

**Reading misconception among intermediate learners:
Basis for an intervention program**

Angie M. Albano*

Teacher 1/Pao Elementary School, Namabucayan Elementary School, Namabucayan, Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined the reading misconceptions among 22 Grade 5 learners of Pa-o Elementary School, Tabuk City, Kalinga, for School Year 2025–2026. It aimed to identify the learners' reading misconceptions, describe their profile, determine if there is a significant relationship between their profile and reading misconceptions, and develop an intervention program. A quantitative descriptive research design was used. Data were gathered through a questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, t-test, and ANOVA. Results showed that most learners were 11–12 years old, male, and had access to books at home, but most spent less than 30 minutes a day reading. The learners rarely showed wrong ideas about reading; however, they often struggled in identifying the main idea and important details of texts. The findings also showed no significant relationship between learners' profile variables and their reading misconceptions. Based on the results, an intervention program called PROJECT CARE was developed to improve learners' reading comprehension, especially in identifying main ideas and supporting details. In conclusion, the learners have basic reading understanding but need further support in developing higher-level comprehension skills.

Keywords: Reading misconceptions, reading comprehension, intermediate learners, intervention program, elementary pupils.

Date Submitted: April 9, 2026
Date Accepted: April 15, 2026
Date Published: April 21, 2026

INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant skills that a learner is expected to develop during their early years of schooling is the skill of reading. Reading is considered the foundation of all learning, as it enables a learner to comprehend information, follow instructions, and acquire knowledge in various subjects. Despite the significance of the skill of reading, many intermediate learners are still facing difficulties in comprehending and interpreting written texts. These difficulties result in reading misconceptions, where a learner misunderstands words, sentences, and the meaning of a passage. The reading misconceptions are not merely errors in decoding, they are persistent, flawed beliefs about the reading process that hinder deep comprehension.

*Corresponding author/ Email: albano.angie@dep.ed.gov.ph
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021002>

Recommended citation:

Albano, A. M. (2026). Reading misconception among intermediate learners: Basis for an intervention program. *Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (2), 1632-1639.
<http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021002>

Globally, the World Bank (2022) warns of a “learning Poverty” crisis, noting that roughly 70% of 10-year-olds in low-income countries cannot understand a basic text. In the Philippines, the situation is acute. Data from EDCOM II (2024) reveals a “proficiency plunge” where reading mastery drops significantly as students move from grade 3 (30%) to Grade 6 (19%). This suggests that while students may have learned to “sound out” words in early grades, they have developed misconceptions that prevent them from mastering higher-level literacy.

Common misunderstandings prevalent among intermediate learners encompass the notion that speed is synonymous with proficiency (reading quickly without comprehending meaning) and the reliance on the “guessing” strategy (depending on context or images instead of phonetic decoding). Additionally, many learners perceive reading as a passive activity focused on memorization rather than an active process of constructing meaning. When these misconceptions go unaddressed, they solidify, leading to “frustration Level” reading and a decline in academic motivation. This research seeks to identify these specific misconceptions to provide educators with a roadmap for targeted, evidence-based intervention. (Phil-IRI Manual).

The intermediate learners are required to move from learning to read to reading to learn. At this level, learners are expected to be able to decode words and also focus on the meaning of the texts. However, some learners still experience difficulties in understanding the texts, and this leads to reading misconceptions. Therefore, it is crucial to identify these misconceptions in order to help learners improve their reading skills.

It is essential for schools and teachers to introduce the appropriate intervention program that will address the specific learning challenges. An effective intervention program will enable the learners to enhance their comprehension skills and increase their knowledge of new words. The learners will be able to overcome their misconceptions through guided reading activities and become confident readers.

In school, reading is a crucial subject area that pupils must learn, as it is the most essential and vital aspect of education. A study conducted by Torppa et al. (2020) reveals that there are alarmingly high reports of struggling readers in elementary grades, indicating a decline in reading comprehension among children in recent times. This issue was also encountered by the researcher, who is an elementary teacher; the development of reading comprehension among learners through modular learning settings during the pandemic period exacerbated the problem of poor reading comprehension among students.

