

Readiness Of The Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program (Aral) Among Public Schools

Celocia , Raphael T.

Abstract — This study investigates the relationship between the level of school readiness implementation and the perceived opportunities of the ARAL program, focusing on insights from both school heads and teachers. Utilizing Pearson r correlation analysis, the research examines key factors such as school infrastructure, teacher training, resource availability, parental involvement, and socio-emotional readiness, to understand their influence on ARAL program readiness and opportunities. Data from 36 school heads and 380 teachers reveal strong correlations between resource availability, teacher training, and infrastructure with the perceived readiness to implement the program. These findings highlight the critical role of tangible inputs in creating a supportive environment for ARAL’s literacy-centered objectives. Furthermore, the study identifies socio-emotional readiness and parental/community support as significant factors linked more closely with the perceived opportunities of the program, indicating that stakeholders view ARAL as a platform for broader developmental and community engagement outcomes beyond immediate instructional readiness. Notably, differences between school heads and teachers emerge, with teachers demonstrating stronger associations between infrastructure, parental involvement, and readiness, reflecting their frontline experience in classroom conditions. Conversely, school heads emphasize teacher training as pivotal for both readiness and future opportunities. The research underscores the need for an integrated approach combining material resources, professional development, and socio-emotional support to maximize the ARAL program’s impact. Recommendations include targeted investments in school infrastructure, sustained teacher training, active parental engagement, and community collaboration to enhance both readiness and opportunity dimensions. The study contributes valuable evidence for policymakers and education leaders aiming to implement literacy programs effectively while fostering holistic student development and community involvement.

Keywords: School Readiness, ARAL Program, Teacher Training, Parental Involvement, Socio-Emotional Readiness

I. INTRODUCTION

The introduction of a thesis provides the research context, outlining the main problem, its significance, and the study's objectives. It briefly reviews relevant theories or literature gaps, establishing the study's purpose and potential contributions. This section guides readers on what to expect, setting a foundation for the research's scope and impact.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to determine the readiness of the academic recovery and accessible learning program (ARAL) among public schools of Buenavista I & II Districts, DepEd Division of Bohol, during the school year 2025-2026 with the end view of proposing an enhancement program.

Specifically, the study seeks answers to the following questions.

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 School Heads;

1.1.1 Age;

1.1.2 Sex;

1.1.3 Civil Status;

1.1.4 Educational Attainment;

1.1.5 Position/Designation

1.1.6 Length of Administrative Experience; and

1.1.7 Number of Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended?

1.2 Teachers;

1.2.1 Age;

1.2.2 Sex;

1.2.3 Civil Status;

1.2.4 Educational Attainment;

1.2.5 Length of Teaching Experience; and

1.2.6 Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended?

2. What is the perceived school readiness of the respondent groups on the implementation of ARAL program in terms of:
 - 2.1 School Infrastructure;
 - 2.2 Teacher Training;
 - 2.3 Resource Availability;
 - 2.4 Effects on Reading Instruction;
 - 2.5 Parental Involvement?
3. What are the perceived opportunities of ARAL program in terms of:
 - 3.1 Cognitive Readiness;
 - 3.2 Socio-Emotional Readiness;
 - 3.3 Parental/Community Support Readiness; and
 - 3.4 Instructional Resource Readiness?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and their level of school readiness implementation for ARAL program?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the perceived opportunities of ARAL program?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of school readiness implementation and the perceived opportunities of ARAL program?
7. Based on the findings of the study, what enhancement program can be proposed?

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research approach employed in this study. This will include details on how the sample size was determined, the criteria for selecting survey locations and timing, and the methodology for choosing respondents. This chapter also explains the rationale behind the research strategy, the selection of research instruments, the data collection methods, and the statistical analysis techniques used to derive meaningful insights from the collected data.

Procedure

This paper will adopt a descriptive-correlational research process to investigate the effective administration and supervision influencing the outcomes and the challenges encountered within the Trinidad District. It will start with obtaining required permission in the School Division Office and to school administrators and then will involve orientation sessions where they should be made aware of the purpose of the study and their consent on the study as informed subjects is taken.

