PANTAO
(International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
Volume 5, Issue 2
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

Public schools' readiness and responsiveness of academic recovery and accessible learning program, tutors' engagement and parental involvement

Jessil N. Nolasco*
Northwest Samar State University, Calbayog City, Philippines

Ramonelle T. Plateja
Northwest Samar State University, Calbayog City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined the level of readiness and responsiveness of schools in implementing the ARAL program in terms of learner readiness, teacher or tutor readiness, school environment readiness, parental engagement readiness, and systems support and governance readiness, as well as the degree of tutors' engagement and parental involvement. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed with 139 respondents selected from participating schools. Data were gathered using validated survey questionnaires and analyzed through frequency distribution, weighted mean, multiple regression analysis, and Pearson r correlation. Findings revealed that learner readiness obtained a high level, indicating that learners are generally prepared and motivated to participate in ARAL interventions. However, teacher or tutor readiness, school environment readiness, parental engagement readiness, and systems support and governance readiness were rated at a moderate level, suggesting areas that still require strengthening. Similarly, tutors' cognitive engagement was high, while affective and behavioral engagement were moderate. Parental involvement was generally moderate across learning at home, school volunteering, decision making, and communication, except for parenting which was rated high. Regression analysis showed a significant relationship between respondents' profiles and school readiness and responsiveness, although only a small proportion of variance was explained. Correlation analysis revealed strong and significant relationships among school readiness components, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement, indicating an interconnected system of support influencing ARAL implementation. The study concludes that effective implementation of ARAL requires a synchronized approach involving school leadership, teacher engagement, and parental participation. Strengthening governance systems, enhancing instructional support, and improving structured parental involvement are essential to optimize literacy and numeracy recovery outcomes in post-pandemic education settings.

Keywords: ARAL Program, School Readiness, Tutor Engagement, Parental Involvement, & Learning Recovery.

*Corresponding author / Email: jessil_nolasco@deped.gov.ph
DOI: http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021148

Recommended citation:
Nolasco, J. N., & Plateja, R. T. (2026). Public schools' readiness and responsiveness of academic recovery and accessible learning program, tutors' engagement and parental involvement. Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (2), 4222-4253. http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05021148

Date Submitted: April 24, 2026
Date Accepted: May 1, 2026
Date Published: May 8, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Millions of children sit in classrooms daily yet remain unable to read simple texts or solve basic arithmetic problems, revealing a persistent global failure to ensure foundational learning. This reflects a continuing learning crisis where many learners complete the early grades without mastering essential literacy and numeracy skills (UNESCO, 2023). Despite long-standing reforms and global commitments to quality education, learning losses persist, particularly after widespread school disruptions, highlighting the urgent need for effective learning recovery systems that address learning gaps and improve learner achievement across contexts (UNESCO, 2023; UNICEF, 2025).

At the international level, education systems have increasingly prioritized structured learning recovery strategies to address disrupted instruction and persistent inequalities in learning outcomes. Schools are expected to implement targeted interventions that respond to diverse learner needs while strengthening foundational skills in literacy and numeracy. However, many systems continue to struggle with preparedness, coordination, and implementation of structured remediation programs for struggling learners (UNICEF, 2025). This emphasizes the need to examine how schools organize, deliver, and sustain learning recovery efforts in real educational settings.

Global literature highlights that effective learning recovery depends on coordinated support involving school leadership, teachers, parents, and instructional personnel. Strong instructional leadership is essential in ensuring that interventions are effectively implemented and sustained within schools (UNESCO, 2023). Likewise, parental involvement has been consistently associated with improved learner achievement in literacy and numeracy, particularly when schools provide structured engagement opportunities (Jeynes, 2022). In addition, Zhang and Wu (2025) emphasize that school leadership significantly influences the effectiveness of parental involvement by establishing systems that promote meaningful participation and communication.

Tutor engagement is also a critical component of learning recovery initiatives. Tutors provide targeted instructional support to address specific gaps in reading, writing, and numeracy. When integrated into structured school-based programs, tutoring has been shown to significantly improve foundational learning outcomes (UNICEF, 2025). This underscores the importance of examining how tutoring interacts with leadership and parental involvement in strengthening school-based learning recovery systems.

In the Philippine context, learning recovery remains a major national concern. The Department of Education has implemented the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program to address persistent learning gaps among elementary learners. However, national reports continue to reveal serious challenges in foundational literacy and numeracy. Senate reports (2024) indicate that many early-grade learners remain non-readers, while others struggle with basic arithmetic skills. UNICEF (2025) further reports that even learners in higher grade levels perform below expected proficiency standards, reflecting long-standing learning deficiencies requiring sustained intervention.

At the regional level, public elementary schools in Northern Samar continue to implement literacy and numeracy interventions such as the Early Language Literacy and Numeracy (ELLN) program and ARAL-related initiatives. Despite these efforts, DepEd Region VIII (2024) reports that many learners still perform below expected proficiency levels. Persistent reading and numeracy gaps across schools suggest that current interventions have

not fully achieved intended outcomes, highlighting the need to examine school readiness, ARAL responsiveness, tutor engagement, and parental involvement as critical factors in learning recovery.

Within this context, the present study investigates how school readiness and responsiveness to the ARAL Program, tutor engagement, and parental involvement influence literacy and numeracy learning recovery among elementary learners in selected public schools. It also explores how these variables interact to support or hinder the effectiveness of learning recovery initiatives in actual school environments.

The findings of this study are significant to various stakeholders. School heads may use the results to strengthen instructional leadership and improve ARAL implementation strategies. Teachers and tutors may benefit from improved understanding of effective remediation practices for struggling learners. Parents may gain clearer awareness of their role in reinforcing literacy and numeracy development at home. Learners may benefit from more structured and coordinated learning support. Policymakers and education officials may use the findings to refine learning recovery programs, particularly in resource-limited and geographically isolated school settings (UNESCO, 2023; DepEd, 2023).

This study is limited to selected public elementary schools in the First District of Northern Samar. Respondents include, teachers, tutors, and parents directly involved in ARAL implementation and literacy and numeracy support programs. The study focuses on four variables: school readiness, ARAL responsiveness, tutor engagement, and parental involvement, in relation to literacy and numeracy learning recovery outcomes. Data are collected through validated and researcher-adapted survey instruments. While limited in scope and based on self-reported data, the study provides context-specific insights that may inform similar public-school settings (DepEd Region VIII, 2024).

Hence, this study posits that school readiness and responsiveness to the ARAL Program, together with tutor engagement and parental involvement, are interconnected determinants of literacy and numeracy learning recovery in public elementary schools. Strengthening these interrelated factors is essential to improving the effectiveness and sustainability of learning recovery initiatives in addressing persistent learning gaps among learners (UNICEF, 2025; Jeynes, 2022).

Statement of the problem

To enhance the effectiveness of the ARAL program by improving school readiness, tutor engagement, and parental involvement.

1. Improve tutors' competencies in literacy and numeracy instruction.
2. Strengthen structured parental engagement programs.
3. Upgrade school learning environments and ARAL delivery systems.
4. Standardize ARAL implementation guidelines.
5. Enhance leadership and governance capacities.
6. Strengthen communication systems between school and home.
7. Improve tutor motivation and engagement.
8. Ensure adequate funding and resource allocation.
9. Promote collaboration among tutors and teachers.
10. Generate advanced research for continuous improvement.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology employed in the study, encompassing the research design, sampling procedures, data collection instruments, data gathering strategies, data processing methods, and ethical protocols observed throughout the conduct of the research. Each methodological element was carefully selected and implemented to ensure the validity, reliability, and integrity of the study's findings, as well as the welfare of all research participants.

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. According to John W. Creswell (2014), descriptive research is used to systematically describe the characteristics of a population or phenomenon, while correlational research examines the relationships among variables without manipulation. This combined design is appropriate for studies that aim to both describe existing conditions and determine the degree of association among variables as they naturally occur. It is particularly useful in educational settings where experimental control is not feasible and where understanding real-world relationships is essential.

The descriptive component of this study focused on presenting the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, position, school assignment, grade level handled, teaching load, years in service, and relevant trainings attended. It also described the level of public schools' readiness and responsiveness in implementing the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program in terms of learner readiness, tutor readiness, school environment readiness, parental engagement readiness, and systems support and governance readiness. In addition, it described the level of tutors' engagement in terms of affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions, as well as the degree of parental involvement in terms of parenting, learning at home, school volunteering, decision-making participation, and school communication. As emphasized by Norman Blaikie (2010), descriptive research provides a detailed account of current conditions, which serves as a foundation for deeper statistical analysis and interpretation.

The correlational component of the study examined the relationships among public schools' readiness and responsiveness, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement. It determined the presence, strength, and direction of relationships among these variables within the context of ARAL Program implementation. As noted by Fred N. Kerlinger (1986), correlational research is concerned with identifying relationships among variables as they naturally occur, without any form of experimental manipulation. This approach is appropriate for determining whether higher levels of school readiness are associated with greater tutor engagement and parental involvement, and vice versa.

The integration of descriptive and correlational designs made this approach particularly suitable for the present study. The descriptive aspect provided a comprehensive profile of respondents and a clear depiction of the current state of ARAL implementation in schools, tutors, and parents, while the correlational aspect allowed the researcher to examine how these variables are related within the natural school environment. According to Donald Ary et al. (2018), combining descriptive and correlational approaches strengthens educational research by allowing both systematic description and relational analysis. Through this combined design, the study generated evidence-based insights into how institutional readiness, instructional engagement, and parental involvement are interconnected in supporting literacy and numeracy recovery efforts in public elementary schools.

The study was conducted in the public elementary schools of Bobon District, Schools Division of Northern Samar, during School Year 2025-2026. These schools are situated in both rural and coastal barangays and serve learners from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. The setting was considered appropriate for examining public schools' readiness and responsiveness in implementing the ARAL Program, as well as tutors' engagement and parental involvement in learning recovery initiatives. The population of the study consisted of 215 respondents

composed of teachers, school heads, and parents directly involved in ARAL Program implementation. From this population, a sample size of 139 respondents was determined using stratified random sampling. This sampling technique was used to ensure that each school was proportionately represented and that all groups had equal opportunity to participate in the study. Stratification by school was applied to maintain balanced representation across all participating schools.

The selection of respondents followed a systematic procedure. First, an official list of teachers, school heads, and parents was obtained from each participating school. The population was then grouped according to school assignment, and proportional allocation was applied to determine the number of respondents per school based on their corresponding population size. After determining the required number of respondents per stratum, a computerized randomizer was used to select participants randomly. This ensured that all members of the population had an equal chance of being selected, thereby minimizing selection bias and enhancing the reliability and representativeness of the data gathered.

