

Project REREAD: It's Impact on the Reading Fluency of Grade 2 Learners with Specific Learning Disabilities

Judith B. Monteveros

Agusan Colleges Inc. M.H. Del Pilar St. Butuan City, Caraga. Philippines
Department of Education, Butuan City Division, Caraga, Philippines

Grace T. Flores, EdD

College of Education, Caraga State University, Butuan City, Caraga, Philippines
gtflores@carsu.edu.ph

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.15.05.2025.p16125
<https://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.15.05.2025.p16125>

Paper Received Date: 16th March 2025

Paper Acceptance Date: 22nd April 2025

Paper Publication Date: 26th May 2025

Abstract

This study investigated the effectiveness of Project REREAD, a repeated reading intervention, on improving the reading fluency of Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities (SLD). Participants were selected from Butuan Central Elementary School and referred to the Butuan City Special Education Center. Employing a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design. Findings reveal that both the control and intervention groups exhibited low reading fluency. However, following the intervention, the intervention group showed marked improvements in fluency, accuracy, and error reduction, while the control group made minimal progress. Statistical analysis confirmed a significant difference in performance before and after the intervention for the intervention group. The study recommends implementing an Enhanced Reading Fluency Program (ERFP) that includes peer-assisted reading, multisensory phonemic awareness training, individualized interventions, and parental engagement strategies to sustain these gains. The study concludes that repeated reading interventions like Project REREAD can effectively enhance reading fluency for Grade 2 learners with SLD.

Index Terms: Reading fluency, repeated reading intervention, specific learning disability (SLD)

I. INTRODUCTION

Project REREAD is a targeted intervention designed to improve reading fluency, particularly for Grade 2 learners with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). It involves repeated reading of texts within a set timeframe or until a performance goal is met, focusing on reading speed and accuracy (Padeliadu, 2021). This method addresses the challenges commonly faced by learners with SLD, fostering confidence and automaticity in word recognition. The significance of such interventions aligns with the 2022 PISA findings, which emphasize the importance of reading fluency. The PISA 2022 results revealed global trends in education, particularly in mathematics, reading, and science. Singapore led in mathematics, followed by Macao (China), Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong (China), Japan, and Korea (OECD, 2023). Despite a general decline in performance, countries like Japan and Korea maintained or improved learning outcomes and educational equity. The report also highlighted an achievement gap—socio-economically disadvantaged students were seven times more likely to lack basic math skills. Additionally, boys outperformed girls in math, while girls excelled in reading.

In the Philippines, PISA 2022 results highlighted significant gaps. Filipino students scored below the OECD average in all three domains. In mathematics, the average score was 355 compared to the OECD average of 472, with only 16% reaching at least Level 2 proficiency versus 69% in OECD countries (OECD, 2023). A notable disparity between public and private school performance was also evident, underscoring the need for focused educational reforms.

Despite the prevalence of reading difficulties among students with SLD, there remains a limited understanding of effective interventions to enhance reading fluency (Hudson et al., 2020). The lack of longitudinal studies further limits insights into the lasting impact of such interventions (Marks et al., 2022). This highlights the need for continued research into evidence-based practices tailored to the needs of learners with SLD. Locally, studies focusing on repeated reading interventions for Grade 2 learners with SLD are scarce (Dela Cruz, 2019). This developmental stage is crucial for literacy acquisition, yet research remains limited. Moreover, there is a lack of localized evidence on the effectiveness of repeated reading in the Philippine context (Reyes, 2020), making it difficult to design culturally and

linguistically relevant instructional approaches. These research gaps underscore the importance of initiatives like Project REREAD, which aims to generate contextually appropriate strategies for improving reading fluency among Filipino learners with SLD.

Legal frameworks include the 1987 Constitution, Republic Act No. 7277 (Magna Carta for Disabled Persons), and DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019, upholding the right to inclusive and quality education. These policies mandate differentiated instruction and appropriate support services for learners with disabilities. Project REREAD supports these mandates by evaluating an evidence-based intervention to improve reading fluency among Grade 2 learners with SLD.

This study was motivated by the increasing number of Grade 2 learners from Butuan Central Elementary School referred to the Butuan City Special Education Center for remedial reading. Since 2013, referrals for SLD have increased by 50%. One school year, 86% (30 out of 35) of referred learners struggled with alphabet sound recognition and word reading, often confusing short and long vowel sounds. Despite five months of remediation, they showed minimal progress, scoring an average of 25% on third-quarter summative tests. These persistent struggles and a lack of locally relevant research underscored the urgent need for effective interventions like Project REREAD.