Given that misconceptions in reading play a role in learning new ideas and achieving success in various educational fields many people have raised concerns. These concerns have put reading instructors in schools, in a tough spot. As a reading educator myself I find this situation puzzling. I decided to investigate what affects students reading misconceptions. By figuring out what helps students read better and understand more the results will give teachers an idea of how to create plans to fix these problems. The goal is to help teachers develop strategies to address students reading shortcomings.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to assess the reading misconception of 22 Grade 5 learners of PA O Elementary School, Nambucayan, Tabuk City, Kalinga for the School Year 2025–2026 as a basis for an intervention plan.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of the learners in terms of age, sex, birth order, highest educational attainment of parents, reading materials available at home, and time spent in reading?
2. What are the common reading misconceptions of intermediate learners?

3. Is there a significant difference in the reading misconceptions of intermediate learners when grouped according to their profile?
4. What intervention program can be developed based on the findings of the study?

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative research approach to examine the significant relationships between the respondents' reading skill levels, their profile variables, and the factors influencing their reading skills. This approach was deemed appropriate because data were primarily collected through a questionnaire, and the measurement procedures and data analysis adhered to the standards of survey and descriptive research. The investigation was conducted among 22 Grade 5 learners enrolled at Pa o Elementary School in Tabuk City, Kalinga during the School Year 2025–2026, who served as the respondents of the study.

The research utilized a questionnaire adapted from the works of P. David Pearson and Michael Pressley, which focused on reading comprehension strategies and common misunderstandings about reading. The instrument was divided into two parts. Part 1 collected information on the profile of the respondents, while Part II focused on identifying common reading misconceptions. These misconceptions were organized into three categories, namely wrong ideas or misinterpretation, difficulty in understanding certain texts, forms, tools, and processes, and misinterpretation of key ideas, confusion of important details, and failure to identify the main idea.

In the conduct of the study, the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Superintendent to ensure that all required protocols were observed. Upon approval, coordination was established with the school head to facilitate the organization of the participating learners. It was ensured that parental consent was secured prior to the inclusion of the learners in the study, thereby upholding ethical considerations related to voluntary participation and informed consent.

For data analysis, a four-point Likert scale was employed to determine the extent of reading misconception among intermediate learners. The scale was interpreted using the following ranges and qualitative descriptions: 3.25-4.00 as Always, 2.50-3.24 as Often, 1.75-2.49 as Rarely, and 1.00-1.74 as Never. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the profile of the respondents. The mean was utilized to determine the overall experiences of the parents. Inferential statistical tools, specifically t-test and ANOVA, were applied to test the hypothesis, and these analyses were performed using the SPSS to ensure accuracy and reliability of the results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present Results and Discussion section is based on data gathered from 22 intermediate learners and is grounded in a descriptive research design employing a survey method. The respondents were selected using an appropriate sampling approach consistent with the study's objectives, and data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed to measure learners' profile characteristics and reading misconceptions across attitudinal, procedural, and cognitive domains. Statistical treatments included frequency counts, percentages, mean scores, total weighted means, and inferential analysis using computed values and corresponding p-values to test relationships between variables. The discussion that follows is firmly anchored in the empirical data obtained and interprets the findings directly in relation to the objectives of examining learners' profiles, identifying prevalent reading

misconceptions, and determining whether significant relationships exist between profile variables and reading comprehension.

The demographic profile reveals that the majority of respondents were aged 11–12 years old, comprising 16 learners or 72.73%, while 6 learners or 27.27% were aged 9–10 years old. In terms of sex, 14 respondents or 63.64% were male, and 8 respondents or 36.36% were female, indicating a male-dominated sample. Birth order distribution shows that 9 learners or 40.91% were first-born, followed by 5 second-born learners or 22.73%, 4 learners classified as fifth and above or 18.18%, 3 third-born learners or 13.63%, and 1 fourth-born learner or 4.55%. With respect to parental educational attainment, 9 parents or 40.91% were secondary graduates, 7 or 31.82% were college graduates, and 6 or 27.27% were elementary graduates. In terms of reading resources, 21 learners or 95.45% reported access to books at home, 1 learner or 4.55% had access to newspapers, and 0 learners or 0.0% reported access to magazines. Despite this high availability of books, reading engagement remains limited, as 14 learners or 63.64% reported spending less than 30 minutes reading daily, 5 learners or 22.73% reported reading more than 30 minutes, and 3 learners or 13.63% reported reading for 1 hour. This pattern suggests a discrepancy between access to reading materials and actual reading behavior, indicating that availability alone does not guarantee sustained reading engagement.