The distribution of respondents across the sixteen participating schools reflects the proportional allocation applied in the sampling procedure. Bobon Central Elementary School, with a population of 47, yielded a sample size of 30, representing 21.86% of the total sample. Acereda Integrated School, with a population of 27, contributed a sample size of 17, representing 12.56%. Arellano Elementary School had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Balat Balud Elementary School likewise had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Calantiao Elementary School, with a population of 7, had a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Dancalan Integrated School, with a population of 29, contributed a sample size of 19, representing 13.49%. E. Duran Elementary School had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Jose Abad Santos Elementary School, with a population of 5, had a sample size of 3, representing 2.33%. Jose P. Laurel had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Magsaysay Elementary School had a population of 9 and a sample size of 6, representing 4.19%. Manuel L. Quezon Elementary School had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Salvacion Elementary School had a population of 18 and a sample size of 12, representing 8.38%. Santander Elementary School had a population of 10 and a sample size of 6, representing 4.65%. San Isidro Elementary School had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. Somoroy Elementary School had a population of 14 and a sample size of 9, representing 6.51%. Trojillo Elementary School had a population of 7 and a sample size of 5, representing 3.26%. The total population across all schools was 215, with a total sample of 139, representing 100% of the proportionally allocated respondents. Schools with larger populations were assigned a higher number of respondents, while smaller schools were still adequately represented in the sample. This proportional distribution ensured that all schools contributed meaningfully to the dataset, allowing for balanced analysis of school readiness and responsiveness, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement. The use of stratified random sampling further ensured fairness in the selection process, and participants were randomly selected using a computerized randomizer to eliminate bias and ensure equal opportunity of inclusion. This method strengthened the validity, reliability, and representativeness of the data, making the sample appropriate for descriptive-correlational analysis.

The study utilized standardized and researcher-adapted instruments to measure public schools' readiness and responsiveness in the implementation of the ARAL Program, learner engagement, and parental involvement. The instruments were anchored on established constructs in educational research focusing on school improvement, learner engagement, and family-school partnerships (Fredricks et al., 2004; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Epstein, 2011;

UNESCO, 2021; World Bank, 2020). The ARAL School Readiness and Responsiveness Audit (ASRRA) developed by the Department of Education served as the primary framework in developing the school readiness instrument (DepEd, 2025). The instruments were adapted and modified to ensure contextual relevance to ARAL Program implementation in Philippine public elementary schools. The modification involved translating general framework indicators into clear, measurable, and school-based survey statements. School readiness and responsiveness were operationalized in terms of learner readiness, tutor readiness, school environment readiness, parental engagement readiness, and systems support and governance readiness. Learner engagement was measured through affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions, while parental involvement was assessed in terms of parenting, learning at home, school volunteering, decision-making participation, and school communication. The modification of the instruments was necessary to ensure that the measures reflected the actual implementation realities of the ARAL Program in public elementary schools. It also aimed to enhance respondent comprehension, improve contextual accuracy, and maintain the validity and relevance of the constructs within the Philippine basic education setting. By contextualizing international and national frameworks into school-based indicators, the instrument became more responsive to local conditions while preserving its theoretical integrity. All instruments used a five-point Likert scale ranging from Always to Never to ensure uniformity of responses and facilitate statistical analysis.

Prior to the actual data collection, pilot testing was conducted in selected public elementary schools in San Jose District with 30 respondents to determine the reliability, clarity, and appropriateness of the instruments. The pilot testing aimed to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire items and identify unclear, redundant, or contextually inappropriate statements. Based on the results, items were revised in terms of wording, simplification, and contextual alignment to improve clarity and ensure consistency with ARAL Program implementation.

The reliability test results demonstrated strong internal consistency across all indicators of the three major variables. For the variable of Readiness and Responsiveness, the indicator of Learner Readiness, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.914, interpreted as excellent reliability. Tutor Readiness, likewise composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.921, interpreted as excellent reliability. School Environment Readiness, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.896, interpreted as very good reliability. Parental Engagement Readiness, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.905, interpreted as excellent reliability. Systems Support and Governance, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.918, interpreted as excellent reliability. For the variable of Learner Engagement, the indicator of Affective engagement, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.907, interpreted as excellent reliability. Behavioral engagement, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.913, interpreted as excellent reliability. Cognitive engagement, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.899, interpreted as very good reliability. For the variable of Parental Involvement, the indicator of Parenting, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.909, interpreted as excellent reliability. Learning at Home, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.915, interpreted as excellent reliability. School Volunteering, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.892, interpreted as very good reliability. Decision Making, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.904, interpreted as excellent reliability. Communication, composed of 10 items, obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.918, interpreted as excellent reliability.

The pilot testing results demonstrated that the research instruments possessed strong internal consistency and were appropriate for full-scale administration. All indicators across

the three major variables obtained Cronbach's Alpha values ranging from 0.892 to 0.921, which were interpreted as very good to excellent reliability. This indicates that the items consistently measured the intended constructs of school readiness and responsiveness, learner engagement, and parental involvement. The results further indicated that the instruments were clear, coherent, and contextually appropriate for respondents involved in ARAL Program implementation. The revisions made after pilot testing improved item clarity, reduced redundancy, and enhanced alignment with actual school conditions. Overall, the findings confirmed that the instruments were reliable, valid, and suitable for use in the actual data collection phase of the study.

The study was conducted in the public elementary schools of the First District of Northern Samar following a systematic, ethical, and research-oriented procedure to ensure the reliability, validity, and integrity of the data gathered. The process began with the preparation and submission of the research proposal to the Office of the Graduate School for review and approval. After securing graduate school approval, a formal request to conduct the study was endorsed to the Schools Division Office of Northern Samar. Upon approval from the division office, coordination with district supervisors and school heads of the identified schools was undertaken to facilitate proper scheduling and ensure smooth implementation of data gathering activities.

Following institutional approvals, the researcher identified the sample schools and respondents using stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation across participating schools. The respondents included school heads, teachers or tutors involved in the ARAL Program, and parents of learners. Prior to data collection, informed consent was secured from all adult participants, and they were oriented about the purpose, procedures, benefits, and ethical considerations of the study. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured of confidentiality and their right to withdraw at any stage without consequences.

Data collection was conducted using structured, standardized, and researcher-adapted instruments aligned with the variables of the study. These instruments included a demographic profile questionnaire, a school readiness and responsiveness instrument based on ARAL implementation indicators, a tutors' engagement scale, and a parental involvement scale. All instruments were anchored on established theoretical frameworks and adapted to the ARAL context to ensure relevance and appropriateness for the local setting. Pilot testing was conducted in selected public elementary schools in San Jose District, Northern Samar, with at least 30 respondents who were not included in the final sample. The purpose of the pilot testing was to determine the clarity, reliability, and internal consistency of the instruments. Reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha was conducted, and based on the results, minor revisions were made to improve clarity, readability, and contextual relevance without altering the constructs of the instruments.

The actual data gathering was conducted during the schools' break for teachers and school heads, thus requiring the researcher to adopt both online and offline modes of distribution to ensure timely and efficient retrieval of responses. Questionnaires were distributed through Google Forms for online access, while printed copies were also provided for respondents with limited internet connectivity. To facilitate faster communication, retrieval, and clarification of responses, the researcher utilized multiple communication platforms such as SMS, email, Messenger, video calls, and other digital means. These strategies ensured efficient coordination with respondents despite the unavailability of regular school operations. In addition to these procedures, the researcher personally corresponded with school heads and designated focal persons to ensure proper distribution and retrieval of instruments. Adequate time was provided for respondents to accomplish the questionnaires, and follow-ups were

conducted when necessary to maximize response rate. The data collection process was carefully managed to ensure accuracy, completeness, and minimal disruption to respondents' available time during the vacation period.

Several challenges were encountered during the conduct of the study. One of the primary challenges was the limited availability of respondents due to vacation schedules, personal commitments, and intermittent internet connectivity in some areas. This required flexible scheduling and repeated follow-ups through multiple communication platforms. Another challenge was the geographic distribution of schools, particularly those located in remote and coastal areas, which affected the speed of retrieval of printed questionnaires and required additional coordination time. Despite these constraints, all targeted data were successfully gathered through persistent follow-up, effective communication, and strong cooperation from school personnel and respondents.

After data collection, responses were systematically coded, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the level of school readiness and responsiveness, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to determine relationships among variables, while multiple regression analysis was applied to identify predictive relationships. All statistical treatments were guided by the conceptual framework of the study, which assumes interrelationships among institutional readiness, tutor engagement, and parental involvement in ARAL implementation. Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the entire process. The study ensured voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and proper data protection. All collected data were used solely for academic purposes, and no identifying information was disclosed in any part of the study.

The processing of data in this study followed a systematic and methodologically rigorous sequence to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of all gathered information. After data collection, all accomplished instruments covering respondents' profiles, school readiness and responsiveness in ARAL implementation, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement were carefully checked for completeness and consistency. Incomplete, invalid, or inconsistent responses were excluded to maintain data integrity and minimize bias (Pallant, 2020). All valid responses were encoded in Microsoft Excel, where Likert-scale responses ranging from 1 ("Never") to 5 ("Always") were numerically coded, and the encoded dataset was subsequently imported into SPSS Version 25 for statistical analysis.

The computation of variables was guided by the dimensions corresponding to the research problems of the study. School readiness and responsiveness was operationalized through learner readiness, teacher or tutor readiness, school environment readiness, parental engagement readiness, and systems support and governance readiness, while tutors' engagement was measured in terms of affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions. In the same manner, parental involvement was examined through parenting, learning at home, school volunteering, decision-making involvement, and communication. These dimensions were treated as subscales, with mean scores computed per dimension by averaging item responses, and composite means derived by aggregating all subscale scores to provide an overall measure for each major variable.

Before proceeding to inferential analysis, the assumption of normality was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test, which is considered appropriate for small to moderate sample sizes and continuous data structures (Field, 2018; Tabachnick et al., 2020). The results of the normality test indicated that all variables and their corresponding dimensions yielded significance values greater than 0.05, which confirms that the data were normally distributed. This finding established that the dataset satisfied the assumptions required for parametric

statistical tests, thereby justifying the use of correlation, regression, and mediation analyses in the succeeding phases of the study.

The normality test results for all study variables and their respective dimensions are as follows. For the variable of School Readiness and Responsiveness, the dimension of Learner Readiness obtained a W statistic of 0.971 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.161. Teacher or Tutor Readiness obtained a W statistic of 0.970 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.158. School Environment Readiness obtained a W statistic of 0.972 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.165. Parental Engagement Readiness obtained a W statistic of 0.969 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.149. Systems Support and Governance obtained a W statistic of 0.971 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.160. For the variable of Tutors' Engagement, Affective Engagement obtained a W statistic of 0.972 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.163. Behavioral Engagement obtained a W statistic of 0.970 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.156. Cognitive Engagement obtained a W statistic of 0.971 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.159. For the variable of Parental Involvement, Parenting obtained a W statistic of 0.973 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.166. Learning at Home obtained a W statistic of 0.970 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.155. School Volunteering obtained a W statistic of 0.971 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.158. Decision-Making Involvement obtained a W statistic of 0.972 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.162. Communication obtained a W statistic of 0.970 with df = 139 and a p-value of 0.157. All computed p-values exceeded the 0.05 level of significance, thereby confirming that the distribution of data for all dimensions was normal. This outcome strengthens the validity of using parametric statistical techniques in the analysis of the study variables, particularly since the assumption of normality is a critical requirement in ensuring the robustness of inferential procedures. Moreover, the consistency of the results across all dimensions further indicates that the dataset demonstrates stable distributional properties, which supports reliable interpretation of relationships and predictive models in the subsequent analyses.