This study aimed to inform the development of instructional strategies tailored to learners with SLD by assessing the impact of repeated reading on reading fluency. Enhanced fluency supports academic achievement and builds self-esteem and a positive attitude toward reading. The findings aim to guide policy, support inclusive practices, and allocate resources effectively. Ultimately, Project REREAD seeks to empower learners with SLD to overcome reading difficulties and reach their full potential.

This study evaluated the effectiveness of Project REREAD in improving the reading fluency of Grade 2 learners with SLD at Butuan Central Elementary School, referred to as the Butuan City Special Education Center, for Academic Year 2024–2025. Specifically, it addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the reading fluency level of Grade 2 learners before exposure to Project REREAD?
2. What is the reading fluency level of Grade 2 learners after exposure to Project REREAD?
3. Is there a significant difference in the reading fluency levels before and after the intervention?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative, quasi-experimental design, where participants were divided into an intervention group that received the Repeated Reading Intervention (RRI) and a control group that received standard instruction. A pretest-posttest approach was used to measure reading fluency before and after the intervention, allowing for comparing results to determine its impact. The study was conducted at Butuan City Special Education Center, involving learners from Butuan Central Elementary School in Butuan City, Philippines. These schools catered to diverse learners, including those with SLD, though they faced challenges in providing adequate support due to limited resources and a lack of specialized teacher training. The research focused on Grade 2 learners with formally assessed SLD, such as dyslexia, dysgraphia, and dyscalculia, all exhibiting reading accuracy, speed, and prosody difficulties. A total of 30 participants were selected through purposive sampling, equally divided into two class sections (15 from Section Lilac and 15 from Section Lotus), ensuring that the sample was directly relevant to the study's objectives. The study utilized a validated and contextualized reading instrument designed for Grade 2 learners with SLD to measure reading fluency.

The test was administered as a pretest and posttest to track improvements after exposure to the intervention. Validity was ensured through standardized fluency assessments, while reliability was maintained through trained scorers and consistent administration procedures. Data collection followed a structured process. In Phase 1, the researcher obtained necessary approvals and parental consent, ensuring ethical considerations were met. Phase 2 involved administering the pretest to establish baseline reading fluency. Phase 3 focused on implementing "PROJECT REREAD" through structured intervention sessions tailored to participants' needs. In Phase 4, a posttest was conducted to assess any improvements. Finally, Phase 5 involved data analysis, where pretest and posttest scores were compared to determine the intervention's effectiveness. Data were scored and quantified using standardized fluency rubrics, measuring reading rate, accuracy, and prosody. Statistical analysis included the Mean Percentage Score (MPS) to assess overall fluency and the paired t-test to compare pretest and posttest results, determining if there were significant improvements. Additionally, qualitative observations provided further insights into the intervention's effectiveness.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results and discussions, and the interpretation of the data gathered in the study.

Level of Reading Fluency of the Learners Before and After Project Reread

Table 1. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Words Correct per Minute

Pretest	Posttest
---------	----------

Score Ranges	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Descriptive Rating
0-24	15	15	30	7	2	9	Measurable Progress
25-49	0	0	0	7	8	15	Gradual Progress
50-74	0	0	0	1	5	6	Steady Progress
75-79	0	0	0	0	0	0	Encouraging Progress
80-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	Persistent Progress
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 1 presents the Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of words correct per minute. Words correct per minute (WCPM) is a measure of reading fluency that assesses both speed and accuracy. It gives a more complete picture of a reader's proficiency because it subtracts points for incorrect words. The table is divided into two main sections: Pretest and Posttest, with scores ranging from 0-24, 25-49, 50-74, 75-79, and 80-100. Each score range is associated with a descriptive rating, such as Measurable Progress, Gradual Progress, Steady Progress, Encouraging Progress, and Persistent Progress.

In the Pretest, both the Control Group and Intervention Group have 15 learners each scoring between 0-24 words correct per minute, totaling 30 learners. No learners from either group scored in the higher ranges indicating that both groups of learners have similar reading abilities. In the post-test, the Control Group shows improvement with 7 learners scoring between 0-24 words correct per minute, 7 learners scoring between 25-49, 1 learner scoring between 50-74, and no learners scoring in the higher ranges. The Intervention Group shows 2 learners scoring between 0-24 words correct per minute, 8 learners scoring between 25-49, 5 learners scoring between 50-74, and no learners scoring in the higher ranges.