In examining misconceptions related to wrong ideas or interpretations about reading, the results indicate consistently low levels of misconception among respondents. The statement “Reading is just pronouncing words correctly” yielded a mean of 1.86 with an interpretation of Rarely, indicating that learners generally recognize reading as more than mere decoding. Similarly, the belief “If I read fast, it means I understand everything” obtained a mean of 2.05 interpreted as Rarely, suggesting that learners do not equate speed with comprehension. The statement “Good readers never get confused” had a mean of 2.14, also interpreted as Rarely, reflecting awareness that confusion can occur even among proficient readers. The perception “If I don’t know a word I can’t understand the text” resulted in a mean of 2.18 interpreted as Rarely, while “You should understand everything on the first read” had a mean of 2.05 interpreted as Rarely. The total weighted mean of 2.06, interpreted as Rarely, confirms that learners seldom hold simplistic or incorrect beliefs about the nature of reading. These findings indicate that learners possess a relatively accurate conceptual understanding of reading as a complex process involving interpretation, flexibility, and strategy use, aligning with theoretical perspectives that view reading as an interactive cognitive activity rather than a purely mechanical skill.

In terms of difficulties related to understanding texts, forms, tools, and processes, the results reveal a nuanced pattern. The statement “If I can’t understand a form or a text quickly, it means I’m not a good reader” obtained a mean of 2.91 interpreted as Often, indicating that many learners experience self-doubt when comprehension is not immediate. However, other indicators reflect more adaptive beliefs. The statement “All text should be easy to understand without using any tools or strategies” yielded a mean of 2.05 interpreted as Rarely, suggesting that learners recognize the need for strategic support. The belief “Instruction and processes only need to be read once to be understood” resulted in a mean of 1.45 interpreted as Never, indicating strong disagreement with the notion of one-time comprehension. Similarly, “Using tools like guides, examples or dictionaries is unnecessary if you are a good reader” had a mean of 1.45 interpreted as Never, and “If a process is hard to follow, it is always the fault of the text, not how I read it” yielded a mean of 1.36 interpreted as Never. The total weighted mean of 1.84 interpreted as Never demonstrates that, overall, learners do not struggle with procedural misconceptions and instead exhibit awareness of effective reading practices such as rereading and the use of support tools. Nevertheless, the elevated mean of 2.91 for self-perception suggests that affective factors, particularly confidence, may influence learners’ reading experiences despite their procedural understanding.

A contrasting pattern emerges in the cognitive domain, particularly in the interpretation of key ideas and identification of the main idea. The statement “If I know some words, I understand the whole text” obtained a mean of 3.32 interpreted as Always, indicating a strong tendency toward superficial comprehension. Likewise, “Interesting details are the most important” yielded a mean of 3.36 interpreted as Always, reflecting an overemphasis on salient but potentially non-central information. The belief “The main idea is always the first sentence” resulted in a mean of 3.18 interpreted as Often, while “Any sentence can be the main idea” had a mean of 2.36 interpreted as Often, both suggesting confusion regarding text structure. The statement “The main idea is always easy to see” obtained a mean of 2.45 interpreted as Rarely, indicating that learners recognize the difficulty of identifying central ideas despite holding inconsistent beliefs about how to locate them. The total weighted mean of 2.93 interpreted as Often confirms that learners frequently experience cognitive misconceptions related to comprehension processes. These findings highlight a critical gap between learners’ awareness of reading strategies and their ability to apply higher-order cognitive skills necessary for extracting meaning, synthesizing information, and distinguishing between main ideas and supporting details.

