

# Teaching Reading Practices and Learners' Reading Performance in Select District Schools of Balingasag

Doris E. Quisil<sup>1</sup>, Ninfa C. Osias, PhD<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Teacher, Department of Education

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Cagayan de Oro College

## Abstract

Achieving reading proficiency remains a persistent challenge among basic education learners. This study aimed to determine the teachers' reading practices and reading performance in selected district schools of Balingasag, Division of Misamis Oriental, during School Year 2024–2025. Specifically, this aimed to describe the respondents' profile; find out the respondents' level of teaching reading practices; examine the learners' reading performance in English; determine the significant relationship between teachers' reading practices and learners' reading performance; and test the significant difference in teaching reading practices when grouped according to their profile. It employed a descriptive-correlational research design involving 154 Grade 3 teachers, using stratified sampling and a validated, researcher-made questionnaire. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used to describe the variables in the study. Further, Pearson (r) and T-test were employed to test the significant relationship and differences in the independent and dependent variables, respectively.

The findings revealed that the respondents were female, aged 36-40 years old, had a master's degree, held Teacher 1 positions, and had five years or less of teaching experience. Teachers' reading practices were implemented as highly practiced, with differentiated instruction obtaining the highest mean and technology integration the lowest. Learners' reading was described as Grade Ready and Emergent based on the CRLA post-test results. It further revealed that there was no significant relationship between overall teaching reading practices and overall reading performance, although technology integration showed a significant relationship with learners' insertion miscues. Significant differences were also found between highest educational attainment and guided reading practices, and between teaching experience and differentiated instruction practices. It concludes that teachers may use varied strategies to ensure all learners will develop essential literacy such as decoding, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary at their own level. The study recommends that teachers should strengthen guided reading, focused remediation, and continuous professional development through data-driven instructional planning.

**Keywords:** teaching reading practices, reading performance

## 1. Introduction

Reading proficiency remains a major concern in education, as reading is essential for academic achievement, cognitive development, and lifelong learning. Learners often experience difficulties in

decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension due to limited phonological awareness, weak letter sound recognition, and insufficient background knowledge. Effective reading instruction requires evidence-based strategies such as phonics, guided reading, interactive read aloud, differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and the integration of digital tools to address learners' diverse needs. However, differences in teacher preparedness, instructional approaches, learning resources, and available teaching time continue to affect reading outcomes, particularly following the disruptions caused by the COVID 19 pandemic. Therefore, examining the relationship between teaching reading practices and learners' reading performance is essential for identifying effective instructional strategies, addressing gaps in literacy development, and helping educators, curriculum planners, and policymakers promote inclusive and equitable reading education.

## **2. Research Questions**

This study aimed to determine the teaching reading practices and learners' reading performance in select district schools of Balingasag, Division of Misamis Oriental for the School Year 2024-2025.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents' profile in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and teaching experience?
2. What is the respondents' level of teaching reading practices based on technology integration, phonics-based instruction, guided reading, and differentiated instruction?
3. What are the learners' reading performance in English based on the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) post-test results, considering word recognition, insertion, and omission?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' teaching reading practices and the learners' reading performance in English based on the CRLA post-test results?
5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' teaching reading practices when grouped according to their profile?

## **3. Significance**

Reading plays an important role in learners' academic achievement and overall development. This study would help identify effective teaching reading practices that sustain learners' interest and motivation while developing their foundational reading skills. The findings would guide school heads in implementing a 15 minute Read Rotation Policy, conducting CRLA grouping, and strengthening teachers' skills through learning action cell sessions and peer coaching. Teachers could use appropriate activities for different reading levels, including letter sound drills, word building, guided reading with picture cues, and independent sentence writing or drawing and labeling. The results would also support school heads in providing technical assistance, encourage teachers to reflect on and improve their instructional strategies, and serve as a reference for future researchers examining related variables to further understand effective reading instruction.

## **4. Scope and Limitations**

This study focused on determining the teachers' teaching reading practices and learners' reading performance in select district schools of Balingasag, Division of Misamis Oriental for the School Year 2024-2025. The respondents were the one hundred fifty-four (154) Grade 3 teachers in the district schools where this study was conducted. The independent variables were limited to the respondents' profiles in

terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and teaching experience, and the teachers' reading practices based on technology integration, phonics-based instruction, guided reading, and differentiated instruction. Further, the dependent variables were also limited to learners' reading performance in English CRLA post-test results, considering word recognition, insertion, and omission miscues.