The ratings indicate the level of progress made by the learners. The Control Group shows a shift from Measurable Progress to Gradual and Steady Progress, while the Intervention Group shows a shift from Measurable Progress to Gradual and Steady Progress as well. Data suggest that both groups made progress in reading fluency, with the Intervention Group showing a slightly higher number of learners achieving Gradual and Steady Progress compared to the Control Group. A higher WCPM score indicates better reading fluency. This indicates that the intervention may have had a positive impact on the reading fluency of Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities.

The findings align with the principles of observational learning in Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 2019), which suggests that learners acquire knowledge and skills by observing fluent reading models and practicing repeatedly. Reyes (2020) emphasizes that repeated reading enhances fluency by reinforcing word recognition and automaticity, which explains the increase in learners progressing to higher fluency levels. Additionally, Baker et al. (2020) assert that repeated reading interventions contribute to measurable improvements in word recognition and reading accuracy among students with learning difficulties.

Table 2. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Accuracy Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
0-39	15	15	30	0	0	0	Very Poor
40-54	0	0	0	5	0	5	Poor
55-69	0	0	0	4	0	4	Fair
70-84	0	0	0	6	2	8	Good
85-100	0	0	0	0	13	13	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 2 reveals the Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Accuracy Rate. It refers to the percentage of words read correctly by the learners. The table categorizes learners into five score ranges: 0-39, 40-54, 55-69, 70-84, and 85-100, with descriptive ratings of Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent, respectively. It compares the Pretest and Posttest results of the Control Group and Intervention Group.

During the Pretest, both the Control Group and the Intervention Group had 15 learners each falling into the 0-39 accuracy rate range, totaling 30 learners. No learners from either group scored in the higher ranges of 40-100. This means that at the beginning of the study (during the Pretest), all 30 learners in both the Control and Intervention groups demonstrated very poor reading fluency, as indicated by their accuracy rates falling within the 0-39 range. None of the learners exhibited even Poor, Fair, Good, or Excellent reading fluency at the start. In the post-test, significant improvement is observed. The Control Group now has 5 learners scoring between 40-

54, 4 learners in the 55-69 range, 6 learners in the 70-84 range, and none reaching 85-100. Meanwhile, the Intervention Group shows a stronger upward trend, with 2 learners scoring between 70-84 and 13 learners reaching the highest accuracy rate range of 85-100. The ratings indicate a stark contrast between the Pretest and Posttest results. Initially, all learners were categorized as Very Poor. By the post-test, the Control Group demonstrated progress with learners reaching Poor, Fair, and Good levels. The Intervention Group showed the most notable improvement, with most learners achieving an Excellent rating.

The data suggests that the intervention had a substantial positive impact on the reading fluency of Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. The Intervention Group exhibited a remarkable shift from Very Poor to Excellent accuracy rates, highlighting the effectiveness of PROJECT REREAD in enhancing reading fluency. The shift from "Very Poor" to "Good" and "Excellent" accuracy rates supports the notion that fluency practice enhances word recognition and decoding abilities. This outcome is consistent with Gough's Fitted Word Recognition theory (1972), which highlights how repeated exposure to text improves recognition and speed. McGill & Busse (2016) further assert that tailored reading interventions focusing on individual learning needs significantly improve reading performance. This is echoed by Garcia (2019), who demonstrated that structured fluency interventions significantly reduced reading errors and improved accuracy.

Table 3. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Self-Correction Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
0-39	15	15	30	15	6	21	Very Poor
40-54	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor
55-69	0	0	0	0	0	0	Fair
70-84	0	0	0	0	0	0	Good
85-100	0	0	0	0	9	9	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 3 discusses the Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Self-Correction Rate. Self-correction rate indicates the frequency with which learners successfully correct their own reading errors. The table categorizes learners into five score ranges: 0-39, 40-54, 55-69, 70-84, and 85-100, with corresponding descriptive ratings of Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent.

