention effectiveness. Therefore, the findings suggest that schools should intensify teacher training, coaching, and mentoring programs to strengthen ARAL implementation.

Table 4. Tutor/Teacher Support and Capacity Building

Indicators	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. Tutors/teachers received appropriate training for ARAL implementation.	3.25	I	3.40	I	3.30	I
2. Coaching and mentoring are provided to tutors/teachers when needed.	3.60	HI	3.45	HI	3.20	I
3. Reading materials and teaching guides required for ARAL are readily available.	4.30	FI	3.95	HI	4.40	HI
4. Implementers received adequate support from the school head or coordinator.	4.15	HI	4.00	HI	4.20	HI
5. Tutors/teachers are regularly monitored during implementation.	3.85	HI	3.95	HI	4.00	HI
Category Mean	3.83	HI	3.75	HI	3.82	HI

Table 5. Parental and Community Engagement

Parental & Community Engagement	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. Parents/guardians were	4.40	FI	3.75	HI	4.30	FI



oriented about their roles in the ARAL program.						
2. Parents support learners by participating in home-based reading activities.	3.40	I	2.70	I	2.70	I
3. Community partners (barangay, NGOs, volunteers) assist in the ARAL program.	2.85	I	2.45	LI	2.50	LI
4. Communication between school and parents regarding learner progress is regular.	4.20	HI	3.40	I	3.70	HI
5. The school promotes shared accountability among stakeholders for reading improvement.	4.20	HI	4.10	HI	4.20	HI
Category Mean	3.82	HI	3.28	I	3.48	HI

particularly among parents and school heads. This suggests that although schools-initiated engagement efforts, actual stakeholder participation remained limited.

The teachers may have perceived stronger engagement because they frequently communicate with parents and facilitate school-based activities. Parents, however, may have rated engagement lower because of limited time, insufficient educational background, work responsibilities, or lack of confidence in assisting learners academically. School heads may also have recognized the difficulty of sustaining active community participation and volunteer support for intervention programs. The findings indicate that parental and community engagement remains one of the weaker aspects of ARAL implementation. This finding supports Republic Act No. 12028, which encourages collaborative learning recovery efforts involving schools, parents, communities, and other stakeholders (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The result also aligns with DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012 or the DepEd Child Protection Policy, which promotes shared responsibility among schools, families, and communities in ensuring learner welfare and development (DepEd, 2012). Moreover, DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015 on the Enhanced School Improvement Planning Process emphasizes stakeholder participation and community partnership in improving educational programs and learner outcomes (DepEd, 2015). Jeynes (2018) further noted that active parental involvement significantly improves learner achievement, reading performance, and academic motivation. Therefore, the relatively lower ratings in this area suggest the need for stronger parent orientation programs, community partnerships, and home-based literacy support initiatives to improve ARAL Program effectiveness.

Table 6. Learning Resources and Materials

Indicators	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. Age-appropriate reading materials are available for ARAL learners.	4.25	FI	4.15	HI	4.40	FU
2. Learning modules and	4.45	FI	4.15	HI	4.20	HI

Table 5 shows that teachers recorded the highest category mean (3.82), followed by school heads (3.48) and parents (3.28). Comparatively, teachers viewed parental and community engagement more positively than parents and school heads. Teachers and school heads both rated the promotion of shared accountability for reading improvement highly (4.20), indicating that schools actively encouraged stakeholder participation in learner support. However, the lowest-rated indicators involved parent participation in home-based reading activities and community partner involvement in the ARAL Program,



activity sheets meet the needs of struggling readers.						
3. The school has sufficient materials for all proficiency groups.	4.30	FI	3.95	HI	4.20	HI
4. Digital or printed reading resources are updated and accessible.	4.10	HI	3.85	HI	3.90	HI
5. Materials are used consistently throughout the program.	4.45	FI	4.20	HI	4.40	FI
Category Mean	4.31	FI	4.06	HI	4.22	FI