The analysis of the relationship between reading misconceptions and profile variables further clarifies that demographic factors do not significantly influence reading comprehension outcomes. For age, the computed value of 1.142 with a p-value of 0.364 led to the decision to Accept HO, indicating Not Significant. For sex, the computed value of 0.239 with a p-value of 0.814 also resulted in Accept HO and Not Significant interpretation. Birth order yielded a computed value of 0.918 with a p-value of 0.452, again leading to Accept HO and Not Significant. The highest educational attainment of parents (H.E.A.P) showed a computed value of 1.405 with a p-value of 0.278, which is greater than the 0.05 level of significance, resulting in Accept HO and Not Significant. Reading materials produced a computed value of 1.864 with a p-value of 0.077, still exceeding 0.05, thus Accept HO and Not Significant. Finally, time spent reading yielded a computed value of 0.655 with a p-value of 0.531, leading to Accept HO and Not Significant. Across all variables, the p-values are greater than 0.05, confirming that there is no statistically significant relationship between learners’ profile characteristics and their reading misconceptions or comprehension levels. This indicates that reading difficulties observed in the study are not attributable to demographic differences but are more likely rooted in cognitive processing and skill development.

The integration of these findings suggests that while learners demonstrate sound conceptual and procedural understanding of reading, as evidenced by low misconception levels in attitudinal and strategy-related items, they exhibit persistent cognitive challenges in constructing meaning from text. The discrepancy between high access to reading materials at 95.45% and low reading time at 63.64% spending less than 30 minutes daily further underscores the role of engagement and motivation, as supported by existing literature emphasizing that reading proficiency is influenced not only by exposure but also by active and sustained practice. The tendency of learners to equate partial word recognition with full comprehension, as indicated by a mean of 3.32, aligns with research highlighting the limitations of surface-level processing and the need for explicit instruction in comprehension strategies. Similarly, the overemphasis on interesting details with a mean of 3.36 reflects difficulties in hierarchical text processing, a skill that develops through guided practice and metacognitive awareness. The absence of significant relationships between profile variables and reading outcomes reinforces theoretical perspectives that reading comprehension is primarily a function of cognitive and linguistic processes rather than demographic factors.

In synthesis, the findings demonstrate that the 22 intermediate learners possess accurate foundational beliefs about reading and exhibit appropriate awareness of strategies such as rereading and tool use, as reflected in total weighted means of 2.06 interpreted as Rarely and 1.84 interpreted as Never for attitudinal and procedural misconceptions, respectively. However, they experience notable cognitive difficulties, as evidenced by a total weighted mean of 2.93 interpreted as Often, particularly in identifying main ideas and distinguishing essential information from peripheral details. The inferential analysis confirms that these challenges are not significantly associated with age, sex, birth order, parental education, reading materials, or time spent reading, as all p-values exceed 0.05 and lead to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. These results contribute to the field by emphasizing the need for targeted instructional interventions that focus on higher-order comprehension skills, including main idea identification, text structure analysis, and critical reading strategies. The findings provide a clear empirical basis for the development of such interventions and establish a foundation for subsequent sections of the study that may address program design, implementation, and evaluation.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that the majority of intermediate learners in Pa-o Elementary School are within the age range of 11–12 years old and are predominantly male. Although many learners have access to reading materials at home, they devote less than 30 minutes per day to reading activities. Despite demonstrating an awareness that reading requires effort and the use of strategies such as rereading, learners continue to hold incorrect reading beliefs that hinder their comprehension. A significant difficulty identified in the findings is the learners' inability to recognize main ideas and distinguish them from supporting details, which consequently affects their overall reading comprehension. Furthermore, the analysis established that profile variables such as age, sex, birth order, parents' educational attainment, access to reading materials, and time spent reading do not significantly relate to the presence of reading misconceptions. While learners exhibit basic reading abilities, the results emphasize the need for structured support to enhance their comprehension skills, particularly in identifying and extracting essential ideas from texts.

In light of these findings, it is evident that improving reading comprehension among intermediate learners requires a comprehensive and collaborative approach. Teachers play a crucial role in addressing learners' misconceptions by employing varied and effective reading strategies that facilitate deeper understanding of texts. Providing targeted assistance to learners who experience reading difficulties is essential, alongside the implementation of engaging and interactive classroom activities that foster interest and confidence in reading. Schools and educational institutions are encouraged to develop and implement structured intervention initiatives such as Project CARES, which promote collaboration among teachers, parents, and the wider community to support learners' reading development. Equally important is the provision of adequate professional development opportunities for teachers, particularly in the area of teaching reading to struggling learners, as well as ensuring the availability of diverse and developmentally appropriate reading materials within the school environment.