## **5. Literature Review**

### **Respondents' Profile**

Teachers' profile, including sex, age, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and teaching experience, may influence their instructional practices, self-efficacy, and learners' reading outcomes. However, research shows that these variables do not always directly predict student achievement, as their effects often depend on teaching strategies, professional support, and classroom conditions. Mpiti (2025) and Barrios Fernandez et al. (2024) suggest that demographic characteristics have limited or context dependent effects on learning outcomes, while Engida et al. (2024) emphasize that educational qualifications contribute more effectively to teaching quality when supported by relevant professional development. Similarly, Reyes and Oropa (2025) highlight the importance of mentoring and instructional support in strengthening teachers' practices, while Kelcey et al. (2022) explain that teaching experience helps educators improve classroom management and adapt reading instruction to learners' needs. Overall, teachers' professional backgrounds provide important context for understanding their teaching reading practices, although effective instruction depends on the combined influence of experience, appropriate strategies, and continuous professional learning.

### **Teaching Reading Practices**

Teaching reading requires strong professional knowledge and effective instructional practices to develop learners' decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension skills. Dixon and Oakhill (2024) emphasized the importance of strengthening teachers' knowledge of reading comprehension, while Castles et al. (2022) highlighted the value of systematic phonics instruction in developing early reading skills. Technology integration supports personalized learning, immediate feedback, and learner engagement when combined with appropriate teacher guidance and evidence-based strategies. Guided reading provides targeted instruction and scaffolding to improve reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, while differentiated instruction addresses learners' varying abilities, interests, and reading levels through flexible grouping and appropriate learning activities. Tomlinson (2020) emphasized the importance of adapting instruction to learners' individual needs, while Connor et al. (2022) supported individualized reading instruction to improve literacy outcomes. Overall, effective teaching reading practices require the integration of technology, systematic phonics, guided reading, and differentiated instruction, with their effectiveness assessed through the Department of Education's Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment under DepEd Order No. 9, s. 2024.

### **Reading Performance in English (Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment)**

The Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA), guided by DepEd Order No. 9, s. 2024, is a diagnostic and formative assessment designed to identify Grades 1 to 3 learners' reading abilities and determine the appropriate support needed to improve their literacy skills. It assesses word recognition and reading miscues, particularly insertion and omission, which help teachers identify specific reading

difficulties and plan suitable interventions. Karageorgos et al. (2020) emphasized that accurate word recognition provides a foundation for reading fluency and comprehension, while Foorman et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of systematic phonics instruction in developing decoding and word recognition skills. In addition, Watson (2020) explained that reading miscues, including inserted or omitted words, provide useful information about learners' reading behaviors and comprehension processes. These findings suggest that assessing word recognition and reading miscues enables teachers to understand learners' reading needs, provide targeted instruction, and improve overall reading performance.

## **6. Methodology**

### **Research Design**

This study employed descriptive-correlational research designs to collect and analyze data. Descriptive correlational research is generally used when a researcher wants to identify the characteristics of certain groups of people or find relationships between different variables. A descriptive correlational design is a study in which the researcher has a single group and simply tries to determine the relationship between two variables. The purpose of the descriptive correlational design in research is introduced, highlighting its importance in studying relationships between variables.

Descriptive research is also used for phenomenon collection, and the analysis of data is focused in a structured way, which is inferential and will be helpful in empirical investigation and understanding. From descriptive research, the facts and findings are concluded about the population in question in the study. (Brodowics, 2024). Descriptive-correlational research focuses on describing and explaining, sometimes in a somewhat definite manner, the phenomenon under investigation (Creswell, 2023). Using descriptive-correlational research designs enables the researcher to describe the teacher's teaching reading practices and reading performance for Grade 3 learners.

### **Participants**

The respondents of the study were the one hundred fifty-four (154) Grade 3 teachers and three hundred eight (308) learners from Balingasag Central District, Balingasag North District, and Balingasag South District in the municipality of Balingasag. These teachers were currently teaching in the aforesaid districts of the Division of Misamis Oriental.