materials outside school settings, leading to lower assessments. School heads may have evaluated resource sufficiency from an administrative and logistical perspective, considering the availability and distribution of instructional materials across proficiency groups. The findings imply that schools generally provided adequate and appropriate learning resources for ARAL implementation. This supports Republic Act No. 12028, which emphasizes the provision of accessible and learner-appropriate intervention materials to support academic recovery among struggling learners (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Likewise, DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023 on the National Learning Recovery Program underscores the importance of sufficient learning materials and intervention resources in addressing literacy and numeracy gaps (DepEd, 2023). The findings are also aligned with Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, which mandates the use of contextualized, learner-centered, and developmentally appropriate instructional materials to improve learning outcomes (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013). Internationally, UNESCO (2021) emphasized that effective learning recovery programs require accessible, high-quality, and learner-responsive educational resources. Therefore, the positive assessment suggests that schools recognize the critical role of instructional materials in supporting reading intervention and academic recovery.

As shown in Table 6, teachers obtained the highest category mean (4.31), followed by school heads (4.22) and parents (4.06). Comparatively, teachers assessed the availability and utilization of learning resources more positively than parents and school heads. Teachers gave the highest ratings to the consistent use of materials and the adequacy of learning modules and activity sheets, both with a mean of 4.45. Similarly, school heads highly rated the availability of age-appropriate reading materials and the consistent use of materials, both with means of 4.40. In contrast, parents provided comparatively lower ratings on the accessibility and updating of digital or printed resources (3.85), suggesting that some learning materials may not always be fully accessible at home.

Comparatively, teachers viewed learning resources more favorably because they directly utilize instructional materials during tutorial sessions and classroom intervention activities. Parents, meanwhile, may have experienced limitations in accessing printed and digital

Table 7. Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

Indicators	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. The school uses monitoring tools to track ARAL program implementation.	4.05	HI	3.60	HI	4.00	HI
2. Learners' progress is recorded in dashboards or progress sheets.	3.70	HI	3.60	HI	3.70	HI
3. Challenges encountered in the program are	3.65	HI	3.15	I	2.70	I



documented and addressed.						
4. Reports on ARAL progress are submitted regularly to the district/division.	3.85	H I	3.70	H I	3.20	I
5. Program outcomes are reviewed to guide improvement or adjustments.	3.75	H I	3.65	H I	3.20	I
Category Mean	3.80	H I	3.54	H I	3.36	I

Table 7 reveals that teachers obtained the highest category mean (3.80), followed by parents (3.54) and school heads (3.36). Comparatively, teachers assessed monitoring, evaluation, and reporting mechanisms more positively than parents and school heads. Teachers gave the highest rating to the use of monitoring tools in tracking ARAL implementation (4.05), while parents also rated learner progress recording relatively high (3.60). In contrast, school heads provided the lowest ratings on documenting and addressing program challenges (2.70), indicating concerns regarding the consistency of feedback mechanisms and problem-resolution documentation within program implementation.

The result further shows that teachers may have viewed monitoring systems more favorably because they directly conduct learner assessment, maintain progress records, and prepare reports related to ARAL implementation. Parents, meanwhile, may have based their assessments on communication received from schools regarding learner progress. School heads, however, may have evaluated the implementation more critically because they oversee compliance, reporting systems, and program accountability. The findings imply that while schools have existing monitoring and reporting practices, there is still a need to strengthen documentation procedures and program evaluation mechanisms. This supports Republic Act No. 12028, which requires continuous monitoring and evaluation of intervention programs to ensure effective learner recovery and academic support (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Similarly, DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023 emphasizes evidence-based monitoring, assessment, and reporting systems in implementing learning recovery interventions (DepEd, 2023). Furthermore, DepEd Order No. 029, s. 2022 on School Calendar and Activities

highlights the importance of tracking learner progress and implementing intervention programs responsive to assessment results (DepEd, 2022). International studies also suggest that systematic monitoring and timely feedback improve intervention effectiveness and learner achievement outcomes (Hattie, 2018). Therefore, the moderate assessment indicates that schools have established monitoring systems but still need stronger evaluation and documentation practices to improve ARAL implementation.