Parental involvement also emerges as a critical factor in supporting learners' reading growth. Parents are encouraged to provide access to books, engage in shared reading activities, and monitor their children's reading progress and school participation to reinforce learning at home. In addition, future research is recommended to extend the scope of investigation by examining learners over a longer period to determine the sustained impact of reading interventions on comprehension skills. Further studies may also explore the underlying factors

contributing to reading difficulties among male learners and develop targeted strategies to address these challenges effectively.

To operationalize these recommendations, the proposed intervention program, Project Care, focuses on strengthening learners' comprehension, access to reading materials, reading proficiency, and engagement. The program is designed to enhance learners' ability to identify main ideas, distinguish between important and supporting details, and connect ideas within and across paragraphs through structured and guided activities. Strategies such as the use of visual organizers, sorting and mapping activities, think pair share discussions, question and answer sessions, and summarization exercises are integrated to provide varied and meaningful learning experiences. These activities are implemented through regular, time bound sessions over a six-week period, supported by appropriate instructional materials and continuous assessment through pretests, posttests, quizzes, and performance-based outputs. Through the systematic implementation of this program, learners are expected to demonstrate improved comprehension skills, apply appropriate reading strategies, and exhibit increased interest and confidence in reading. Overall, the study underscores the importance of targeted instructional interventions, collaborative support systems, and sustained engagement in addressing reading misconceptions and enhancing comprehension among intermediate learners.

REFERENCES

- Anhao. (2021). Factors influencing reading comprehension among intermediate learners. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 10(2), 45–53.
- Areepattamannil, S., Freeman, J., & Klinger, D. (2020). The role of the home literacy environment in students' reading achievement. *Educational Studies*, 46(3), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1576860>
- Boonen, A., Van Damme, J., & Onghena, P. (2020). Parental involvement and children's reading development. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(2), 366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09480-0>
- Cabalo. (2019). Reading ability of pupils from far-flung barangays based on PHIL-IRI results. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 98(1), 67–78.
- Cain, K. (2020). Reading comprehension development and difficulties. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71(1), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050935>
- Casicas, & Quirap. (2023). Reading motivation and intrinsic interest in literacy learning. *Journal of Literacy Studies*, 15(2), 120–134.
- Connolly, P., Keenan, C., & Urbanska, K. (2019). The influence of teaching practices on literacy outcomes in primary schools. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.03.002>
- Garcia, & Cain, K. (2021). Vocabulary knowledge and its role in reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(4), 756–768.
- Garcia, et al. (2025). Digital parenting and academic outcomes in rural communities. *Asian Journal of Education and Development Studies*, 14(1), 88–102.

- Mahwasane. (2017). The role of school libraries in improving learning outcomes. *South African Journal of Education*, 37(1), 1–9.
- Manaois. (2021). Reading comprehension as a complex cognitive process. *Philippine Journal of Language and Literacy*, 12(1), 45–58.
- Martin. (2018). Reading for pleasure and its effects on student development. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 57(3), 256–269.
- McVeigh. (2019). Reading for pleasure and vocabulary growth among learners. *Journal of Literacy Education*, 11(2), 67–79.
- Nadeem, & Moin. (2023). Intrinsic motivation and reading engagement among students. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 12(1), 44–60.
- OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
- Saggaf, et al. (2020). Factors affecting reading comprehension among students. *International Journal of Literacy Studies*, 8(2), 78–89.
- Taladngoan. (2020). Environmental factors affecting students' reading performance. *Journal of Educational Development*, 9(1), 55–63.
- Torppa, M., Georgiou, G., Lerkkanen, M., Niemi, P., Poikkeus, A., & Nurmi, J. (2020). Examining reading development and difficulties among children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(3), 389–407. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.279>
- Tomas, et al. (2021). The relationship between reading fluency and comprehension. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 17(2), 112–124.
- Tuell. (2021). Socioeconomic status and student literacy development. *Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), 22–34.
- Vuzo. (2022). Availability of school libraries and students' reading interest. *African Educational Research Journal*, 10(2), 145–153.
- Zhang. (2020). Instructional practices and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(5), 1010–1023.