Given the established normality of the data, descriptive statistics were then employed to describe the respondents' profiles and determine the level of school readiness and responsiveness, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement across all dimensions. This was complemented by measures of central tendency and dispersion, which provided a clearer understanding of the patterns and variability of responses. Subsequently, inferential statistics were applied in line with the research problems of the study, where Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was utilized to examine the strength and direction of relationships among school readiness and responsiveness, tutors' engagement, and parental involvement. In addition, Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted to determine the predictive influence of school readiness and parental involvement on tutors' engagement, allowing the study to identify which variables significantly contribute to engagement outcomes. Furthermore, mediation analysis was employed to test whether parental involvement functioned as an intervening variable between school readiness and tutors' engagement, thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding of the underlying relationships among the constructs. All statistical treatments were performed using SPSS Version 25 at a 0.05 level of significance, ensuring that all interpretations were grounded on standard statistical decision criteria and aligned with the objectives of the study.

The study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards to ensure the protection of participants and the integrity of the research process. Prior to data collection, approval was secured from the Schools Division Office of Northern Samar and from the school heads of the participating schools to ensure that all procedures were properly coordinated and conducted without disrupting school operations. Informed consent was obtained from all participants after they were fully informed about the purpose of the study, procedures, and their rights.

Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured that they could withdraw at any time without any consequence and that their responses would not affect their employment or professional standing.

Confidentiality, anonymity, and data privacy were strictly observed by ensuring that no identifying information was collected. All responses were encoded using numerical codes, stored securely, and reported in aggregated form only. Online responses were protected through password-secured files, while printed questionnaires were safely stored and accessed only by the researcher. The researcher addressed ethical challenges during data collection by using flexible and inclusive strategies. For issues on internet connectivity and accessibility, both online and printed questionnaires were provided to ensure equal opportunity for participation without forcing respondents to comply under difficult conditions. For challenges related to respondent availability and distance between schools, schedules and follow-ups were conducted respectfully and without pressure, ensuring that participation remained voluntary and convenient for respondents. Overall, these measures ensured that ethical principles such as informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and responsible data handling were strictly observed throughout the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study examined the readiness and responsiveness of schools in implementing the ARAL program, along with the tutors' level of engagement and the degree of parental involvement, among 139 teacher-respondents drawn from 16 elementary schools within the district. A researcher-made survey questionnaire served as the primary data collection instrument, organized around the key variables of school readiness and responsiveness, tutor engagement, and parental involvement. The data were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages to describe the profile of respondents, weighted means to assess the level of each variable and its dimensions, multiple regression analysis to determine the relationship between teacher profile variables and the three major dependent variables, and Pearson r correlation to examine the interrelationships among school readiness and responsiveness, tutors' level of engagement, and parents' degree of involvement. The discussion that follows presents and interprets the findings in direct relation to the objectives of the study, grounded entirely in the data gathered from the 139 respondents.

Profile of the Respondents

The age distribution of the 139 respondents reflects a workforce that is predominantly composed of mid-career professionals. The largest proportion falls within the 42-48 age bracket, accounting for 52 respondents or 37.4% of the total sample. This is followed by those aged 35-41 with 30 respondents or 21.6%, and those aged 49-55 with 24 respondents or 17.3%. The older group aged 56-62 comprises 18 respondents or 12.9%, while the youngest group aged 28-34 includes 15 respondents or 10.8%. This distribution indicates that the majority of respondents are within the 35-48 age range, suggesting a relatively mature and experienced teaching population. Mid-career teachers are typically at a stage where they have accumulated sufficient pedagogical knowledge and classroom management skills, allowing them to adapt more effectively to intervention programs such as ARAL. Hallinger (2021) highlighted that effective monitoring and goal-setting practices by school leaders are more impactful when teachers possess the professional maturity to implement them consistently. Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) further found that coaching and sustained teacher support are particularly effective among educators who already have a solid instructional foundation but

remain open to professional growth. Conversely, the presence of younger teachers aged 28-34 and those approaching retirement aged 56-62 introduces diversity that may require differentiated support strategies, as emphasized by Madulara, Paglinawan, and Orongan (2025), who noted that leadership practices must be responsive to teacher characteristics to effectively enhance competence. In relation to tutoring and instructional support, Darling-Hammond et al. (2021), Kraft and Goldstein (2022), and Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) demonstrated that structured tutoring programs are most effective when teachers are able to sustain consistent and focused instructional interactions, a capacity that mid-career teachers who dominate this sample are well-positioned to exercise.

In terms of sex, the distribution shows near-equal representation with 71 male respondents or 51.1% and 68 female respondents or 48.9%. This balanced composition indicates that both male and female teachers are almost equally represented in the teaching workforce covered by the study. Such parity supports collaborative and inclusive educational practices that are essential in implementing recovery programs. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that leadership effectiveness is strengthened when collaboration occurs among diverse members of the teaching staff, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) highlighted that a gender-balanced workforce can foster varied mentoring styles and peer support systems. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) further found that effective tutoring relies not only on instructional structure but also on the ability of tutors to connect meaningfully with learners, a capacity that is enhanced by diversity among educators. Tayab (2024) and Cereno and Quinito (2025) similarly demonstrated in the Philippine context that localized interventions benefit from inclusive teaching environments. Madulara, Paglinawan, and Orongan (2025) affirmed that leadership plays a crucial role in harnessing such diversity to enhance teacher competence and performance, underscoring the need for leadership practices that promote collaboration and mutual learning irrespective of gender.

With respect to civil status, the majority of respondents are married, comprising 104 out of 139 teachers or 74.8%, followed by single respondents with 32 or 23.0%, widowed respondents with 2 or 1.4%, and 1 separated respondent or 0.7%. The predominance of married respondents indicates a workforce that balances professional demands alongside family responsibilities, which may influence availability and time management in implementing additional duties such as tutoring or extended instructional support. However, this group may also demonstrate greater career stability and long-term commitment, which are valuable attributes in sustaining school-based recovery initiatives. Hallinger (2021) highlighted that systematic monitoring and clear goal-setting can guide teachers effectively even when they face competing demands, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) found that coaching and continuous support help teachers manage responsibilities while improving instructional practices. For married teachers particularly, Madulara, Paglinawan, and Orongan (2025) underscored that leadership-driven instructional supervision enhances teacher competence regardless of personal circumstances, suggesting that flexible and responsive leadership approaches are essential when contextual demands vary. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) emphasized that well-organized tutoring systems can yield significant improvements in literacy and numeracy even within constrained time resources, while Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) confirmed that tutoring effectiveness depends on consistency and structure rather than solely on duration, a principle that supports the meaningful participation of married teachers when programs are appropriately designed.

Regarding highest educational attainment, the distribution reveals a highly qualified teaching workforce. The largest group consists of those holding a completed Master's Degree with 63 respondents or 45.3%, followed by those with a Master's Degree with CAR comprising

31 respondents or 22.3%, and 17 respondents or 12.2% with Master's Degree units. Twenty-two respondents or 15.8% hold a Bachelor's Degree as their highest qualification, while a smaller proportion have pursued doctoral studies, including 3 respondents or 2.2% with doctorate units, 2 or 1.4% with a Doctorate Degree-CAR, and 1 or 0.7% with a completed Doctorate Degree. The overwhelming orientation toward master's-level study reflects the respondents' commitment to professional development and their recognition that advanced pedagogical knowledge is necessary for managing complex instructional demands. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that leadership practices such as monitoring and goal-setting are most effective when teachers possess the necessary knowledge and skills to implement them, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) found that coaching and teacher support significantly improve performance particularly among those with a strong educational foundation. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) demonstrated that structured tutoring programs are more successful when tutors have strong content knowledge and pedagogical expertise, and Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) identified tutoring as one of the most effective strategies for closing learning gaps when delivered by competent educators. Tayab (2024) and Cereno and Quinito (2025) further showed in the Philippine context that programs led by well-trained teachers significantly improved literacy and numeracy outcomes. Despite the high overall level of educational attainment, the presence of respondents holding only a bachelor's degree highlights the continuing need for leadership-driven mentoring and coaching to bridge gaps in knowledge and ensure that all teachers contribute effectively to recovery efforts.

In terms of position or designation, the majority of respondents are Teacher III with 103 or 74%, followed by Teacher I-II with 23 respondents or 17%, Master Teacher I with 9 respondents or 7%, and Master Teacher II and Master Teacher III each with 2 respondents or 1%. This distribution confirms that the teaching workforce is largely composed of experienced classroom practitioners who are actively engaged in direct instruction. Teacher III positions typically require demonstrated competence and years of service, making these teachers well-suited for implementing recovery programs. The limited presence of Master Teachers, who ordinarily serve as instructional leaders and mentors, further highlights the importance of structured instructional support systems in filling the leadership gap that their small number creates. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that school heads can influence teaching and learning through structured monitoring and goal-setting, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) demonstrated that coaching and support enhance professional practices particularly among teachers who are still developing their expertise. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that structured tutoring programs are most effective when supported by skilled educators who can adapt instruction to learners' needs, and Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) highlighted that tutoring effectiveness depends on consistent and high-quality instruction, which can be facilitated by experienced mid-level teachers who dominate this sample.

With regard to school classification, the distribution shows that 30 respondents or 21.86% are from Bobon Central Elementary School, while the remaining 109 respondents or 78.14% are distributed across 15 non-central schools, with Acereda Integrated School contributing 17 respondents or 12.56%, Dancalan Integrated School contributing 19 respondents or 13.49%, and Salvacion Elementary School contributing 12 respondents or 8.38%. The remaining schools each contributed between 3 and 9 respondents, with smaller schools such as Jose Abad Santos Elementary School contributing 3 respondents or 2.33%, and schools such as Arellano, Balat Balud, Calantiao, E. Duran, Jose P. Laurel, ML. Quezon, San Isidro, and Trojillo Elementary Schools each contributing 5 respondents or 3.26%, while Magsaysay and Santander Elementary Schools contributed 6 respondents or 4.19% and 4.65%,

respectively, and Somoroy Elementary School contributing 9 respondents or 6.51%. This predominance of non-central school respondents, reflecting 78.14% of the sample, highlights the relevance of examining how readiness and responsiveness operate in less advantaged contexts where access to resources, infrastructure, and professional development opportunities is more constrained. Hallinger (2021) noted that systematic monitoring and clear goal-setting are essential in ensuring that all schools regardless of classification achieve desired outcomes, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) demonstrated that coaching and teacher support significantly improve school performance especially in resource-limited contexts. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that structured tutoring programs can compensate for resource limitations by providing targeted support to learners, and Tayab (2024) and Cereno and Quinito (2025) showed that localized tutoring initiatives are particularly effective in non-central schools where students often require additional support.