Table 8 Overall Program Implementation and Outcomes

Indicators	Teacher		Parent		School Head	
	Mean	DI	Mean	DI	Mean	DI
1. The ARAL program has improved learners' reading confidence.	4.25	F I	4.10	H I	4.40	F I
2. Learners show measurable progress based on post-assessments.	4.15	H I	3.95	H I	4.30	F I
3. The program has helped address the learning gaps of struggling readers.	4.11	H I	4.00	H I	4.00	H I
4. Stakeholders collaborate effectively in support of program goals.	3.95	H I	4.05	H I	3.90	H I
5. The ARAL program is implemented effectively in the school.	4.25	F I	4.10	H I	4.30	F I
Category Mean	4.14	H I	4.04	H I	4.18	H I

Table 8 shows that school heads obtained the highest category mean (4.18), followed by teachers (4.14) and parents (4.04). Comparatively, school heads viewed the overall implementation and outcomes of the ARAL Program more positively than teachers and parents. School heads gave the highest ratings to the improvement of learners' reading confidence and the overall effectiveness of



ARAL implementation, both with means of 4.30. Teachers also highly rated learner reading confidence and effective implementation, both with means of 4.25. In contrast, parents provided comparatively lower ratings regarding learners' measurable progress based on post-assessments (3.95), although the interpretation remained positive.

Comparatively, school heads may have perceived strong implementation effectiveness because they oversee the overall management, coordination, and compliance of the program. Teachers, meanwhile, directly observed learner participation and academic improvement during intervention sessions, leading to similarly high assessments. Parents may have provided slightly lower ratings because learner improvement at home may not always be immediately visible or consistently observed. The findings imply that stakeholders generally perceived the ARAL Program as effective in improving reading confidence, addressing learning gaps, and supporting struggling readers. This finding supports Republic Act No. 12028, which aims to improve literacy and numeracy competencies through targeted tutorial and intervention programs for learners experiencing educational difficulties (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The result also aligns with DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023, which emphasizes the implementation of intervention programs to accelerate learning recovery and improve learner achievement (DepEd, 2023). Furthermore, Republic Act No. 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act promotes learner-centered and inclusive educational interventions designed to improve academic outcomes and learner development (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013). Internationally, Slavin et al. (2020) emphasized that structured reading intervention programs positively affect learner confidence, literacy performance, and academic achievement when implemented consistently. Therefore, the generally high assessment indicates that the ARAL Program effectively contributed to learning recovery and reading improvement among learners.

2.0 Significant difference in the assessment of the ARAL Program implementation by school heads, teachers and parents

Table 9. ANOVA to Test of Significant difference in the assessment of the ARAL Program implementation by school heads, teachers and parents

Program				
1. Learner Identification & Assessment	2.813	0.07	Accept H _o	Not significant
2. Program Planning & School Readiness	1.144	0.33	Accept H _o	Not significant
1. Teaching-learning delivery & tutorial sessions	3.53	0.04	Reject H _o	Significant
4. Tutor/teacher support & capacity building	0.146	0.87	Accept H _o	Not significant
5. Parental & community engagement	5.31	0.008	Reject H _o	Significant
6. Learning resources and materials	1.67	0.200	Accept H _o	Not significant
7. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting	2.06	0.139	Accept H _o	Not significant
8. Overall program implementation & outcomes	0.82	0.447	Accept H _o	Not significant