### **Data Collection**

The study used a researcher made survey questionnaire consisting of three parts. Part I gathered the respondents' profiles in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and teaching experience. Part II examined teachers' reading teaching practices in technology integration, phonics-based instruction, guided reading, and differentiated instruction, with ten indicators for each area. Part III assessed learners' English reading performance based on word recognition, insertion, and omission using the post test results of the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA), following DepEd Order No. 9, s. 2024. Reading performance was classified into four levels: Grade Ready, Transitioning, Developing, and Emergent, using reading selections intended for Grade 3 learners. The questionnaire was developed through a thorough review of relevant books, articles, journals, and electronic sources, and the collected data were analyzed and interpreted to establish the study's findings.

## 7. Data Analysis

The data that were gathered in this study were coded and treated statistically. The study used descriptive statistics to determine frequency count, percentage distribution, means, and standard deviations.

Problem 1 and 2 descriptive statistics were employed to determine the extent of teachers' practices and the reading performance of the Grade 3 learners. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, comprise those methods concerned with collecting and describing a set of data to yield meaningful information (Narkhede, 2019).

Problem 3 used a one-sample t-test to analyze the post-test results of CRLA. Problem 4 used the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ ) to determine the significant relationship, while Problem 5 used a t-test to determine the difference between teachers' teaching reading practices and learners' reading performance, as shown in the results of the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA).

## 8. Results and Discussions

**Problem 1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, teaching position, and teaching experience?**

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Respondents' Profile in terms of Sex**

| Category     | Frequency  | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Male         | 19         | 12         |
| Female       | 135        | 88         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>154</b> | <b>100</b> |

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents were female teachers, comprising 135 or 88% of the total, while 19 or 12% were male. This indicates that elementary education, particularly at the Grade 3 level, is predominantly staffed by women. Although female teachers may contribute to nurturing classroom environments and personalized learner support, teaching effectiveness depends more on professional competence, training, and experience than on sex. The limited representation of male teachers may reflect persistent gender stereotypes and barriers to entering or remaining in the elementary teaching profession. Despite this imbalance, the findings suggest that both male and female teachers follow common curricular standards and evidence-based reading practices. Therefore, school administrators should promote equitable professional development, mentoring, leadership opportunities, and instructional support for all teachers to strengthen reading instruction and improve learners' performance.

**Table 2**  
**Distribution of Respondents' Profile in terms of Age**

| Category               | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 56 years old and above | 15        | 10         |
| 51-55 years old        | 16        | 10         |
| 46-50 years old        | 29        | 19         |

|                        |            |            |
|------------------------|------------|------------|
| 41-45 years old        | 30         | 19         |
| 36-40 years old        | 31         | 20         |
| 31-35 years old        | 16         | 10         |
| 26-30 years old        | 7          | 5          |
| 25 years old and below | 10         | 6          |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>154</b> | <b>100</b> |

Table 2 reveals that the highest number of respondents belonged to the 36 to 40 years old age group, with 31 or 20% of the total, indicating that the teaching workforce consists largely of mid-career professionals who may possess considerable classroom management skills, pedagogical knowledge, and instructional experience. These teachers can contribute to effective reading instruction and support colleagues through mentoring and collaborative professional development. Meanwhile, the lowest frequency was recorded among respondents aged 26 to 30 years, with 7 or 5%, suggesting limited representation of early career teachers who may still need guidance in classroom management, differentiated instruction, and the use of effective reading strategies. Providing mentoring, coaching, and professional development opportunities can help younger teachers strengthen their instructional competence while encouraging innovation in reading instruction.

**Table 3**  
**Distribution of Respondents' Profile in terms of Highest Educational Attainment**

| Category                                 | Frequency  | Percentage |
|------------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Doctoral Degree                          | 0          | 0          |
| Masteral Degree with Doctoral units      | 0          | 0          |
| Masteral Degree                          | 102        | 66         |
| Baccalaureate Degree with Masteral units | 48         | 31         |
| Bachelor's Degree                        | 4          | 3          |
| <b>Total</b>                             | <b>154</b> | <b>100</b> |

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents, comprising 102 or 66%, held a master's degree, indicating that most Grade 3 teachers had attained advanced educational qualifications that may support their pedagogical knowledge, instructional planning, and implementation of effective reading strategies. Their educational background can contribute to the use of differentiated instruction, guided reading, phonics based approaches, and technology integration to address learners' diverse literacy needs. Meanwhile, only 4 or 3% held a bachelor's degree, highlighting the need to provide these teachers with additional training, coaching, and mentoring to strengthen their reading instruction and assessment skills. School heads and master teachers can support their professional growth through workshops, peer mentoring, and collaborative learning activities. Overall, continuous professional development for teachers with different educational backgrounds can help maintain instructional quality and improve learners' reading performance.