In the Pretest, both the Control Group and the Intervention Group had 15 learners each falling into the 0-39 self-correction rate range, totaling 30 learners. No learners from either group scored in the higher ranges of 40-100. This indicates that before the intervention, the reading fluency of *all* 30 learners was quite low. The self-correction rate, as measured by the test, was in the lowest range for every participant. This suggests a significant need for improvement in reading fluency across the entire sample. The fact that both groups performed similarly at the pretest suggests that the groups were comparable before the intervention began. The result indicates that before any intervention, all 30 learners demonstrated poor reading fluency, as measured by their self-correction rate. Their performance was at the lowest level (0-39) before the intervention. In the Posttest, improvements are evident. The Control Group still has 15 learners in the Very Poor category, while the Intervention Group shows noticeable progress with only 6 learners remaining in the 0-39 range. Additionally, 9 learners in the Intervention Group have moved to the highest accuracy range of 85-100, achieving an Excellent rating.

The ratings indicate that while the Control Group did not demonstrate a shift, the Intervention Group showed significant improvement. The intervention resulted in a remarkable shift from Very Poor to Excellent self-correction rates for a notable portion of the learners. The data suggests that the intervention had a strong positive impact on the self-correction ability of Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. The intervention facilitated improved self-monitoring and accuracy, reinforcing the benefits of rereading strategies in enhancing reading fluency.

The significant improvement in self-correction rates in the intervention group is explained by Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 2011), which emphasizes that repeated exposure to reading materials allows learners to process text efficiently with reduced cognitive burden. Kim et al. (2019) indicate that self-monitoring through repeated reading enables learners to refine word recognition strategies and become more aware of their errors, leading to improved self-correction behaviors.

Table 4. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Substitution Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
13-15	0	2	2	0	0	0	Very Poor
10-12	1	1	2	0	0	0	Poor
7-9	2	4	6	0	0	0	Fair

4-6	5	5	10	4	0	4	Good
0-3	7	3	10	11	15	26	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 4 posits the Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Substitution Rate. Substitution rate refers to the number of times the pupil substituted one word for another. It is when the pupils say a word that is different from the word printed on the page. It is computed by dividing the number of substitutes over the total number of words times 100. The table is divided into score ranges of 13-15, 10-12, 7-9, 4-6, and 0-3, with corresponding descriptive ratings of Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent. It compares the Pretest and Posttest results of both the Control Group and the Intervention Group.

The Pretest showed a relatively even distribution across score ranges, with a slight skew towards the lower scores (0-3 and 4-6). The intervention group had a slightly higher frequency of higher scores (7-9 and 10-12) than the control group. The posttest results show a marked difference compared to the pretest. The intervention group shows a 4-step, slightly significant increase in the "Excellent" range (0-3), while the control group distributes scores in other ranges. This suggests the intervention may have had a positive effect.

The ratings indicate that the Intervention Group had more learners falling into lower substitution rate categories compared to the Control Group, reducing substitution errors in the intervention group. The intervention group's posttest distribution shows a marked shift toward "Excellent" ratings compared to its pretest distribution, suggesting the intervention may have been effective. This significant improvement in the intervention group is noteworthy. The minimal change in substitution rates suggests that fluency interventions have limitations in addressing word substitution behaviors. Hudson et al. (2020) highlight that fluency gains do not necessarily translate into improved substitution rates unless specific decoding interventions are incorporated. Schmitz (2021) emphasizes that while repeated reading strengthens fluency, additional phonemic awareness training is required to reduce substitution errors.

Table 5. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Omission Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
36-44	5	2	7	0	0	0	Very Poor
27-35	2	5	7	0	0	0	Poor
18-26	6	5	11	6	0	0	Fair
9-17	2	3	5	3	0	3	Good
0-8	0	0	0	6	15	21	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 5 raises the reading fluency of learners in terms of omission rate, categorizing their performance within specific score ranges. Omission rate refers to the percentage of words a reader skips or leaves out while reading aloud. It is computed by dividing the number of omitted words by the total number of words in the passage, times 100. These scores are further classified into descriptive ratings, including Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent. The table compares Pretest and Posttest results for both the Control and Intervention Groups, illustrating changes in omission frequency before and after the intervention. Before the intervention, both groups had all learners scoring across all categories except within the 0-8. However, in the Posttest, the distribution shifted significantly, particularly within the Control Group, where learners were spread, from Fair to Excellent. Specifically, 6 learners in the Control Group moved into the 36-44 range, categorized as Excellent, 3 learners shifted to the 9-17 range, labeled as Good, and 6 learners remained in the Fair Category, labeled as Fair.

Meanwhile, in the Intervention Group, the results show a different trend. The other ranges from Very Poor to Good have gone down to 0 subsequently. Only the 0-8 range was occupied by 15 learners labeled as Excellent. The data suggest that the intervention group altered omission rates among Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. While both groups exhibited a shift away from the Excellent rating seen in the Pretest, the intervention group demonstrated a more varied improvement pattern. This implies that rereading strategies have influence omission rates greatly based on the results of the intervention group.