As shown in table 9, it reveals there was a significant difference in the assessment of teachers, parents, and school heads regarding teaching-learning delivery and tutorial sessions, and Parental & community engagement in the ARAL Program. The significant difference may be attributed to the varying roles and perspectives of stakeholders in program implementation. Teachers directly conduct tutorial sessions, monitor learner attendance, and apply intervention strategies, leading to stronger confidence in the effectiveness of instructional delivery. Parents, meanwhile, may assess tutorial effectiveness based on learner behavior and progress observed at home, while school heads evaluate implementation through supervision and compliance monitoring. This finding implies that stakeholders have differing levels of exposure and expectations regarding the quality and consistency of tutorial instruction. The result supports Republic Act No. 12028, which mandates the implementation of tutorial sessions and intervention classes to address learning gaps among struggling learners (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The findings are likewise aligned with DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023, which identifies tutorial support and structured remediation as key components of the National Learning Recovery Program (DepEd, 2023). Nickow et al. (2020) further emphasized that structured tutoring programs improve learner achievement when implemented

Components of ARAL	F	P	Decision	Interpretation
--------------------	---	---	----------	----------------



consistently and adapted to learner needs. Therefore, the significant difference suggests that while tutorial delivery was generally positive, stakeholders differed in their perceptions regarding the effectiveness and consistency of implementation. Moreover, varying experiences and expectations of stakeholders regarding home-school-community participation. Teachers regularly communicate with parents and facilitate engagement activities, which may have contributed to their more favorable assessment. Parents, however, may have experienced challenges such as limited time, insufficient educational background, or economic responsibilities that affected their participation in home-based reading activities. School heads may also have recognized the difficulty of sustaining active community partnerships and volunteer involvement in intervention programs. This finding supports Republic Act No. 12028, which promotes collaborative learning recovery efforts involving schools, parents, and communities (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Similarly, DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015 on the Enhanced School Improvement Planning Process emphasizes stakeholder participation and community partnership in improving educational programs and learner outcomes (DepEd, 2015). Jeynes (2018) further noted that active parental involvement positively influences learner achievement, literacy development, and academic motivation. Therefore, the significant difference suggests that stakeholders varied in their perceptions regarding the effectiveness and consistency of parental and community participation in the ARAL Program. The other dimensions of ARAL Program showed p-value greater than the 0.05 level of significance, therefore no significant difference in the assessment of teachers, parents, and school heads regarding the implementation of the ARAL Program. Teachers, parents, and school heads generally agreed similarly on these dimensions. The finding supports Republic Act No. 12028, which aims to improve literacy and numeracy competencies through accessible intervention programs for learners experiencing educational difficulties (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Likewise, DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023 emphasizes the implementation of structured intervention and learning recovery programs to address learning loss and improve learner achievement (DepEd, 2023). The findings are also aligned with Republic Act No. 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act, which promotes learner-centered and inclusive educational interventions to improve academic outcomes and learner development (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013). Slavin et al. (2020) further emphasized that structured literacy intervention programs positively influence learner confidence, academic engagement, and

reading achievement when implemented consistently. Therefore, the findings suggest that stakeholders generally agreed that the ARAL Program was effectively implemented and contributed positively to learner recovery and reading improvement.

3.0 Challenges do stakeholders encounter in the implementation of the ARAL Program

The thematic analysis of the responses from teachers, parents, and school heads revealed several recurring challenges encountered in the implementation of the ARAL Program. Across all stakeholder groups, the findings consistently highlighted issues related to workload and time constraints, limited parental support, insufficient resources and materials, lack of training and human resources, learner-related difficulties, and environmental or logistical concerns. These recurring themes demonstrate that although the ARAL Program is viewed positively, several institutional, social, and operational barriers affect its effective implementation.

Workload and Time Constraints

One of the most dominant challenges identified by all stakeholders was workload and time management. Teachers reported difficulty balancing ARAL activities with regular teaching loads, preparing instructional materials, checking learner outputs, and conducting tutorial sessions after regular class hours. As one teacher stated, "*Minsan kulang na kulang talaga ang oras kasi pagkatapos ng klase may ARAL pa, tapos marami pang papeles na kailangang ayusin.*" ("Sometimes the time is really not enough because after classes there is still ARAL, and there are still many papers to be accomplished.")