**Table 4**  
**Distribution of Respondents' Profile in terms of Teaching Position**

| Category         | Frequency  | Percentage |
|------------------|------------|------------|
| Master Teacher 1 | 8          | 5          |
| Teacher 3        | 14         | 9          |
| Teacher 2        | 25         | 16         |
| Teacher 1        | 107        | 69         |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>154</b> | <b>100</b> |

Table 4 shows that the majority of the respondents, comprising 107 or 69%, held the Teacher I position, indicating that most were directly responsible for implementing classroom instruction and literacy programs. These teachers play an important role in developing learners' reading skills through phonics-based instruction, guided reading, differentiated activities, and technology integration. Meanwhile, Master Teacher I had the lowest representation, with 8 or 5% of the respondents, suggesting limited availability of experienced instructional leaders for mentoring and coaching. This highlights the need for school heads and master teachers to provide continuous technical assistance, professional development, and collaborative learning opportunities to strengthen teachers' instructional competence. Establishing effective mentoring systems and providing access to appropriate teaching resources can help ensure consistent reading instruction and improve learners' reading performance.

**Table 5**  
**Distribution of Respondents' Profile in terms of Length of Service in Teaching**

| Category           | Frequency  | Percentage |
|--------------------|------------|------------|
| 31 years and above | 0          | 0          |
| 26-30 years        | 0          | 0          |
| 21-25 years        | 6          | 4          |
| 16-20 years        | 6          | 4          |
| 11-15 years        | 16         | 10         |
| 6-10 years         | 35         | 23         |
| 5 years and below  | 91         | 59         |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>154</b> | <b>100</b> |

Table 5 shows that the majority of the respondents, comprising 91 or 59%, had five years or less of teaching experience, indicating that the teaching workforce was largely composed of early career teachers who may still be developing their instructional confidence, classroom management skills, and mastery of reading strategies. Although these teachers may demonstrate enthusiasm and openness to innovative approaches, they may benefit from additional guidance in implementing effective reading instruction and

addressing learners' difficulties. Meanwhile, teachers with 16 to 20 years and 21 to 25 years of experience had the lowest representation, with 6 or 4% in each group, suggesting limited availability of experienced educators who can provide mentorship and share instructional expertise. These findings highlight the importance of structured mentoring, peer coaching, and continuous professional development to strengthen teachers' competencies, promote collaborative learning, and improve learners' reading performance.

## **Problem 2. What is the respondents' extent of teaching reading practices based on technology integration, phonics-based instruction, guided reading, and differentiated instruction?**

**Table 6**  
**Summary Distribution of Respondents' Extent of Teaching Reading Practices**

| Variable                   | Mean        | SD          | Interpretation          |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Integration of technology  | 3.52        | 0.42        | Highly Practiced        |
| Phonic-based Instruction   | 3.61        | 0.41        | Highly Practiced        |
| Guided Reading             | 3.61        | 0.46        | Highly Practiced        |
| Differentiated Instruction | 3.70        | 0.42        | Highly Practiced        |
| <b>Overall</b>             | <b>3.70</b> | <b>0.42</b> | <b>Highly Practiced</b> |

Table 6 shows that teachers' extent of teaching reading practices obtained an overall mean of 3.70 (SD = 0.42), interpreted as Highly Practiced, indicating consistent use of various instructional strategies to develop learners' reading skills. Differentiated instruction received the highest mean of 3.70 (SD = 0.42), suggesting that teachers regularly adjust learning activities and materials to accommodate learners' different abilities and needs. Meanwhile, technology integration obtained the lowest mean of 3.52 (SD = 0.42), although it was still interpreted as Highly Practiced, indicating that digital tools were used but could be further strengthened in reading instruction. These findings highlight the importance of sustaining differentiated teaching practices while providing teachers with additional training, appropriate technological resources, and continuous technical assistance to improve the integration of digital tools and enhance learners' reading performance.