Regarding grade level handled, the distribution is nearly equal with 67 respondents or 48.2% handling Key Stage 1 and 72 respondents or 51.8% handling Key Stage 2. This balanced distribution ensures that the study captures perspectives from both early and intermediate grade levels, providing a comprehensive view of instructional practices across foundational stages of education. Key Stage 1 focuses on building basic reading, writing, and arithmetic competencies, while Key Stage 2 consolidates these skills into more complex academic performances. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that effective leadership involves setting clear goals appropriate for different grade levels, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) found that coaching is essential in helping educators adapt their strategies to grade-level-specific learning gaps. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found structured tutoring highly effective in early grades where foundational skills are developed, while Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) confirmed that tutoring remains effective across all grade levels when properly designed. Tayab (2024) demonstrated that tutoring significantly improves reading comprehension among early-grade learners, while Cereno and Quinito (2025) showed its effectiveness in numeracy remediation at higher grade levels, reinforcing the importance of addressing both key stages in recovery efforts.

In terms of teaching load, the majority of respondents, comprising 103 teachers or 74.1%, carry the standard load of 360 minutes per day. Twenty-five respondents or 18.0% handle more than 360 minutes, while 11 respondents or 7.9% handle less than 360 minutes. The presence of teachers carrying loads above the standard is particularly notable in recovery program contexts, where additional responsibilities such as remediation and tutoring are expected alongside regular instruction. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that clear goal-setting and monitoring can help teachers manage their workload more effectively, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) highlighted that coaching enables teachers to optimize their instructional time even under demanding conditions. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that high-dosage tutoring programs are effective but require dedicated time and effort, while Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) emphasized that tutoring effectiveness depends on consistency and quality rather than sheer quantity, supporting the argument that even teachers with heavier workloads can contribute meaningfully when interventions are well-designed.

Concerning the number of years in teaching, 54 respondents or 38.8% have less than 10 years of experience, 49 respondents or 35.3% have 10-19 years, and 36 respondents or 25.9% have more than 20 years. This diversity in professional experience reflects a balanced mix of early-career, mid-career, and veteran teachers, each contributing different strengths to recovery program implementation. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that leadership practices must be responsive to varying levels of teacher experience through differentiated goal-setting and

monitoring, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) found that coaching is particularly effective in supporting less experienced teachers while also enhancing the skills of more experienced educators. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that experienced teachers are often more effective in delivering structured tutoring due to their mastery of content and pedagogy, while Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) emphasized that training and structure rather than experience alone determine tutoring effectiveness, suggesting that all teachers regardless of career stage can contribute meaningfully when properly supported.

Finally, regarding the number of relevant seminars and trainings attended, 80 respondents or 57.6% have attended 4-6 trainings, 38 respondents or 27.3% have attended 1-3, and 21 respondents or 15.1% have attended 7 or more. The predominance of respondents with moderate training exposure suggests a solid but still-developing foundation for professional growth. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that leadership plays a crucial role in promoting professional development through systematic monitoring, while Rivera (2024) and Blas and Guhao (2023) highlighted that coaching enhances the impact of training by helping teachers apply new knowledge in practice. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that well-trained tutors are more successful in delivering structured interventions, and Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) emphasized that training enhances the quality and consistency of tutoring programs. Tayab (2024) and Cereno and Quinito (2025) demonstrated in the Philippine context that training significantly improves the effectiveness of tutoring initiatives particularly in literacy and numeracy remediation, reinforcing the importance of aligning professional development opportunities with program goals and ensuring that all teachers, including those with the least training exposure, are adequately supported.

Level of Readiness and Responsiveness in Implementing the ARAL Program

Learner readiness. The descriptive statistics on learner readiness reveal an overall mean of 3.54 (s = 0.91), interpreted as high, indicating that learners in the ARAL program are generally prepared to engage in literacy and numeracy recovery activities. Among the indicators, "Learners are assessed using CRLA, Phil-IRI or RMA" obtained the highest mean of 3.68 (s = 0.86), followed by "ARAL Learner Roster was generated and validated based on assessment results" with a mean of 3.65 (s = 1.00), and "The targeted learners have undergone the mandatory health assessment" with a mean of 3.63 (s = 0.86). "Learners tagged with health/nutrition risk are referred" recorded a mean of 3.60 (s = 0.80), "The school established a mechanism for following up at-risk learners" obtained a mean of 3.56 (s = 0.72), "Counseling services are readily available to ARAL Learners" yielded a mean of 3.54 (s = 0.72), and "Learners who are emotionally at risk are referred to guidance or the Mental Health services" and "Learners actively participate in learning activities" both recorded a mean of 3.48 (s = 0.90 and s = 0.89, respectively). "Learners can follow instructions during tutoring sessions" obtained a mean of 3.46 (s = 0.97), while the lowest-rated indicator, "Learners demonstrate interest in participating in the ARAL program," recorded a mean of 3.32 (s = 1.37), falling within the moderate range. This pattern suggests that while learners are participating and progressing, intrinsic interest in the program may still require deliberate strengthening, possibly reflecting motivation driven more by external prompting from teachers and parents than by sustained internal engagement. Jutara and De Jesus (2024) emphasized that structured guidance and orientations improve learner engagement in literacy and numeracy, while Narzoles and Alon (2023) found that responsive communication between schools and parents enhances learner motivation and participation. The Department of Education (2023) similarly reported improvements in reading and numeracy outcomes when learners are consistently supported by both teachers and families, confirming that the high level of learner readiness observed in this

study is underpinned by strong relational support systems among teachers, parents, and learners, consistent with Social Capital Theory's emphasis on collaborative networks within the school community.

Teacher or tutor readiness. The level of teacher or tutor readiness yielded an overall mean of 3.34 (s = 0.97), interpreted as moderate, indicating that while tutors are generally prepared for ARAL implementation, their readiness is not consistently strong across all dimensions. The highest-rated indicators include "The school identified a sufficient number of tutors from eligible sources" with a mean of 3.60 (s = 0.86), "Tutors selected based on prescribed criteria" with a mean of 3.51 (s = 0.84), "Tutors completed the required ARAL training modules" with a mean of 3.48 (s = 1.00), and "There is a documented plan with assigned learners, session times, and subject focus tutors" with a mean of 3.45 (s = 0.83), all falling within the high range. The remaining indicators fall within the moderate range: "The tutorial workload is integrated into the teacher's or tutor's class/program load without overburdening" recorded a mean of 3.40 (s = 1.03), "A provision for incentives is in place" obtained a mean of 3.28 (s = 0.88), "There is a structured class program with time blocks, groupings, and activities per week" yielded a mean of 3.27 (s = 1.15), "Teaching practices, materials, or learners' strategies are shared among tutors" and "Tutors are prepared with lesson plans and materials" both recorded a mean of 3.17 (s = 1.23 and s = 0.95, respectively), and the lowest-rated indicator, "Tutors use appropriate teaching strategies," obtained a mean of 3.10 (s = 0.94). These results suggest that while tutors possess foundational training knowledge and are properly selected, practical implementation skills, consistency in strategy use, and resource preparation remain areas for improvement. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) emphasized that effective tutoring requires sustained training and structured support systems, and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that instructional quality improves when tutors receive consistent coaching. The Department of Education Region VIII (2023) reported that tutor effectiveness improves when embedded in well-supported school systems, while Pennington et al. (2024) stressed the importance of structured supervision, reinforcing the conclusion that tutor readiness in the present study, while functional, requires further development to reach an optimal level.

School environment readiness. The overall mean for school environment readiness was 3.27 (s = 1.04), interpreted as moderate, with all ten indicators falling within this range. The highest-rated indicator, "There is a designated ARAL Room or space," obtained a mean of 3.36 (s = 1.02), followed by "Adequate school furniture is available and functional" with a mean of 3.33 (s = 1.19). "The school meets the basic sanitation requirements and standards in line with the WinS Three-Star Approach" and "The school meets the basic requirements and standards for health education in line with the WinS Three-Star Approach" both recorded a mean of 3.30 (s = 0.97 and s = 1.03, respectively). "The school meets the basic requirements and standards for adequate and safe water," "ARAL teaching guides, workbooks, and remedial modules are available for learners and tutors," and "Learners have sufficient access to textbooks, print modules, and the digital LMS" all obtained a mean of 3.27 (s = 1.06, s = 1.06, and s = 1.07, respectively). "Digital devices are accessible for tutorials or assessments" recorded a mean of 3.22 (s = 1.02), "Electricity is available and stable during ARAL implementation" obtained a mean of 3.19 (s = 0.93), and the lowest-rated indicator, "The internet connectivity meets the required specifications," yielded a mean of 3.18 (s = 1.09). These results suggest that while schools provide basic structural support, they lack fully optimized learning environments necessary for high-impact recovery programs, with constraints in digital infrastructure and connectivity posing particular concerns. Rivera (2024) highlighted that curriculum-aligned environments improve recovery outcomes, while Dhandapani and Kaur (2024) stressed that

responsiveness depends on resource mobilization. The Department of Education (2023) found that learning environments significantly influence literacy recovery success, and from the perspective of Social Capital Theory, the moderate results suggest that while structural spaces exist, stronger coordination among stakeholders is needed to maximize the effectiveness of the school environment in supporting ARAL implementation.

Parental engagement readiness. Parental engagement readiness obtained the lowest overall mean of 3.18 (s = 1.10) among all readiness dimensions, interpreted as moderate. The highest-rated indicators include "All identified ARAL learners submitted signed parents/guardian consent forms" with a mean of 3.38 (s = 1.11), "Parents/guardians are aware and fully oriented of their child's inclusion in ARAL" with a mean of 3.37 (s = 0.93), and "Parents/guardians are aware of their role in the ARAL implementation" with a mean of 3.36 (s = 0.88). "The PTA supported the conduct of preparatory activities for the ARAL implementation" obtained a mean of 3.26 (s = 0.95), "The school conducted orientation or parenting education sessions to support the ARAL Program at home" yielded a mean of 3.21 (s = 1.19), "There is a system to track parent-teacher communication on learner progress" and "Participants were able to access the Network Stress Test" both recorded a mean of 3.09 (s = 1.15 and s = 1.22, respectively), "The school has sufficient computers/laptops for ARAL use" obtained a mean of 3.06 (s = 1.15), "Available computers meet the minimum ARAL tech specs" yielded a mean of 3.01 (s = 1.22), and the lowest-rated indicator, "The school has computer rooms," recorded a mean of 2.97 (s = 1.24). These findings reveal that while parents are somewhat informed and initially consenting, their structured and sustained engagement remains limited. Escol and Alcopra (2024) identified socio-economic barriers to parental engagement, while Narzoles and Alon (2023) emphasized the importance of structured school communication in overcoming these barriers. Pennington et al. (2024) highlighted that monitoring systems improve parental participation, while Barth and Tsemach (2025) stressed the importance of community involvement. Epstein's framework of parental involvement confirms that engagement is multi-dimensional and requires school-initiated structures to develop, and Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler's model further explains that participation depends on school invitations and parents' perceived efficacy, both of which require more deliberate cultivation in the present context.