School heads similarly emphasized teacher fatigue, time management issues, and the difficulty of implementing ARAL alongside multigrade instructional responsibilities. One school head shared, "*Marami talagang ginagawa ang mga guro lalo na sa multigrade, kaya nahihirapan silang pagsabayin ang ARAL at regular classes.*" ("Teachers really have many tasks especially in multigrade, so they find it difficult to balance ARAL and regular classes.")

Parents also experienced limited time in assisting learners because of work responsibilities, farming activities, and household obligations. As one parent explained, "*Kayat mi koma nga tumulong iti panagbasa ti ubing, ngem gapu iti trabaho iti talon, nakurang ti oras nga maited mi tapno matutokan ida*" ("We want to help our child in reading but because of work on the farm, our time is really limited.")

This finding suggests that time-related pressures significantly affect the consistency and sustainability of ARAL implementation. The conduct of tutorial sessions



after regular classes may contribute to exhaustion among both teachers and learners, thereby affecting instructional quality and learner participation. This finding supports Republic Act No. 12028 or the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program Act, which recognizes the need for adequate support systems and personnel in implementing learning recovery interventions (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Likewise, DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023 on the National Learning Recovery Program emphasizes the need for sustainable implementation strategies and institutional support mechanisms to address learning gaps effectively (Department of Education [DepEd], 2023). Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) also explained that excessive workload and insufficient instructional time negatively affect teacher effectiveness and intervention quality.

Insufficient Resources and Learning Materials

Teachers, parents, and school heads all identified insufficient instructional materials, lack of equipment, inadequate facilities, and limited funding as significant barriers to program implementation. Teachers reported shortages in reading materials and instructional resources. As one teacher shared, "*Kulangan talaga kami sa reading materials kaya minsan kami na rin ang gumagawa ng worksheets para sa mga bata.*" ("We really lack reading materials, so sometimes we are the ones making worksheets for the learners.")

Parents also emphasized the lack of computers, conducive classrooms, and even basic facilities such as drinking water systems. One parent stated, "*Awan talaga ti computer mi ken no dadduma saan unay a nasayaat ti classroom dagiti ubbing, ken uray ti danum ket no maminsan problema pay.*" ("We really do not have computers and sometimes the classroom conditions are not good, even drinking water is sometimes a problem.")

School heads likewise highlighted the need for increased budget allocation and ready-made instructional materials to support implementation. As one school head noted, "*Kulang talaga ang budget at instructional materials kaya hirap ang full implementation ng ARAL.*" ("There is really a lack of budget and instructional materials, so full implementation of ARAL is difficult.")

These findings indicate that resource limitations continue to affect the quality and accessibility of intervention activities under the ARAL Program. The lack of sufficient materials and facilities may reduce learner engagement and limit teachers' ability to deliver effective instruction. This finding supports Republic Act No. 12028, which emphasizes the provision of accessible and learner-

appropriate intervention materials for struggling learners (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Likewise, Republic Act No. 9155 or the Governance of Basic Education Act highlights the responsibility of educational institutions and stakeholders in ensuring quality educational resources and supportive learning environments (Republic Act No. 9155, 2001). UNESCO (2021) also stressed that learning recovery initiatives require adequate instructional materials, infrastructure, and institutional support to become effective and sustainable.

Lack of Training and Human Resource Constraints

Teachers and school heads consistently identified inadequate training, insufficient ARAL tutors, and lack of professional support as major implementation concerns. Teachers expressed difficulty coping with intervention strategies for struggling learners due to limited training opportunities. As one teacher stated, "*Nahihirapan kami sa ARAL kasi kulang kami sa training kaya sariling diskarte na lang ang ginagamit namin sa pagtuturo.*" ("We are having difficulty with the ARAL Program because we lack training, so we just use our own strategies in teaching.")