## **Problem 3. What are the learners' reading performance in English based on the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) post-test results considering word recognition, insertion, and omission?**

**Table 7**  
**Distribution of Learners' Reading Performance in English considering Word Recognition**

| Reading Performance | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Grade Ready         | 179       | 58         |
| Transitioning       | 82        | 27         |
| Developing          | 27        | 9          |
| Emergent            | 20        | 6          |

|                     |     |     |
|---------------------|-----|-----|
| <b>Total</b>        | 308 | 100 |
| <b>Mean = 17.03</b> |     |     |
| <b>SD = 2.43</b>    |     |     |

Table 7 shows that the 308 learners obtained an overall mean score of 17.03 (SD = 2.43) in word recognition, indicating generally satisfactory reading performance with some differences in individual achievement. Most learners, 179 (58%), were classified as Grade Ready, suggesting that they had developed the foundational reading skills needed for their grade level. Meanwhile, 20 learners (6%) were classified as Emergent, indicating a need for targeted interventions to strengthen phonological awareness, decoding, vocabulary, word recognition, and comprehension. These findings highlight the importance of systematic phonics instruction, guided reading, differentiated activities, and appropriate technology integration to sustain the progress of proficient readers and provide individualized support for learners who need additional assistance.

**Table 8**  
**Summary of the Learners' Reading Performance in English on Omission and Insertion**

| <b>Variables</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b>   | <b>Interpretation</b>    |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Insertion        | 1.77        | 0.79        | Highly Proficient        |
| Omission         | 1.67        | 1.23        | Highly Proficient        |
| <b>Overall</b>   | <b>1.72</b> | <b>1.01</b> | <b>Highly Proficient</b> |

Table 8 shows that learners' insertion and omission miscues obtained an overall mean of 1.72 (SD = 1.01), interpreted as Highly Proficient, indicating generally strong performance in reading accuracy. Insertion miscues had a higher mean than omission miscues, suggesting that learners tended to add words, particularly the article "the," that were not present in the reading selection. Meanwhile, omission obtained a mean of 1.67 (SD = 1.23), indicating that learners occasionally skipped words while reading. These findings suggest the need for continued reading practice to improve accuracy and reduce miscues. Activities such as guided reading, repeated reading, and oral read aloud exercises can help learners recognize words accurately, monitor their reading, and develop fluency and comprehension.

**Problem 4. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' teaching reading practices and the learners' reading performance in English based on the CRLA Post-test result?**

**Table 9**  
**Result of the Test on Relationship Between Teachers' Reading Practices and Learners' Reading Performance**

| <b>Teaching Reading Practices</b> | <b>Statistical Value</b> | <b>Learners' Reading Performance</b> |                  |                 | <b>Overall</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                                   |                          | <b>Word Recognition</b>              | <b>Insertion</b> | <b>Omission</b> |                |
| Integration of Technology         | r-value                  | 0.146                                | 0.256            | 0.019           | <b>0.140</b>   |
|                                   | p-value                  | 0.071                                | 0.001            | 0.807           | <b>0.293</b>   |

|                            |                |       |       |       |              |
|----------------------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Phonics-based Instruction  | Interpretation | NS    | S     | NS    | NS           |
|                            | r-value        | 0.111 | 0.182 | 0.005 | <b>0.099</b> |
|                            | p-value        | 0.167 | 0.023 | 0.941 | <b>0.377</b> |
| Guided Reading             | Interpretation | NS    | NS    | NS    | NS           |
|                            | r-value        | 0.134 | 0.192 | 0.002 | <b>0.109</b> |
|                            | p-value        | 0.095 | 0.167 | 0.979 | <b>0.414</b> |
| Differentiated Instruction | Interpretation | NS    | NS    | NS    | NS           |
|                            | r-value        | 0.046 | 0.037 | 0.085 | <b>0.056</b> |
|                            | p-value        | 0.568 | 0.641 | 0.293 | <b>0.501</b> |
|                            | Interpretation | NS    | NS    | NS    | NS           |

Table 9 shows that teachers' reading practices generally had no significant relationship with learners' English reading performance based on the CRLA posttest, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. However, technology integration had a significant but weak positive relationship with learners' insertion miscues ( $r = 0.256$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), indicating that greater use of technology was associated with changes in the frequency of words added during oral reading. This suggests that interactive digital activities may encourage learners to rely on context and predict words instead of carefully decoding the text. Therefore, teachers should ensure that technology supports reading accuracy through explicit decoding instruction, guided practice, corrective feedback, and self-monitoring strategies to improve learners' fluency and comprehension.