The improvement in omission rates aligns with Reciprocal Determinism theory of (Bandura, 1986), where behavioral patterns are influenced by personal and environmental factors, this also supported by the study of Mucherah et al. (2020) found that repeated reading enhances word recognition and reducing omissions. However, Cruz (2019) indicates that omission errors may persist in learners with severe reading difficulties despite fluency interventions.

Table 6. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Insertion Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
13-15	6	0	6	0	0	0	Very Poor
10-12	2	0	2	1	0	1	Poor
7-9	2	0	2	2	0	2	Fair
4-6	0	0	0	2	0	2	Good
0-3	5	15	20	10	15	25	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 6 illustrates the reading fluency of learners in terms of insertion rate. Insertion rate refers to the percentage of words a reader adds to the text that weren't originally there. It's another important metric for evaluating reading fluency because it shows how well a reader can follow the text and avoid adding their own words. It is being computed by dividing the number of inserted words over the total number of words in the passage times 100. Their performance was categorized into five distinct score ranges: 13-15, 10-12, 7-9, 4-6, and 0-3. These ranges correspond to descriptive ratings from Very Poor to Excellent. The table compares the Pretest and post-test results of both the Control and Intervention Groups, allowing for an analysis of how the insertion rate changed over time.

Before the intervention, the Control Group had 6 learners categorized as Very Poor in the 13-15 range, while none of the Intervention Group learners fell into this category. The remaining learners in both groups were spread across lower insertion rate ranges, with 5 learners in the Control Group and all 15 learners in the Intervention Group achieving an Excellent rating (0-3 range).

After the intervention, a shift in distribution is noticeable. The Control Group shows improvement, with fewer learners in the Very Poor category and an increase in those classified as Excellent, moving from 5 to 10 learners. Similarly, the Intervention Group maintains its strong performance, with all learners still in the Excellent category. The data suggests that the intervention had a positive influence on the insertion rate among Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. The increase in learners achieving an Excellent rating, particularly in the Control Group, indicates that rereading strategies may reinforce accuracy in insertion and lead to improved fluency. However, further assessment may be required to determine the long-term retention of these improvements. The intervention's positive influence on insertion rate can be attributed to enhanced word familiarity and automaticity, as suggested by Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 2011). Alvermann et al. (2019) assert that repeated exposure reduces the tendency to insert unnecessary words by improving focus and comprehension. Santos (2019) observed that fluency interventions emphasizing guided practice mitigate insertion errors, reinforcing the improvements seen in learners who participated in PROJECT REREAD.

Table 7. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Mispronunciation Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
13-15	6	2	8	0	0	0	Very Poor
10-12	2	0	2	1	0	1	Poor
7-9	2	5	7	2	0	2	Fair
4-6	0	3	3	2	0	2	Good
0-3	5	5	10	10	15	25	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 7 presents the reading fluency of learners in terms of mispronunciation rate. The mispronunciation rate refers to the percentage of words a reader pronounces incorrectly while reading aloud. It's a key metric for assessing reading fluency because it reveals the reader's ability to decode words accurately. It is being measured by dividing the number of mispronounced words over the total number of words in the Passage times 100. Their performance was categorized within specific score ranges. These scores are further classified into descriptive ratings: Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent. The table compares Pretest and Posttest results for both the Control and Intervention Groups, highlighting changes in mispronunciation frequency before and after the intervention.

In the Pretest, the Control Group had 6 learners in the 13-15 range, categorized as Very Poor, while the Intervention Group had only 2 learners in this category. In the lower mispronunciation rate ranges, the distribution varied across both groups, with the highest concentration of learners in the 0-3 range, classified as Excellent. The Control Group had 5 learners in this category, while the Intervention Group had 5 learners as well. After the intervention, the Control Group showed improvement, with all learners moving out of the Very Poor category and increasing their presence in the Excellent category, rising from 5 to 10 learners. Similarly, the Intervention Group demonstrated significant progress, with all 15 learners achieving an Excellent rating.