Data Processing

With the approval of the Schools Division Superintendent for the conduct of the study, the questionnaires will be personally distributed to all respondents, including school heads and school teachers of Buenavista I and II Districts, to achieve a 100 percent retrieval rate. Some school heads who are not available in their respective schools during the researcher's visit to their schools will be asked to answer the questionnaires during the district meeting as called by the public schools' district supervisor. The procedure for filling up the questionnaires will be thoroughly discussed with the respondents, and ample time will be given to them to answer the questionnaires. After the retrieval of the questionnaires, the researcher will identify those teachers who indicate their willingness to participate in the research process. All responses will be confidentially treated.

The guiding principle of sampling in qualitative research is one of convenience; however, the availability of people willing to allow the researcher to collect data about them is of high importance. Another main issue with sampling is whether or not readers will trust the findings. Therefore, providing information on how the researcher collected evidence, particularly in relation to how and why particular persons were selected, and detailed description about the process of gaining access and selection of the research participants is of paramount importance (Lincoln & Cuba, 1985). My strategy to gain entry to the research field and the participants was as follows. First, I talked to senior administrators in the school district and on the school board, and second, I

invited teachers and parents to participate in this study. I designed a flyer with information on the purpose of the study, date, schedule sessions of the focus group.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides a detailed presentation of the demographic profile of the school heads who participated in the study. Specifically, it outlines the distribution of respondents according to age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, position or designation, length of administrative experience, and the number of relevant seminars and trainings attended. Examining these variables through frequency and percentage, the study aims to establish a clearer understanding of the background and professional qualifications of the school leaders involved in the implementation of the ARAL program. The tabulated results are shown in the succeeding tables.

This section presents the frequency and percentage on the profile of the school heads in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, position/designation, length of administrative experience, and number of relevant seminars and trainings attended. The results are displayed below.

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE PROFILE OF THE SCHOOL HEADS IN TERMS OF AGE

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	4	11.1%
49-55	9	25.0%
42-48	11	30.6%
35-41	10	27.8%
28-34	2	5.6%
Total	36	100.0%

Age. The data shows that the majority of school heads fall within the age brackets of 42–48 (30.6%) and 35–41 (27.8%). These middle-aged professionals represent a generation likely to have experience and energy for leadership roles. The least represented group is the youngest (28–

34), comprising only 5.6%, suggesting limited upward mobility for younger educators into administrative roles. Older educators aged 56–62 account for 11.1%, which may indicate nearing retirement. These demographics are critical when considering reading instruction leadership, as age may correlate with exposure to or preference for traditional versus contemporary literacy practices.

The age profile of school heads can influence how reading programs are implemented, especially with shifts in pedagogical trends. Younger leaders may be more receptive to research-based innovations in EFL reading strategies (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). In contrast, older administrators may rely on established routines unless continuously updated through professional development. With most school heads in the 35–48 age range, there's potential for a balance of experience and openness to research-informed methods. Leadership age diversity ensures that educational decisions, including those about reading instruction, are informed by a range of generational perspectives. **Sex.** There is a relatively even distribution between male (47.2%) and female (52.8%) school heads, indicating a healthy gender balance in educational leadership. This equilibrium allows for a variety of perspectives in school management and policy-making. Research shows that gender-inclusive leadership can contribute to more equitable instructional strategies, including in literacy education. Both male and female leaders can champion reading development, ensuring that no gender bias shapes the design or delivery of reading programs. Balanced gender representation may foster more holistic approaches to improving reading comprehension and literacy rates among students.

Gender. Gender-sensitive approaches are especially relevant in reading research where differences in reading interests and styles across genders are acknowledged. A diverse leadership team can better address student needs through inclusive literacy programs. When both male and female heads support professional development in reading instruction, schools are more likely to implement practices grounded in studies such as those by Snow et al. (2005). Gender-balanced leadership can ensure equal attention is given to reading challenges among both boys and girls. This contributes to literacy gains, critical thinking skills, and broader educational equity.

Civil Status. The majority of school heads are married (69.4%), followed by single (19.4%), and a small portion are widowed or separated (5.6% each). Married leaders may benefit from greater stability, which could positively impact their effectiveness in school administration. Conversely, single school heads might have more flexibility for professional development opportunities such as literacy training. Understanding civil status could help tailor wellness and leadership programs that indirectly affect how school heads promote reading in their schools. Work-life balance, shaped partly by civil status, may influence the level of engagement in literacy improvement initiatives.