Systems support and governance readiness. The overall mean for systems support and governance readiness was 3.40 (s = 0.92), interpreted as moderate. The four highest-rated indicators fell within the high range: "ARAL Program is included in the School Improvement Plan and MOOE budget allocations" obtained the highest mean of 3.57 (s = 1.03), "The School Governance Council is engaged in ARAL Implementation" recorded a mean of 3.53 (s = 0.77), "The Local School Board allocated Special Education Fund or passed resolution to support ARAL needs" obtained a mean of 3.48 (s = 0.85), and "The LGU issued local ordinances, executive orders, or inter-agency support mechanisms related to ARAL" yielded a mean of 3.45 (s = 0.83). The remaining six indicators fell within the moderate range: "The Division/Regional Office provided coaching, mentoring, or feedback to the school on ARAL program planning and preparation" and "The school head, non-teaching personnel, and local persons received formal capacity development from DepEd, HEIs or NGOs" both recorded a mean of 3.39 (s = 1.03 and s = 0.90, respectively), "There is an active partnership with private organizations, academe, NGOs or Civil Society Organizations supporting ARAL" and "The SDO/school designated Administrative Officer/Project Development Officer to assist in ARAL coordination" both obtained a mean of 3.34 (s = 0.90), "The school Child Protection Committee is organized and functioning" yielded a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.89), and the lowest-rated indicator, "There is an established mechanism for reporting and monitoring bullying/abuse cases affecting ARAL Learners," recorded a mean of 3.15 (s = 1.14). These results indicate that while

governance structures and policy frameworks are relatively well-established, operational coordination, external partnerships, and child protection mechanisms require further strengthening. Rivera (2024) and the Department of Education (2023) emphasized that governance structures significantly influence learning recovery outcomes, and from the perspective of instructional leadership theory, the moderate results suggest partial achievement of the leadership functions of providing clear direction, supervision, and resource alignment.

Summary of readiness and responsiveness. The grand mean for overall school readiness and responsiveness in implementing the ARAL program was 3.35 (s = 0.99), interpreted as moderate. Among the five dimensions, learner readiness achieved the highest mean of 3.54 (s = 0.91), rated high, while systems support and governance readiness recorded a mean of 3.40 (s = 0.92), teacher or tutor readiness obtained a mean of 3.34 (s = 0.97), school environment readiness yielded a mean of 3.27 (s = 1.04), and parental engagement readiness recorded a mean of 3.18 (s = 1.10), all interpreted as moderate. This pattern suggests that learners are relatively prepared, but institutional and family-level systems require significant strengthening to fully support recovery efforts. The Department of Education (2023), Obuta et al. (2025), and Rivera (2024) collectively confirmed that effective recovery requires the integration of leadership, instructional support, and parental involvement, and the moderate grand mean reflects the partial but still-developing realization of this integrated system in the present context.

Level of Engagement

Affective engagement. The descriptive statistics on affective engagement reveal an overall mean of 3.35 (s = 0.89), interpreted as moderate, indicating that tutors demonstrate a fair level of emotional connection and motivation in delivering the ARAL program. The three highest-rated indicators fell within the high range: "I feel motivated when conducting tutoring sessions in the ARAL program" obtained the highest mean of 3.53 (s = 0.85), "I maintain a positive attitude when teaching learners" recorded a mean of 3.43 (s = 0.89), and "I enjoy assisting learners in improving their academic performance" yielded a mean of 3.42 (s = 0.91). The remaining indicators fell within the moderate range: "I feel satisfied with my contribution to the ARAL program" obtained a mean of 3.40 (s = 0.81), "I remain enthusiastic during tutoring sessions" recorded a mean of 3.34 (s = 0.95), "I feel valued as a tutor in the school" yielded a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.89), "I feel a sense of fulfillment when learners show progress" obtained a mean of 3.32 (s = 0.94), "I show concern for learners who struggle academically" recorded a mean of 3.29 (s = 0.79), "I feel responsible for the success of my learners" yielded a mean of 3.22 (s = 0.92), and the lowest-rated indicator, "I am emotionally committed to my role as a tutor," obtained a mean of 3.20 (s = 0.91). These results indicate that while tutors possess intrinsic motivation and a positive disposition toward their roles, limitations in sustained emotional commitment, likely related to workload, insufficient recognition, or inadequate support systems, temper their overall affective engagement. Hallinger (2021) highlighted that when school leaders set clear goals and provide continuous support, teacher efficacy and motivation improve, while Barth and Tsemach (2025) noted that acknowledging tutors' contributions enhances motivation and program sustainability. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) emphasized that effective tutoring requires not only technical skills but also strong interpersonal relationships and motivation, and Jones and Palikara (2023) highlighted that tutor enthusiasm fosters learner confidence and resilience, confirming that strengthening affective engagement through recognition and inclusive leadership practices is a priority for ARAL program sustainability.

Behavioral engagement. The overall mean for behavioral engagement was 3.26 (s = 1.04), interpreted as moderate, with only the highest-rated indicator falling within the high range. "I actively participate in all tutoring sessions assigned to me" obtained a mean of 3.43 (s = 0.85), interpreted as high, while all remaining indicators were rated moderate: "I complete required reports and documentation on time" recorded a mean of 3.34 (s = 0.94), "I manage my time effectively during tutoring sessions" obtained a mean of 3.28 (s = 1.06), "I attend meetings and trainings related to the ARAL program" and "I follow scheduled tutoring sessions regularly" and "I provide additional support to learners when needed" all yielded a mean of 3.27 (s = 1.11, s = 1.11, and s = 1.06, respectively), "I collaborate with other teachers and tutors" and "I monitor learners' progress consistently" both recorded a mean of 3.26 (s = 1.12 and s = 1.00, respectively), "I implement strategies to improve learners' performance" obtained a mean of 3.15 (s = 1.07), and the lowest-rated indicator, "I consistently prepare materials for tutoring sessions," yielded a mean of 3.09 (s = 1.11). This pattern suggests that while tutors are present and fulfilling their primary attendance responsibilities, challenges in sustaining consistent effort across documentation, material preparation, monitoring, and collaborative activities point to the need for stronger organizational systems and expectations. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that clear expectations and regular monitoring improve teacher performance, while Blas and Guhao (2023) found that monitoring literacy and numeracy interventions enhances accountability. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) highlighted that high-dosage tutoring requires consistent attendance, preparation, and monitoring, and Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) confirmed that the effectiveness of tutoring programs depends on sustained and structured implementation, suggesting that clearer guidelines, structured schedules, and ongoing supervision are necessary to elevate behavioral engagement from its current moderate level.

Cognitive engagement. Cognitive engagement yielded the highest overall mean of 3.48 (s = 0.96) among the three dimensions of engagement, interpreted as high, with eight of the ten indicators falling within the high range. "I adjust my teaching based on learners' performance" obtained the highest mean of 3.61 (s = 0.83), followed by "I continuously seek ways to improve my tutoring strategies" with a mean of 3.58 (s = 1.21), "I encourage learners to think critically" and "I design activities that promote deeper understanding" and "I analyze learners' strengths and weaknesses" all with means of 3.53 (s = 0.82), 3.52 (s = 0.90), and 3.52 (s = 0.82), respectively. "I integrate new knowledge from trainings into my teaching" obtained a mean of 3.48 (s = 0.91), "I reflect on my teaching practices to improve my effectiveness" yielded a mean of 3.45 (s = 0.90), and "I use problem-solving approaches during tutoring" recorded a mean of 3.42 (s = 1.04). Only two indicators fell within the moderate range: "I plan lessons that require active learner participation" obtained a mean of 3.35 (s = 1.26) and "I apply different teaching strategies to meet learners' needs" yielded a mean of 3.34 (s = 0.88). These findings indicate that tutors are not merely delivering content but are actively adapting and improving their instructional approaches, demonstrating reflective practice and professional learning integration that are essential for effective recovery instruction. Alinsunurin (2020) highlighted that using data to guide instruction improves learner outcomes, while Kim (2020) emphasized the importance of feedback and reflection in enhancing teaching effectiveness. Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that effective tutoring requires the ability to adapt instruction based on learner needs, and the Department of Education Region VIII (2023) reported that tutors who applied reflective and adaptive strategies significantly improved learners' numeracy skills. However, the moderate ratings for lesson planning and strategy diversification indicate areas where further professional development is needed to maximize the full impact of tutors' cognitive capabilities.

PANTAO
(International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
Volume 5, Issue 2
ISSN 3028-0877 | DOI 10.69651/2022PIJHSS

Summary of engagement. The summary results on the level of engagement show a grand mean of 3.36 (s = 0.96), interpreted as moderate. Among the three dimensions, cognitive engagement ranked highest with a mean of 3.48 (s = 0.96), interpreted as high, while affective engagement obtained a mean of 3.35 (s = 0.89) and behavioral engagement recorded a mean of 3.26 (s = 1.04), both interpreted as moderate. This pattern reveals an important imbalance: tutors are intellectually engaged in their roles and capable of reflective, adaptive instruction, yet their emotional commitment and behavioral consistency remain insufficiently sustained. Hallinger (2021) emphasized that leadership practices such as goal-setting, monitoring, and professional development enhance teacher effectiveness across all engagement dimensions, while Darling-Hammond et al. (2021) and Kraft and Goldstein (2022) found that effective tutoring requires a combination of cognitive skills, emotional commitment, and consistent behavior. Nickow, Oreopoulos, and Quan (2022) confirmed that sustained engagement is critical for closing learning gaps, and the Department of Education Region VIII (2023) emphasized the importance of integrating tutoring into school-led recovery plans, reinforcing the conclusion that cognitive capacity alone is insufficient and that affective and behavioral engagement must also be strengthened through enhanced leadership, recognition systems, and structured support.