School heads highlighted the shortage of ARAL tutors and the heavy workload of existing teaching personnel. One school head shared, "*Kulang talaga ang tutors kaya napupunta sa mga teachers ang dagdag na trabaho.*" ("There is really a shortage of tutors, so the additional workload is given to teachers.")

Parents also recognized that teachers had limited time to monitor learner progress because of multiple responsibilities. As one parent noted, "*Adu talaga dagiti trabaho dagiti mannursuro isu a saan da a dagus mabantayan ti panagdur-as dagiti ubbing.*" ("Teachers really have many responsibilities, which is why they are not able to immediately monitor the children's progress.")

This finding implies that the successful implementation of the ARAL Program depends heavily on adequate human resources and continuous capacity-building. Without sufficient training and dedicated personnel, intervention quality and learner monitoring may become inconsistent. This supports Republic Act No. 12028, which recognizes the importance of trained educational personnel and support systems in implementing academic recovery programs (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). The findings are also aligned with DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers, which highlights continuous professional development and instructional enhancement among educators (DepEd, 2020). Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) further explained that teacher training and professional



support significantly improve instructional effectiveness and learner outcomes in intervention programs

Learner Diversity, Motivation, and Engagement

Another recurring challenge identified by stakeholders involved learner-related difficulties such as varied reading levels, low learner interest, poor concentration, refusal to participate, and learner exhaustion. Teachers and school heads noted that some learners were difficult to motivate and struggled to maintain active participation during intervention sessions. As one teacher shared, *“May mga bata talaga na hindi interesado sa pagbabasa at madaling nawawalan ng focus sa ARAL sessions.”* (“There are really children who are not interested in reading and easily lose focus during ARAL sessions.”)

School heads also observed similar concerns regarding learner behavior and participation. One school head stated, *“May ilang learners na hirap talagang hikayatin na makisali at nawawalan agad ng gana sa reading activities.”* (“Some learners are really hard to encourage to participate and quickly lose interest in reading activities.”)

Parents likewise reported concentration problems and lack of interest among learners at home. As one parent mentioned, *“No adda iti balay, no dadduma saan a kayat ti ubing nga agbasa ken nalaka a mapukaw ti konsentrasyon.”* (“At home, sometimes the child does not want to read and easily loses focus.”)

These findings suggest that learner diversity and motivational issues significantly affect the effectiveness of the ARAL Program. Since struggling learners possess different literacy levels and learning needs, intervention sessions become more difficult to manage, especially in multigrade settings. This finding supports DepEd Order No. 012, s. 2020 on the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan, which emphasizes flexible and differentiated instructional approaches responsive to learner diversity and contextual realities (DepEd, 2020). Tomlinson (2017) also emphasized that differentiated instruction is necessary in addressing diverse learner needs and improving learner engagement. Therefore, schools implementing ARAL may require more learner-centered and differentiated intervention strategies to sustain learner motivation and participation.

Environmental and Logistical Challenges

Parents and school heads also identified logistical and environmental difficulties affecting implementation, including distance from school, unsuitable home learning environments, weather conditions, and the complexities of multigrade classroom settings. As one parent explained,

“No dadduma agaw-awan a rumwar ti ubing ta adayu ti balay mi ken narigat ti panagbiahe.” (“Sometimes the child goes home early because our house is far and transportation is difficult.”)

School heads emphasized that multigrade classes complicated learner monitoring and intervention delivery. One school head stated, *“Sa multigrade setting, mahirap talaga bantayan at sabay-sabay na matutukan ang lahat ng learners sa ARAL.”* (“In a multigrade setting, it is really difficult to monitor and simultaneously attend to all learners in ARAL.”)