The data suggests that the intervention had a strong positive impact on mispronunciation rates among Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. The increase in learners attaining an Excellent rating, particularly in the Intervention Group, highlights the effectiveness of rereading strategies in enhancing pronunciation accuracy and fluency. This suggests that structured interventions in fluency practice can lead to significant improvements in articulation and word recognition. The sharp reduction in mispronunciations among the intervention group underscores the efficacy of repeated reading in improving pronunciation accuracy. Reyes (2020) posits that fluency practice allows learners to internalize correct word pronunciation patterns over time. Garcia et al. (2020) found that structured repeated reading interventions led to significant improvements in articulation and prosody, supporting the project's effectiveness. This outcome aligns with Social Cognitive Theory's emphasis on learning through observation and repetition (Bandura, 1986).

Table 8. Reading Fluency of the Learners in terms of Error Rate

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
80.01-1	4	7	11	0	0	0	Very Poor
60.01-8	11	8	19	0	0	0	Poor
40.01-6	0	0	0	7	0	7	Fair
20.01-4	0	0	0	5	0	5	Good
0-20.0	0	0	0	3	15	18	Excellent
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 8 shows the distribution of learners in the control and intervention groups across different score ranges, representing their reading fluency in terms of error rate, both before (pretest) and after (posttest) the intervention. The error rate is a comprehensive measure that combines all types of reading errors into one percentage. It includes the substitution, omissions, insertions and mispronunciation rates. It is being computed by dividing the total number of errors over the total number of words in the Passage times 100.

During the pretest, the control group exhibited a wider range of error rates, with 4 learners scoring in the "Very Poor" range (80.01-100) and 11 learners scoring in the "Poor" range (60.01-80). Comparatively, the intervention group also showed significant challenges in reading fluency, with 7 learners in the "Very Poor" range and 8 in the "Poor" range. Neither group had learners in the "Fair," "Good," or "Excellent" categories at the pretest stage, indicating a generally low level of reading fluency across both groups before the intervention.

The posttest results, however, reveal a dramatic shift, particularly in the intervention group. The control group showed no improvement, maintaining the same distribution with 7 learners in the "Fair" range, 5 in the "Good" range, and 3 in the "Excellent" range. This suggests that without the intervention, learners' reading fluency did not improve. In stark contrast, the intervention group demonstrated significant progress. All 15 learners in the intervention group achieved scores in the "Excellent" range (0-20.0), indicating a substantial reduction in error rates and a marked improvement in reading fluency.

The data provide compelling evidence for the effectiveness of "PROJECT REREAD" in enhancing the reading fluency of Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. The pretest results highlight the significant challenges faced by both control and intervention groups, with most learners exhibiting "Very Poor" or "Poor" reading fluency. However, the posttest results clearly demonstrate the positive impact of the intervention. While the control group shows no improvement, the intervention group achieved remarkable progress, with all learners reaching the "Excellent" reading fluency category. This implies that "PROJECT REREAD" provides targeted and effective strategies that significantly reduce error rates and improve reading fluency among learners with specific learning disabilities as stated by the study of Baker et al. (2020) that fluency interventions enhance self-monitoring skills, allowing learners to reduce reading mistakes significantly. The lack of improvement in the control group emphasizes the necessity of targeted interventions, as natural maturation or general classroom instruction alone may not be sufficient to address the specific reading challenges faced by these learners. The decrease in error rates, particularly among the intervention group, is supported by Kim et al. (2019), who found that repeated reading strategies foster accuracy and minimize errors over time.

Table 9. Reading Level of the Learners in the Pretest and Posttest

Score Ranges	Pretest			Posttest			Descriptive Rating
	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	Control Group	Intervention Group	Total	
0 – 6	15	15	30	0	0	0	Emerging Level
7 – 13	0	0	0	15	2	17	Developing Level
14 – 20	0	0	0	0	13	13	Progressing Level
Total	15	15	30	15	15	30	

Table 2.9 illustrates the distribution of learners in the control and intervention groups across different reading level categories, as measured by score ranges, during both the pretest and posttest phases. In the pretest, both the control and intervention groups exhibited a uniform pattern: all 15 learners in each group were categorized at the "Emerging Level," falling within the score range of 0-6. This indicates that prior to the intervention, all learners in both groups demonstrated significant challenges in reading, lacking foundational reading skills.

The post-test results, however, reveal a significant improvement between the two groups. The control group, which did not receive the "PROJECT REREAD" intervention, showed a shift, but not a substantial improvement. All 15 learners in the control group moved to the "Developing Level," scoring within the 7-13 range. This suggests some natural improvement of general classroom instruction, but no significant advancement beyond the developing stage. In contrast, the intervention group demonstrated remarkable progress. Two learners moved to the "Developing Level" (7-13), while a significant majority, 13 learners, achieved the "Progressing Level" (14-20). This indicates that the "PROJECT REREAD" intervention effectively facilitated significant improvements in reading levels, moving learners beyond mere development and towards a more proficient level of reading.