Degree of Parental Involvement

Parenting. The degree of parental involvement in terms of parenting yielded an overall mean of 3.48 (s = 0.96), interpreted as high, with nine of the ten indicators falling within the high range. The three highest-rated indicators include "Parents support discipline in learning activities" with a mean of 3.54 (s = 0.82), "Parents guide their children in developing good study habits" with a mean of 3.53 (s = 1.01), and "Parents set expectations for academic performance" with a mean of 3.53 (s = 1.02). "Parents encourage their children to attend ARAL sessions regularly" and "Parents motivate children to improve academically" both recorded a mean of 3.49 (s = 1.00 and s = 0.81, respectively). "Parents provide basic needs that support their child's learning," "Parents create a home environment conducive to studying," and "Parents show concern for their child's education" all obtained a mean of 3.47 (s = 1.11, s = 1.11, and s = 0.82, respectively). "Parents ensure children complete school requirements" yielded a mean of 3.42 (s = 0.88), while the only indicator falling within the moderate range, "Parents monitor their children's behavior at home," recorded a mean of 3.36 (s = 1.00). These results indicate that parents play a strong role in shaping learners' attitudes and behaviors toward education, although some inconsistency in sustained behavioral monitoring is evident. Jutara and De Jesus (2024) found that structured orientations and communication strategies enhance parental engagement particularly in reinforcing discipline and academic expectations at home, while Tus (2021) and Alharthi et al. (2022) confirmed that home supervision and parental encouragement positively affect academic performance. Escol and Alcopra (2024) and Rasonabe (2024) noted that while parents are generally willing to support their children, gaps in school-provided guidance can limit the effectiveness of their involvement, reinforcing the need for schools to provide clearer frameworks and sustained communication to optimize the already strong parenting dimension identified in this study.

Learning at home. The degree of parental involvement in terms of learning at home yielded an overall mean of 3.21 (s = 0.90), interpreted as moderate. Three indicators fell within the high range: "Parents help children review lessons at home" and "Parents monitor study schedules at home" both recorded a mean of 3.43 (s = 0.93 and s = 0.89, respectively), and "Parents explain lessons when children have difficulty" obtained a mean of 3.42 (s = 0.82). The

remaining indicators fell within the moderate range: "Parents encourage independent learning at home" recorded a mean of 3.35 (s = 0.95), "Parents ensure a quiet place for studying" obtained a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.90), "Parents provide time for home study activities" yielded a mean of 3.32 (s = 0.94), "Parents support completion of ARAL tasks at home" obtained a mean of 3.31 (s = 0.81), "Parents check their children's schoolwork regularly" recorded a mean of 3.23 (s = 0.93), "Parents guide children in reading and comprehension activities" obtained a mean of 3.21 (s = 0.91), and the lowest-rated indicator, "Parents assist their children in answering assignments," yielded a mean of 2.09 (s = 0.95). This last indicator, while still interpreted as moderate, stands as a notably weaker area and may reflect parents' limited content knowledge, time constraints, or reduced confidence in assisting with academic tasks. Escol and Alcopra (2024) and Rasonabe (2024) identified gaps in parental capability and clarity of guidance as barriers to effective home-based learning support, while Jutara and De Jesus (2024) emphasized that parental engagement in this domain is strongly influenced by the quality of communication and support from schools. O'Connor-Bones et al. (2022) and Lawrence (2021) emphasized that active parental involvement in home learning significantly improves literacy outcomes, suggesting that the moderate rating in this dimension represents a meaningful opportunity for school-driven improvement through targeted training and structured communication.

School volunteering. The degree of parental involvement in terms of school volunteering yielded an overall mean of 3.33 (s = 0.91), interpreted as moderate. Four indicators fell within the high range: "Parents participate in school activities and events," "Parents volunteer in school maintenance or improvement activities," and "Parents contribute time for school improvement efforts" all recorded a mean of 3.43 (s = 0.86, s = 0.90, and s = 0.89, respectively), and "Parents show willingness to help the school" obtained a mean of 3.42 (s = 0.83). The remaining indicators fell within the moderate range: "Parents actively support ARAL program implementation" recorded a mean of 3.36 (s = 0.94), "Parents attend school meetings and assemblies" obtained a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.97), "Parents help organize school-related activities" yielded a mean of 3.31 (s = 0.79), "Parents assist teachers during school activities when needed" recorded a mean of 3.24 (s = 0.92), "Parents support fundraising or school projects" obtained a mean of 3.22 (s = 0.91), and the lowest-rated indicator, "Parents assist during school programs and ARAL activities," yielded a mean of 3.11 (s = 1.13). These findings indicate that parents are generally willing to contribute to school initiatives, yet their active involvement in ARAL-specific activities and targeted school volunteering remains limited. Jutara and De Jesus (2024) emphasized that parental involvement in school activities depends on effective communication and structured opportunities, while Escol and Alcopra (2024) and Rasonabe (2024) noted that unclear school guidance frequently limits active participation despite parental willingness. Obuta et al. (2025) demonstrated that family involvement in school initiatives contributes to improved problem-solving and learning outcomes, and Dela Cruz (2024) found that structured parental involvement in school programs significantly improved numeracy remediation, confirming that increasing the structure and clarity of volunteering opportunities can directly enhance learning recovery outcomes.

Decision making and involvement. The degree of parental involvement in terms of decision making and involvement yielded an overall mean of 3.31 (s = 0.92), interpreted as moderate. Only two indicators reached the high range: "Parents are consulted on school programs and policies" and "Parents voice concerns about school issues" both recorded a mean of 3.42 (s = 0.87 and s = 0.92, respectively). All remaining indicators fell within the moderate range: "Parents are active partners in school governance" obtained a mean of 3.42 (s = 0.82), "Parents help in setting academic goals for learners" recorded a mean of 3.35 (s = 0.95), "Parents participate in school decision-making activities" yielded a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.90),

"Parents collaborate with teachers in decision-making" obtained a mean of 3.32 (s = 0.96), "Parents support school improvement plans" recorded a mean of 3.31 (s = 0.80), "Parents are involved in evaluating school programs" obtained a mean of 3.22 (s = 0.93), "Parents participate in planning ARAL-related activities" yielded a mean of 3.20 (s = 0.93), and the lowest-rated indicator, "Parents attend PTA meetings regularly," recorded a mean of 3.09 (s = 1.12). These results indicate that while parents are invited to consultation processes and willing to voice concerns, deeper engagement in shared decision-making, governance collaboration, and program planning remains limited. Jutara and De Jesus (2024) highlighted that parental engagement improves when schools provide clear communication channels and defined roles, while Escol and Alcopra (2024) and Rasonabe (2024) reported that parents are often hindered by a lack of clarity regarding their roles in school decision-making. Obuta et al. (2025) and Dela Cruz (2024) emphasized that collaborative decision-making between schools and families leads to improved learner outcomes, and Narzoles and Alon (2023) highlighted that parental willingness to engage must be supported by structured frameworks to achieve meaningful participation, reinforcing the need to move beyond surface-level consultation toward genuine partnership in program governance.

Familiarity with school communication. The degree of parental involvement in terms of familiarity with school communication yielded an overall mean of 3.33 (s = 0.92), interpreted as moderate. Three indicators fell within the high range: "Parents are consulted on school programs and policies" and "Parents participate in school decision-making activities" both recorded a mean of 3.45 (s = 0.88 and s = 0.90, respectively), and "Parents are active partners in school governance" obtained a mean of 3.43 (s = 0.85). The remaining indicators fell within the moderate range: "Parents participate in planning ARAL-related activities" recorded a mean of 3.37 (s = 0.94), "Parents voice concerns about school issues" and "Parents collaborate with teachers in decision-making" both obtained a mean of 3.35 (s = 0.88 and s = 0.94, respectively), "Parents attend PTA meetings regularly" yielded a mean of 3.32 (s = 0.82), "Parents are involved in evaluating school programs" obtained a mean of 3.25 (s = 0.92), "Parents support school improvement plans" recorded a mean of 3.23 (s = 0.91), and the lowest-rated indicator, "Parents help in setting academic goals for learners," yielded a mean of 3.10 (s = 1.11). These findings suggest that while communication channels exist and parents are informed to a degree, the clarity, consistency, and actionability of school-to-parent communication are not yet sufficient to fully activate parental engagement. Jutara and De Jesus (2024) emphasized that effective communication is a key predictor of parental involvement, while Escol and Alcopra (2024) and Rasonabe (2024) identified gaps in communication as a primary barrier to active participation. Tus (2021) and Alharthi et al. (2022) highlighted that effective communication enhances parental supervision and support leading to improved student outcomes, and Dela Cruz (2024) demonstrated that structured parental guidelines significantly improve numeracy remediation, further confirming that enhancing the clarity, frequency, and accessibility of school-to-parent communication is a foundational requirement for deepening all dimensions of parental involvement.

Summary of parental involvement. The summary results on the degree of parental involvement reveal an overall grand mean of 3.33 (s = 0.92), interpreted as moderate. Among the five dimensions, parenting ranked highest with a mean of 3.48 (s = 0.96), interpreted as high, confirming that parents demonstrate a strong foundation of home-based support. Learning at home obtained a mean of 3.21 (s = 0.90), school volunteering recorded a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.91), decision making and involvement yielded a mean of 3.31 (s = 0.92), and familiarity with school communication obtained a mean of 3.33 (s = 0.92), all interpreted as moderate. The pattern reflects strong parental commitment at the foundational level of child-rearing while

other more structured and collaborative forms of involvement remain underdeveloped. Tus (2021) and Alharthi et al. (2022) confirmed the importance of parental supervision and encouragement in improving academic performance, while Jutara and De Jesus (2024) identified communication and partnership strategies as key determinants of deeper engagement. Escol and Alcopra (2024) and Rasonabe (2024) noted that unclear guidance limits effective parental involvement, and Narzoles and Alon (2023) pointed to a mismatch between parental willingness and structured school support as the primary gap to be addressed. O'Connor-Bones et al. (2022) and Lawrence (2021) confirmed that parental participation enhances literacy outcomes, while Obuta et al. (2025) highlighted its impact on problem-solving and academic performance, reinforcing the study's conclusion that parental involvement represents a critical but uneven resource that must be more deliberately cultivated through integrated leadership, communication, and structured engagement strategies.

Relationship Between the Profile of the Respondents and School Readiness and Responsiveness

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the individual contributions of each profile variable to the school's level of readiness and responsiveness. Among all variables tested, only age (beta = -0.441, p = 0.026) and school (beta = -0.483, p = 0.001) were found to be statistically significant predictors at the 0.05 level of significance, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis for these two variables. All other variables, including sex (beta = 0.071, p = 0.594), civil status (beta = 0.079, p = 0.622), highest educational attainment (beta = 0.000, p = 0.800), position (beta = 0.221, p = 0.424), grade level handled (beta = -0.063, p = 0.711), teaching load (beta = 0.371, p = 0.067), number of years in teaching (beta = 0.246, p = 0.164), and number of relevant seminars or trainings attended (beta = -0.202, p = 0.330), were not statistically significant, and their corresponding null hypotheses were retained. Teaching load, while not crossing the significance threshold, approaches it at p = 0.067, indicating a potential influence that may warrant further investigation.