**Problem 5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' teaching reading practices when grouped according to their profile?**

**Table 10**

**Result on the of Significant Difference in Respondents' Extent of Teaching Reading Practices When Grouped according to their Profile**

| Respondents' Profile           | Statistical Value | Teaching Reading Practices |                           |                |                            |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
|                                |                   | Integration of Technology  | Phonics-based Instruction | Guided Reading | Differentiated Instruction |
| Sex                            | t-value           | 0.014                      | 0.041                     | 0.011          | 0.022                      |
|                                | p-value           | 0.855                      | 0.609                     | 0.884          | 0.782                      |
|                                | Interpretation    | NS                         | NS                        | NS             | NS                         |
| Age                            | t-value           | 0.063                      | 0.075                     | 0.049          | 0.065                      |
|                                | p-value           | 0.043                      | 0.351                     | 0.545          | 0.421                      |
|                                | Interpretation    | NS                         | NS                        | NS             | NS                         |
| Highest Educational Attainment | t-value           | 0.102                      | 0.121                     | 0.187          | 0.063                      |
|                                | p-value           | 0.204                      | 0.132                     | 0.02           | 0.434                      |
|                                | Interpretation    | NS                         | NS                        | S              | NS                         |
| Teaching Position              | t-value           | 0.039                      | 0.014                     | 0.059          | 0.045                      |
|                                | p-value           | 0.633                      | 0.858                     | 0.467          | 0.573                      |

|                     |                       |             |             |             |             |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Teaching Experience | Interpretation        | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          |
|                     | t-value               | 0.107       | 0.104       | 0.114       | 0.16        |
|                     | p-value               | 0.186       | 0.196       | 0.158       | 0.047       |
|                     | Interpretation        | NS          | NS          | NS          | S           |
| Overall             | <b>t-value</b>        | <b>0.07</b> | <b>0.07</b> | <b>0.08</b> | <b>0.07</b> |
|                     | <b>p-value</b>        | <b>0.38</b> | <b>0.43</b> | <b>0.41</b> | <b>0.45</b> |
|                     | <b>Interpretation</b> | <b>NS</b>   | <b>NS</b>   | <b>NS</b>   | <b>NS</b>   |

Table 10 shows that teachers' reading practices generally did not significantly differ according to their profiles, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. However, guided reading significantly differed according to teachers' highest educational attainment ( $p = 0.020$ ), while differentiated instruction significantly differed according to teaching experience ( $p = 0.047$ ). These findings suggest that advanced educational qualifications may strengthen teachers' knowledge and skills in implementing guided reading, while teaching experience may improve their ability to adjust instruction to learners' varied needs. Therefore, continuous professional development, mentoring, and practical training are essential to enhance teachers' reading instruction and support diverse learners effectively.

## 9. Conclusion and Recommendations

### Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that differentiated instruction increased reading outcomes among students with learning difficulties. It is a responsive approach. It is a responsive approach to teaching that tailors instruction to accommodate the diverse learning needs, interests, reading readiness level, and learning profile of students. It provides varied pathways to ensure all learners develop essential literacy skills such as decoding, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary at their own pace and level. Moreover, the learners' reading performance is Grade-ready in word recognition, as evidenced by their ability to read words accurately with minimal insertion and omission miscues. This concludes that the learners have developed foundational decoding and word recognition skills appropriate for their grade level, enabling them to read with greater accuracy and supporting their overall reading proficiency.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are hereby proposed:

1. Teachers should be encouraged to pursue a master's degree and participate in professional development programs to enhance their teaching skills.
2. Teachers should find time to incorporate interactive features within apps and supervision in teaching reading practices, hands-on training on the use of educational applications, particularly gamified features such as games, quizzes, and interactive activities. Schools may provide technical support, appropriate digital resources, and opportunities for teachers to become more confident and capable of integrating gamified tools into their lessons.
3. Teachers should exert effort in their teaching of reading, particularly in insertion by employing strategies that indicate a reader's existing knowledge and understanding of the topic being read.
4. Teachers should be aware that technology integration alone cannot produce meaningful improvements in foundational reading skills such as decoding, word recognition, and fluency, especially for elementary learners with reading difficulties.