These findings imply that contextual and environmental realities influence the accessibility and consistency of ARAL implementation, particularly in rural and geographically isolated schools. This finding aligns with Republic Act No. 12028, which recognizes the need for accessible and context-responsive learning recovery interventions (Republic Act No. 12028, 2024). Likewise, DepEd’s learning continuity and recovery policies emphasize flexible educational delivery systems responsive to local school conditions and learner realities (DepEd, 2023). Therefore, the findings suggest that contextualized implementation strategies and localized support systems are necessary to improve the effectiveness and inclusivity of the ARAL Program.

Conclusion

The study concludes that the ARAL Program was generally implemented to a high extent; however, its implementation was constrained by challenges such as limited parental and community involvement, inadequate teacher training and support, learner attendance issues during tutorial sessions, and insufficient instructional resources and monitoring practices.

Recommendations

1. The Department of Education, particularly the Division of Apayao, should strengthen policies and provide sustained support for the ARAL Program through enhanced training, adequate resources, and effective monitoring systems.
2. School heads should intensify supervision and coordination among stakeholders to ensure the consistent and effective implementation of ARAL interventions.
3. Teachers should engage in continuous professional development and apply varied reading intervention strategies to better address learners’ reading needs.



4. Parents should take an active role in supporting home-based reading activities and maintain regular communication with teachers regarding learner progress.

5. Parents, teachers and other stakeholders should strategize to encourage learners to consistently participate in ARAL sessions and actively engage in reading activities to improve their literacy skills and academic performance.

6. Future researchers should conduct further studies on the ARAL Program focusing on its long-term effects and other related variables affecting reading and ARAL Program implementation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- [2] Lubis AH. Improving elementary school students' reading skills using picture word cards: How is this possible? *J Indonesian Prim Sch*. 2024;1(2):9-18.
- [3] Hanemann U, Robinson C. Rethinking literacy from a lifelong learning perspective in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals and the International Conference on Adult Education. *Int Rev Educ*. 2022;68(2):233-58.
- [4] Mendoza RU, Santos KC, Garcia G. Understanding the factors behind (and boosting) basic and functional literacy rates in the Philippines. SSRN. 2025. Available from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5542738>
- [5] Manuel JP. No child left behind, literacy challenges ahead: A focus on the Philippines. *Front Educ*. 2024 Jan.
- [6] Regunda RO, Patiño EMS. Unveiling pedagogical hurdles: An exploration of teachers' struggles in nurturing reading proficiency among senior high school students of Toledo S. Pantilo Sr. Memorial National High School. 2025.
- [7] Department of Education (PH). DepEd Memorandum No. 064, s. 2025: Implementing guidelines for the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in Reading for Key Stages 1 to 3. Manila: Department of Education; 2025.
- [8] Lopez AC, Bauyot MM. Stakeholders' involvement in school-based programs: A case study. 2025.
- [9] Momo RF. Bridging gaps, building futures: ARAL's relevance and sustainability in the ASEAN framework. 2024.
- [10] Castillo JE. Interrelation of reading comprehension, fluency, and academic achievement among Grade 10 learners. *Educative J Ilmiah Pendidik*. 2025;3(3):149-57.
- [11] Dayag F. The Electronic Audio Reading Aid Lecture (E-ARAL): Intervention in developing reading comprehension and analysis of texts. *Int J Bus Law Educ*. 2022;3(2):96-9.
- [12] Panganiban GL, Hucalinas M, Madrigal DV. Reading motivation, reading habits, word recognition, and reading comprehension of Grade 5 pupils in public elementary schools. *Technium Soc Sci J*. 2025;75:106.
- [13] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311>
- [14] Jeynes, W. H. (2018). A practical model for school leaders to encourage parental involvement and parental engagement. *School Leadership & Management*, 38(2), 147-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2018.1434767>
- [15] Nickow, A., Oreopoulos, P., & Quan, V. (2020). The impressive effects of tutoring on PreK-12 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 27476*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w27476>