The data provide strong evidence for the effectiveness of the "PROJECT REREAD" intervention in enhancing the reading levels of Grade 2 learners with specific learning disabilities. The pretest results highlight the initial homogeneity of both groups, with all learners demonstrating an "Emerging Level" of reading. However, the posttest results clearly illustrate the differential impact of the intervention. While the control group showed some improvement, moving to the "Developing Level," the intervention group exhibited a more substantial advancement, with a majority reaching the "Progressing Level." The findings emphasize the importance of targeted interventions in addressing the specific reading needs of these learners, as general classroom instruction alone may not be sufficient to facilitate significant progress. The progression from "Emerging" to "Developing" and "Progressing" reading levels in the intervention group aligns with Schunk & Usher's (2020) findings on self-efficacy in literacy development. Learners who experience repeated success in reading become more confident and motivated, leading to sustained improvements. Reyes et al. (2019) found that fluency interventions foster gradual progress, reinforcing the effectiveness of PROJECT REREAD in advancing reading levels among learners with SLD.

Significant difference in the reading fluency level before and after exposure to Project Reread

Table 10 Independent t-test between reading fluency level Before and After Exposure to REREAD

		Group	Mean	SD	t	p-value	Decision on H_0	Interpretation
Pre REREAD		Control Group	4.73	.458	1.122	.271	Do not reject H_0	Not significant
		Intervention Group	4.53	.516				
Post REREAD		Control Group	9.40	2.16	8.57**	.000	Reject H_0	Significant
		Intervention Group	15.47	1.68				

Table 10 shows the result of the t-test between the performances of the control group and the intervention group before and after exposure to the REREAD intervention. It can be gleaned from the Table that before exposure to the REREAD intervention, the mean scores of the learners in both groups were almost the same, with the control group having a lower standard deviation value ($SD=.458$) than the intervention group ($SD=.516$). This means that the scores of the learners in the intervention group were more dispersed from the mean scores as compared with the scores of the learners in the control group. That is, some learners in the intervention group have lower scores than those in the control group.

Before the REREAD intervention, the reading fluency level of the learners in both groups is in the emerging level (Table 2.9). This is confirmed by the t-value of 1.122 at $p=.271$ indicating that there is no significant difference in their mean scores in the test before the REREAD intervention. Thus, the null hypothesis not rejected. This is an indication that the requirement for a quasi-experimental

design was complied with, where the participants in both groups exhibited similar abilities to ensure internal validity of the treatment/experiment.

After exposure to the REREAD intervention, the mean score of the learners in the control group ($m=9.40$) is evidently lower than the mean score of the learners in the intervention group ($m=15.47$). It can also be noted that the standard deviation value of the control group ($SD = 2.16$) is now higher than the standard deviation value of the intervention group ($SD=1.68$). This means that the learners in the intervention group have scores that are less dispersed from the mean, indicating almost the same level of reading fluency for the majority of these learners.

The resulting t-value of 8.57 at $p=.000$ indicates that there is indeed a significant difference between the mean scores of the learners in the intervention group than those in the control group. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that the learners exposed to the REREAD intervention have significantly improved their reading fluency level compared to the learners in the control group. It can be recalled that after the REREAD intervention, all the learners in the control group improved their reading fluency to the developing level. On the other hand, the learners in the intervention group had improved their reading fluency level to a progressing level, save for two (2) of them who were in the developing level. The statistical results indicating significant improvement in reading fluency align with research findings by Marks et al. (2022), which emphasize the long-term benefits of structured fluency interventions. The rejection of the null hypothesis supports the argument that repeated reading has a measurable impact on reading fluency, as also demonstrated by studies by Hudson et al. (2020) and Schmitz (2021).