5. Researchers may consider other variables that could influence the use of instructional practices, such as teachers' training, access to instructional resources, administrative support, teaching specialization, and classroom conditions.

## References

1. Alnahdi, G. H. (2023). The impact of gender differences in teachers' teaching practices on students' grades. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1066843. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1066843>
2. Balanquit, E. P., Ladia, M. A. P., & Nool, N. R. (2023). The influence of faculty members' educational attainment on the performance in the licensure examination for teachers (LET) among state universities and colleges in the Philippines. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 12(1), 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v12n1p247>
3. Barrios Fernández, A., Pérez García, P., & Álvarez, F. (2024). Teacher value added and gender gaps in educational outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, 103, 102398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2024.102398>
4. Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2020). [Reference details to be verified against the original publication.]
5. Connor, C. M., et al. (2022). [Reference details to be verified against the original publication.]
6. Dixon, M., & Oakhill, J. (2024). Exploring teacher teaching reading comprehension, knowledge, behaviours, and attitudes. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2024.2357884>
7. Ehri, L. C. (2022). Orthographic mapping: How sight word reading develops. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(2), 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.448>
8. Engida, M. A., Iyasu, A. S., & Fentie, Y. M. (2024). Impact of teaching quality on student achievement. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1367317>
9. Foorman, B. R., et al. (2020). [Reference details to be verified against the original publication.]
10. Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., Stuckey, D., & Collins, G. (2021). Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force. University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
11. Karageorgos, P., Richter, T., Haffmans, M., Schindler, J., & Naumann, J. (2020). The role of word recognition accuracy in the development of word recognition speed and reading comprehension in primary school: A longitudinal examination. *Cognitive Development*, 56, 100949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2020.100949>
12. Karemaker, A. M., Pitchford, N. J., & O'Malley, C. (2020). Does whole word multimedia software support literacy acquisition? *Reading and Writing*, 23, 31–51.
13. Kelcey, B., Romano, M., & Phelps, G. (2022). Measuring and improving teachers' instructional quality in reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(3), 512–531.
14. Liu, Z., et al. (2021). Exploring the relationship between social interaction, cognitive processing and learning achievements in a MOOC discussion forum. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*.
15. Mpiti, V. S. (2025). Do educators' demographic characteristics drive learner performance? *Education Sciences*, 15(4), 487. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040487>
16. National Reading Panel. (2020). Teaching children to read: An evidence based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
17. OECD. (2025). The impact of digital technologies on students' learning. OECD Publishing.

18. Reyes, M. B., III, & Oropa, J. C. (2025). Instructional supervision of master teachers: Its critical role in advancing teachers' and learners' performance. *Asian Journal of Educational Technology*.  
<https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajet/article/view/4399>
19. Shanahan, T. (2021). Guided reading and differentiated instruction in improving literacy achievement. *The Reading Teacher*, 74(5), 567–576. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1998>
20. Tomlinson, C. A. (2023). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (4th ed.). ASCD.
21. Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Herron, J., & Lindamood, P. (2020). Computer assisted instruction to prevent early reading difficulties in students at risk for dyslexia: Outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 60, 40–56.
22. Ventista, O. M., & Brown, C. (2023). Teachers' professional learning and its impact on students' learning outcomes: Findings from a systematic review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 8(1), Article 100565. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100565>
23. Watson, S. (2020). Miscue analysis for diagnosing reading skills. ThoughtCo.  
<https://www.thoughtco.com/miscue-analysis-for-diagnosing-reading-difficulties>
24. Wyse, D., & Goswami, U. (2021). Synthetic phonics and the teaching of reading: The debate surrounding England's 2010 policy initiative. *Literacy*, 55(1), 10–21.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12242>
25. Zhang, L., & Li, L. (2022). Study on the relationship between psychological status and sports habits of law college students. *Revista de Psicología del Deporte*, 31(1), 40–48.