The negative beta coefficient for age suggests that younger teachers tend to perceive and contribute to higher levels of readiness and responsiveness, which may be attributed to greater adaptability, openness to innovation, and familiarity with newer teaching approaches essential in implementing recovery programs. The significant negative coefficient for school indicates that the type of school plays a crucial role in determining readiness and responsiveness, with non-central schools facing greater challenges in terms of limited resources, reduced access to training, and weaker organizational support systems. The overall model's explanatory power of R2 = 0.158 indicates that 15.8% of the variation in school readiness and responsiveness is explained by the profile variables included, suggesting that systemic and institutional factors beyond individual teacher characteristics are the primary determinants of readiness. Hallinger (2021) and Hallinger and Murphy's instructional leadership framework posit that leadership practices rather than demographic characteristics are the primary drivers of school effectiveness, which is consistent with the limited significance of most profile variables in the present analysis. Social Capital Theory (Coleman, 1988) further explains that relationships and collaborative practices within the school community are more influential than individual attributes, while Epstein's framework of parental involvement highlights that school practices rather than teacher demographics drive parental engagement. Narzoles and Alon (2023) and Pennington et al. (2024) reinforced that parental responsiveness to school communication and structured feedback mechanisms are more powerful enhancers of program success than teacher profile characteristics, collectively underscoring that ARAL

readiness must be addressed primarily through systemic leadership, governance, and community engagement strategies.

Relationship Between the Profile of the Respondents and Level of Engagement

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between teacher profile variables and tutors' level of engagement. Among all variables tested, only school (beta = -0.380, p = 0.008) was found to be a statistically significant predictor at the 0.05 level of significance, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis for this variable. All other variables, including age (beta = -0.163, p = 0.391), sex (beta = 0.070, p = 0.586), civil status (beta = -0.196, p = 0.209), highest educational attainment (beta = 0.167, p = 0.128), position (beta = 0.044, p = 0.869), grade level handled (beta = 0.043, p = 0.794), teaching load (beta = 0.183, p = 0.348), number of years in teaching (beta = 0.035, p = 0.839), and number of relevant seminars or trainings attended (beta = -0.169, p = 0.401), were not statistically significant, and their corresponding null hypotheses were retained.

The negative beta coefficient for school indicates that the school context significantly influences tutors' level of engagement, with non-central schools associated with lower engagement levels, likely due to their more constrained resource environments and less developed support structures. The non-significance of all individual teacher characteristics reinforces the conclusion that tutor engagement is shaped more decisively by institutional context than by personal attributes. This finding strongly supports Hallinger (2021) and Spillane's distributed leadership theory (2006), which posit that teacher effectiveness and engagement depend on organizational structures, shared responsibility, and leadership practices rather than on demographic variables. Social Capital Theory further explains that engagement improves within strong relational networks and that the absence of such networks in non-central schools may constrain tutor motivation and consistency. The findings from the profile-engagement analysis align with broader empirical evidence confirming that engagement sustainability in tutoring programs is an institutional and leadership challenge that must be addressed through structured support, recognition, and professional development systems distributed equitably across all school types.

Relationship Between the Profile of the Respondents and Degree of Parental Involvement

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between teacher profile variables and the degree of parental involvement. Among all variables tested, only school (beta = -0.403, p = 0.005) was found to be a statistically significant predictor at the 0.05 level of significance, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis for this variable. All other variables, including age (beta = -0.302, p = 0.111), sex (beta = 0.102, p = 0.430), civil status (beta = -0.291, p = 0.062), highest educational attainment (beta = 0.061, p = 0.572), position (beta = 0.298, p = 0.263), grade level handled (beta = 0.048, p = 0.769), teaching load (beta = 0.065, p = 0.736), number of years in teaching (beta = 0.016, p = 0.923), and number of relevant seminars or trainings attended (beta = -0.010, p = 0.962), were not statistically significant, and their corresponding null hypotheses were retained. Civil status approached significance at p = 0.062, indicating a borderline pattern that warrants cautious interpretation in future research.

The negative beta coefficient for school indicates that school context is the primary driver of parental involvement, with non-central schools associated with lower levels of parental engagement, likely due to limited infrastructure, geographical barriers, and fewer

organized programs that facilitate parent participation. This finding aligns directly with Social Capital Theory, which emphasizes that schools in more centralized locations tend to have stronger social networks and more established systems for engaging parents, leading to higher levels of involvement. Epstein's framework of parental involvement confirms that structured school practices rather than individual teacher characteristics are the primary determinants of parental engagement, and Hallinger and Murphy's instructional leadership framework reinforces that school leaders, by establishing clear policies and inclusive environments, can enhance parental involvement regardless of teacher profile characteristics. Narzoles and Alon (2023) found that parental responsiveness to school communication improves learner outcomes, while Escol and Alcopra (2024) highlighted the importance of structured support in overcoming contextual barriers to engagement, collectively confirming that the significant effect of school type on parental involvement underscores the need for context-sensitive leadership and targeted support strategies particularly in non-central school settings.

Relationships Among School Readiness and Responsiveness, Tutors' Level of Engagement, and Parents' Degree of Involvement

Pearson r correlation analysis was used to examine the interrelationships among school readiness and responsiveness, tutors' level of engagement, and parents' degree of involvement. All relationships were found to be positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level, resulting in the rejection of all null hypotheses. The relationship between school readiness and tutors' level of engagement yielded a Pearson r of 0.787 ($p = 0.000$), described as a strong positive relationship, indicating that schools that are more prepared and responsive support higher levels of tutor engagement across all dimensions. The relationship between school readiness and affective engagement was the strongest within this cluster, yielding a Pearson r of 0.910 ($p = 0.000$), described as a very strong positive relationship, followed by school readiness and behavioral engagement with a Pearson r of 0.818 ($p = 0.000$), and school readiness and cognitive engagement with a Pearson r of 0.804 ($p = 0.000$), both also described as very strong positive relationships. These results confirm that emotional motivation in particular is deeply embedded in and enabled by the overall quality of school preparedness and responsiveness. The relationship between school readiness and parents' degree of involvement yielded a Pearson r of 0.373 ($p = 0.000$), described as a moderate positive relationship, indicating that while school preparedness influences parental participation, the effect is less pronounced than its influence on tutor engagement, suggesting that parental involvement is mediated by additional contextual barriers beyond school readiness alone. The relationship between tutors' level of engagement and parents' degree of involvement yielded a Pearson r of 0.572 ($p = 0.000$), described as a moderate to strong positive relationship, indicating that increased tutor engagement is associated with greater parental involvement and highlighting the role of tutors as intermediaries who can bridge school-based support and family participation.

Within the parental involvement dimensions, indicators of parenting, learning at home, school volunteering, decision making, and communication showed significant positive correlations with readiness and engagement variables, with coefficients ranging from 0.420 to 0.940, confirming that parental participation functions as an integrated system deeply embedded in the overall functioning of school readiness and tutor engagement rather than as an independent or supplementary element. The systems support and governance dimension showed the strongest correlation with overall readiness ($r = 0.909$), confirming that governance structures are the primary institutional driver of ARAL implementation quality. Teacher readiness and school environment readiness yielded a correlation of $r = 0.941$, indicating that

instructional preparedness is highly dependent on the physical and organizational learning environment. These correlation patterns collectively confirm that ARAL program success depends on a highly interconnected ecosystem in which school readiness, tutor engagement, and parental involvement function as mutually reinforcing components.

Obuta et al. (2025) confirmed that improvements in learner performance are achieved when instructional supervision is combined with active family participation, while Garzon (2024) and Hamoc (2023) highlighted that parental involvement during recovery learning is essential but frequently constrained by structural limitations in school communication and support. Dela Cruz (2024) further emphasized that structured parental guidelines significantly improve numeracy remediation, and Narzoles and Alon (2023) identified the mismatch between parental willingness and actual participation as a gap that school systems and governance structures must bridge. Social Capital Theory provides the most comprehensive explanatory lens for these findings, emphasizing that trust, collaboration, and shared responsibility among stakeholders enhance educational outcomes, and that when schools, tutors, and parents are effectively connected, the collective capacity to support learners increases substantially. The present findings contribute to the existing literature by empirically demonstrating the interconnectedness of these variables in a unified analytical model, addressing a gap in the Philippine research base where most studies have examined leadership, tutoring, or parental involvement separately rather than as components of a single integrated recovery ecosystem.

Taken together, the findings of this study establish a coherent and empirically grounded understanding of ARAL program implementation as a multi-dimensional system driven by the interaction of learner readiness, tutor engagement, school environment quality, governance structures, and parental involvement. Learner readiness is the strongest performing dimension, reflecting the dedication of learners and the immediate effectiveness of school-level preparations, while tutor engagement demonstrates cognitive strength that is not yet fully matched by affective and behavioral consistency. Parental involvement remains the most underdeveloped variable, with parenting serving as a genuine strength but structured school-based and collaborative forms of engagement requiring deliberate institutional investment. Across all three multiple regression analyses, school type emerges as the most consistent and significant contextual predictor, underscoring that the organizational environment of a school, rather than the individual characteristics of its teachers, is the primary determinant of readiness, engagement, and parental involvement outcomes. The very strong positive correlations among all major variables confirm that ARAL program effectiveness cannot be achieved through improvements in any single dimension in isolation but requires synchronized and sustained effort across all educational stakeholders. These findings provide a substantive evidence base for the targeted policy recommendations, programmatic interventions, and leadership strategies that are detailed and elaborated in the succeeding chapter of this manuscript.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the implementation of the ARAL program is characterized by moderate overall readiness and responsiveness, with learner readiness emerging as the strongest component while tutor readiness, school environment, parental engagement, and governance systems remain at moderate levels. Tutors demonstrate strong cognitive engagement but only moderate affective and behavioral engagement, suggesting that while tutors possess the intellectual capacity to deliver the program, their emotional investment and consistent behavioral commitment require further cultivation. Parents, similarly, show strong

support at the home level but exhibit limited participation in structured school-based activities, pointing to a disconnect between domestic encouragement and formal program involvement. These patterns collectively indicate that while certain foundational elements of ARAL implementation are in place, critical dimensions of the program ecosystem have yet to reach their full operational potential.

Statistical analyses confirm that school readiness and responsiveness are significantly influenced more by institutional and systemic factors than by individual teacher characteristics, underscoring the primacy of organizational conditions in determining program effectiveness. This finding repositions the focus of improvement efforts from the individual level toward broader structural and governance considerations, affirming that sustainable gains in ARAL implementation cannot be achieved through personnel-centered interventions alone. Furthermore, strong interrelationships among readiness indicators, tutor engagement, and parental involvement emphasize that ARAL implementation functions as an interconnected system, wherein weaknesses in one dimension reverberate across others. Improving literacy and numeracy recovery outcomes therefore requires synchronized efforts across leadership, instruction, and family engagement, rather than isolated or fragmented interventions.