IV. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

The study demonstrated that PROJECT REREAD significantly improved the reading fluency of Grade 2 learners with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). The findings highlight the need for structured and specialized interventions, as traditional literacy methods often fall short for learners with SLD. Repeated reading effectively enhanced word recognition, reading rate, and accuracy. The results affirm the importance of incorporating evidence-based strategies like PROJECT REREAD into early-grade reading programs to support struggling readers. Furthermore, when fluency instruction is prioritized within remedial programs and supported by school resources, it leads to better reading outcomes. A holistic approach, including differentiated instruction, peer support, and home-based reading activities, enhances the overall effectiveness of such interventions. The study may recommend implementing structured reading activities, such as repeated reading and phonemic awareness exercises, to help improve reading fluency and accuracy among learners with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). It is essential to continuously monitor students' progress to evaluate the effectiveness of the Enhanced Reading Fluency Program (ERFP) and make necessary adjustments. The findings of this study may also be shared with educators and policymakers to promote the adoption of evidence-based reading strategies tailored for learners with SLD. Also, future researchers are encouraged to further validate the effectiveness of PROJECT REREAD and ERFP across different learning environments and populations.

REFERENCES

- Alvermann, D. E., Swafford, J., & Montero, M. K. (2019). Content area literacy instruction for the elementary grades. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 51(1), 3-29.
- Baker, S. K., Smolkowski, K., Katz, R., Fien, H., Kame'enui, E. J., & Beck, C. T. (2020). Reading fluency interventions for students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of the evidence. *Exceptional Children*, 86(4), 441-465.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2019). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(2), 164-180.
- Cottrell, R. R. (2014). *Principles and foundations of health promotion and education* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Cruz, M.E. (2019). The influence of personal, environmental, and behavioral factors on the reading fluency of Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *Philippine Journal of Special Education*, 16(1), 75-92.
- de Guzman, J. (2020). Self-efficacy and reading performance among Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education*, 35(2), 210-225.
- Dela Cruz, A. (2019). *Reading interventions for students with specific learning disabilities in the Philippines: A review of literature*. Philippine Journal of Special Education, 15(2), 45-60.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Garcia, A. (2019). The effects of audiobooks on the reading fluency of Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(3), 45-53.
- Garcia, R., Santos, M., & Reyes, J. (2020). A multi-faceted reading intervention for Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities: The impact of reciprocal determinism. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(4), 285-301.

- Gough, P. B. (1972). Theoretical models and processes of reading. In J.F. Kavanagh & I.G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by Ear and by Eye*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, (pp. 661-685).
- Hudson, A., Koh, P. W., Moore, K. A., & Binks-Cantrell, E. (2020). Fluency interventions for elementary students with reading difficulties: A synthesis of research from 2000–2019. *Education Sciences*, 10(3), 52.
- Kim, J. S., Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., & Wei, S. (2019). The effects of peer-mediated reading interventions for students with reading difficulties: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 40(4), 220-235.
- Kitsantas, A., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2019). Enhancing self-regulated learning through self-efficacy and self-monitoring. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 58, 101778.
- Marks, R. A., Mesite, L., Fox, A. B., & Christodoulou, J. A. (2022). Early Reading and Math Developmental Trajectories: Examining Influences of Specific Learning Disabilities and Socioeconomic Status.
- McGill, R. J., & Busse, R. T. (2016). Fitted theory in educational interventions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(3), 345-357.
- Mucherah, W., Yasin, A., & Arifin, Z. (2020). The effect of reciprocal teaching strategy on students' reading comprehension and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(3), 599-612.
- OECD. (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>.
- Reyes, C. (2020). The effects of repeated reading and teacher modeling on the reading fluency of Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 18, 120-138.
- Reyes, M. (2020). *The effects of repeated reading on the reading fluency of Filipino learners*. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 40(1), 85-98.
- Reyes, M., Cruz, A., & Santos, J. (2019). Self-efficacy and the effectiveness of a reading intervention for Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 66(3), 275-290.
- Santos, L. (2019). Peer modeling and reading fluency among Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 20(1-2), 35-48.
- Santos, R., de Guzman, A., & Reyes, P. (2020). The impact of positive feedback and encouragement on the self-efficacy and reading fluency of Filipino learners with specific learning disabilities. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 36(2), 155-170.
- Schmitz, Katelyn, "The Impact of Repeated Reading Interventions on Second Grade Readers" (2021). Dissertations, Theses, and Projects. 625.
- Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2020). Social cognitive theory and motivation. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (2nd ed., pp. 13-28). Oxford University Press.
- Smith, P., & Jones, K. (2018). *Long-term outcomes of reading interventions for students with specific learning difficulties*. Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties, 23(1), 35-50.
- Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. In J. P. Mestre & B. H. Ross (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Cognition in education* (pp. 37–76). Elsevier Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-387691-1.00002-8>