In light of these conclusions, a comprehensive set of recommendations is offered to guide program implementers, school leaders, and policymakers toward more effective and sustainable ARAL delivery. Continuous professional development programs for tutors should be strengthened, with deliberate focus on literacy and numeracy intervention strategies, while targeted motivational and recognition programs should also be established to address gaps in tutor affective and behavioral engagement. Alongside this, stronger collaboration between tutors and classroom teachers is recommended to ensure that remediation strategies are aligned with regular classroom instruction, thereby creating a more coherent and reinforcing learning experience for program beneficiaries.

Structured parental engagement programs should be institutionalized to improve both learning-at-home support and meaningful school collaboration, complemented by the establishment of stronger communication systems between schools and parents through digital and community-based platforms. Concurrently, school learning environments should be improved by enhancing instructional resources, physical spaces, and scheduling systems dedicated to ARAL sessions, supported by increased funding allocation specifically directed toward ARAL implementation activities. Clear and consistent implementation guidelines should be developed and standardized across schools to ensure fidelity and coherence in program delivery, while school leadership training should be enhanced with emphasis on instructional supervision, data-driven decision-making, and systematic program monitoring. Finally, further studies employing mediation analysis and structural equation modeling are recommended to examine the causal relationships among readiness, engagement, and learner outcomes, as such inquiry would deepen the theoretical and empirical foundations upon which future ARAL program improvements may be grounded.

REFERENCES

Alharthi, M., Alghamdi, A., & Alzahrani, H. (2022). Parental involvement and student achievement: Evidence from literacy and numeracy support. International Journal of Educational Research, 115, 102052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102052

Alinsunurin, J. (2020). Data-driven decision-making in Philippine public schools: Implications for instructional leadership (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines.

Alinsunurin, J. (2020). Instructional leadership practices in Philippine schools: Implications for school-based management. Philippine Journal of Education, 97(1), 23–40.

APASDG4Education2030. (2024). Mid-term review of SDG 4 progress in Asia-Pacific. UNESCO Asia-Pacific.

Baker, D. P., et al. (2020). Educational inequality and achievement gaps research.

Baldera, M. (2025). Instructional leadership practices of master teachers in public elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation). Philippine Normal University.

Barth, R., & Tsemach, E. (2025). Sustaining tutor and parental engagement in literacy recovery programs (Doctoral dissertation). University of Melbourne.

Barth, R., & Tsemach, S. (2025). Parent-school collaboration and its impact on student learning recovery. Educational Studies, 51(2), 145–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2025.1234567

Blas, M., & Guhao, E. (2023). Instructional supervision and teacher performance in literacy recovery programs. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 11(3), 56–68.

Blas, R., & Guhao, E. (2023). Monitoring literacy and numeracy interventions in Philippine schools (Master's thesis). Visayas State University.

Bloom, B. S. (1984). The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. Educational Researcher.

Cereno, L., & Quinito, R. (2025). Structured parental involvement programs and literacy recovery in Philippine schools. Philippine Educational Review, 76(1), 101–118.

Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (Eds.). (2012). Handbook of research on student engagement. Springer.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94(Supplement), S95–S120. https://doi.org/10.1086/228943

Day, C., Sammons, P., Leithwood, K., Hopkins, D., Gu, Q., Brown, E., & Ahtaridou, E. (2016). Successful school leadership.

Dela Cruz, A. (2024). Parent engagement initiatives and their effects on numeracy outcomes. Journal of Philippine Education Studies, 12(2), 77–89.

Department of Education. (2022). Basic education development plan and learning recovery guidelines. https://www.deped.gov.ph

Department of Education. (2023). DepEd Order No. 013, s. 2023: National learning recovery program.

Department of Education. (2023). Implementation of the academic recovery and accessible learning (ARAL) program in Philippine public schools (Master's thesis). University of the Philippines.

Department of Education. (2025). Memorandum on the ARAL school readiness and responsiveness audit (ASRRA). https://www.deped.gov.ph

Department of Education Region VIII. (2023). Tutor engagement and numeracy recovery under ARAL initiatives in Northern Samar (Master's thesis). Visayas State University.

Desforges, C., & Abouchaar, A. (2003). The impact of parental involvement on student achievement.

Epstein, J. L. (2001). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools. Westview Press.

Epstein, J. L. (2011). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools (2nd ed.). Westview Press.

Epstein, J. L. (2020). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools. Routledge.

Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. The Journal of Educational Research, 95(5), 308–318.

Escol, J., & Alcopra, M. (2024). Barriers to parental engagement in Philippine public schools. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(2), 45–62.

Escol, J., & Alcopra, M. (2024). Socio-economic barriers and parental involvement in literacy recovery (Doctoral dissertation). Leyte Normal University.

Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review.

Francis-Press, J. (2021). Parental involvement and school-community partnerships in post-pandemic education. Educational Review, 73(4), 512–528. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2021.1895274

Francis Press, J. (2021). Community collaboration and tutor engagement in school-led recovery plans (Doctoral dissertation). Ateneo de Manila University.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Fryer, R. G. (2017). The production of human capital in developed countries: Evidence from high-dosage tutoring.

Garcia, L., & de Guzman, M. (2020). Parental involvement among low-income Filipino families and literacy outcomes (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines.

Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. D. (2009). Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to intervention and multi-tier intervention.

Hallinger, P. (2021). A review of research on instructional leadership: Mapping the conceptual terrain. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(1), 9–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220985184

Hallinger, P. (2021). A systematic review of research on educational leadership and management in Southeast Asia. Journal of Educational Administration, 59(5), 539–557. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2020-0225

Hallinger, P. (2021). Instructional leadership and curriculum alignment in global recovery contexts (Systematic review). Mahidol University.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. Educational Leadership.

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2020). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. Developmental Psychology.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? Review of Educational Research, 67(1), 3–42. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001003

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2005). The social context of parental involvement: A path model. Educational Psychology Review.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. (2020). Parental involvement model: Beliefs, invitations, and efficacy in education (Systematic review). Vanderbilt University.

Jeynes, W. H. (2022). A meta-analysis on the effects of parental involvement on academic achievement. Urban Education, 57(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085920978517

Jones, A., & Palikara, O. (2023). Tutor engagement and learner resilience in literacy recovery programs (Doctoral dissertation). University of London.

Jones, G., & Palikara, O. (2023). Parent-school partnerships in recovery programs: Evidence from structured engagement platforms. British Journal of Educational Studies, 71(2), 189–207.

Jutara, M., & De Jesus, R. (2024). School leadership and parental engagement in Philippine recovery programs. Philippine Journal of Educational Policy, 10(1), 34–49.

Jutara, R., & De Jesus, P. (2024). Structured parental orientations and literacy support at home (Doctoral dissertation). Philippine Normal University.

Kim, S. (2020). Challenges of instructional leadership in balancing administrative and supervisory roles. Journal of Educational Administration, 58(3), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-07-2019-0123

Kim, S. (2020). Instructional guidance and reflective practice in teacher development (Doctoral dissertation). Seoul National University.

Kraft, M., & Goldstein, P. (2020). High-dosage tutoring and reading fluency improvement (Doctoral dissertation). Harvard University.

Lawrence, J. (2021). Parental support and student achievement in literacy and numeracy. Educational Studies, 47(5), 623–639. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2021.1895275

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). What we know about successful school leadership. National College for School Leadership.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2021). Leadership dimensions and student achievement: Setting direction, developing people, redesigning organizations (Systematic review). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Madulara, J., Paglinawan, R., & Orongan, P. (2025). Coaching and monitoring practices in instructional leadership. Philippine Journal of Teacher Education, 20(1), 55–72.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly.

Narzoles, J., & Alon, R. (2023). Parental responsiveness to school communication and learner outcomes (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines.

Narzoles, R., & Alon, P. (2023). School-community collaboration in rural education recovery. Philippine Educational Review, 75(1), 88–104.

Netolicky, D. (2020). School leadership and the pandemic: Navigating crisis and sustaining learning. Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 5(3), 281–290. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-05-2020-0017

Obuta, C., Santos, M., & Reyes, J. (2025). Parental involvement, student engagement, and academic performance in recovery programs. International Journal of Educational Development, 82, 102356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.102356

OECD. (2018). The future of education and skills: Education 2030 framework. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org

OECD. (2018). The resilience of education systems: Insights from PISA. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 results. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018). The resilience of education systems: Insights from PISA. OECD Publishing.

Ortiz, M., Reyes, J., & Villamor, P. (2025). Distributed instructional leadership styles in Philippine public schools (Doctoral dissertation). Philippine Normal University.

PAC Studies. (2025). Regional learning recovery assessments in Philippine schools. Philippine Academic Consortium.

Pennington, R., Hughes, T., & Clark, S. (2024). Structured parental engagement and student achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 117(3), 245–260.

Pennington, S., Cruz, A., & Villanueva, J. (2024). Tutor training, supervision, and parental monitoring in recovery programs (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Philippines.

Rasonabe, L. (2024). Parental supervision and learner mastery in literacy recovery. Philippine Journal of Education, 99(2), 45–62.

Rivera, C. (2024). Curriculum alignment and school readiness in recovery initiatives (Doctoral dissertation). University of Santo Tomas.

Rivera, J. (2024). Instructional leadership and learner outcomes in literacy recovery. Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership, 8(1), 22–39.

Robinson, V. M. J. (2011). Student-centered leadership: The key to school improvement.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3(1), 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

Slavin, R. E. (2020). How evidence-based reform will transform research and practice in education.

Sriklaub, K., & Wongwanich, S. (2021). Instructional leadership practices and challenges in Southeast Asian schools. International Journal of Educational Development, 81, 102340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102340

Sui-Chu, E. H., & Willms, J. D. (1996). Effects of parental involvement on eighth-grade achievement. Sociology of Education.

Torgesen, J. K. (2004). Preventing early reading difficulties.

UNESCO. (2021). Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org

UNESCO. (2022). Global education monitoring report. UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report: Education in a changing world. UNESCO Publishing. https://www.unesco.org

UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report: Learning recovery after disruption. UNESCO Publishing.

UNICEF. (2021). COVID-19 and learning loss report. UNICEF.

UNICEF. (2025). Tutoring and foundational learning recovery in Asia-Pacific (Systematic review). University of Melbourne.

UNICEF Philippines. (2022). Learning recovery and parental engagement in the Philippines. UNICEF Philippines.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.

World Bank. (2020). Remote learning, distance education and online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: A resource list. World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic: Shocks to education systems and recovery strategies. World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2022). Learning poverty global report. World Bank Group.

Zhang, Y., & Wu, L. (2025). Parental engagement and school leadership: A systematic analysis of collaborative practices. International Journal of Educational Research, 120, 102145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2025.102145