Highest Educational Attainment. Most school heads hold a master's degree (75.0%), with additional percentages holding master's units or degrees in-progress. Only a small proportion (2.8%) have completed a doctorate, and others are either CAR (Candidate for Academic Requirements) or with doctorate units. This reflects a leadership group that is largely well-educated, with substantial formal training in educational theory and practice. High educational attainment suggests that these administrators are likely aware of research-based best practices in reading instruction. Their academic backgrounds position them well to implement literacy strategies supported by studies like those of Temur and Sezer (2023).

Length Of Administrative Experience. The majority of school heads have 10–19 years of administrative experience (58.3%), indicating a seasoned leadership pool. Those with over 20 years of experience make up 16.7%, while newer leaders with less than 10 years account for 25.0%. This mix of experience levels can enhance institutional knowledge and innovative practice. Administrators with moderate to long experience are often better positioned to support sustained literacy initiatives. However, newer leaders may bring fresh insights aligned with current reading research and EFL strategies.

Seminars And Trainings Attended. Most school heads have attended regional (38.9%) and national (30.6%) seminars, suggesting strong participation in broader professional development efforts. Fewer have participated in international (19.4%) or division-level (11.1%) training. This indicates a commitment to upskilling, particularly through exposure to nationwide and regional literacy trends. Training at higher levels often incorporates the latest findings in reading research, enhancing school heads' capacity to implement evidence-based literacy strategies. Such exposure

supports the integration of reading comprehension, critical thinking, and language acquisition emphasized by researchers like Grabe & Stoller (2013).

This section presents the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents, highlighting key characteristics relevant to their professional background. The data include frequency and percentage distributions based on age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and the number of relevant seminars and trainings attended. Understanding these factors provides context for interpreting their perspectives on the implementation of the ARAL program. The detailed results are displayed in the tables below.

This presents the frequency and percentage on the profile of the teachers in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, number of relevant seminars and trainings attended. The results are shown below.

TABLE 9
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE PROFILE OF THE TEACHERS IN TERMS OF AGE

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	30	7.9%
49-55	46	12.1%
42-48	80	21.1%
35-41	126	33.2%
28-34	76	20.0%
Total	380	100.0%

Age. The largest group of teachers is aged 35–41 (33.2%), followed by those aged 42–48 (21.1%) and 28–34 (20.0%). This shows that the majority of teachers are in their prime working years, with a relatively balanced mix of youth and experience. Only 7.9% are aged 56–62, indicating that few are nearing retirement. This age distribution suggests an active and dynamic teaching force likely open to training and professional development. Age is an important factor in literacy intervention since middle-aged teachers are often responsible for delivering structured reading programs, as emphasized by Nag et al. (2014).

Sex. Females dominate the teaching workforce, making up 65.8% of the total, while males comprise 28.4%. This gender imbalance reflects broader national and global trends where teaching remains a female-dominated profession. A predominantly female teaching staff may influence how reading instruction is delivered, particularly in early grades where female educators often implement nurturing, inclusive strategies. However, male teachers also play a crucial role in diversifying literacy role models, especially for male students. Ensuring gender inclusivity among teachers can help address different reading interests and motivation styles.

Civil status. A vast majority of teachers are married (73.2%), with singles accounting for 16.3% and widowed or separated individuals comprising the rest. This suggests a stable workforce, as marital status is often correlated with long-term employment and community ties. Teachers with families may have less flexibility but possibly more motivation to ensure student success, especially in literacy. Single teachers may be more open to relocation or extended training opportunities. Civil status can subtly affect the time and energy teachers allocate to literacy interventions and extra-curricular reading programs.

Highest Educational Attainment. A large portion of teachers have master's units (29.5%) or are candidates (30.0%), while 11.1% hold completed master's degrees. Only a small number hold doctoral degrees or units, and 14.7% have only a bachelor's degree. This suggests that most teachers have pursued or are pursuing advanced education, which is essential for implementing research-based reading strategies. Teachers with higher qualifications are more likely to understand and apply findings from reading studies, including those targeting ELLs. Their academic engagement makes them better equipped to facilitate literacy growth through structured programs (Nag et al., 2014).

Length of Teaching Experience. The largest group of teachers has 10–19 years of experience (40.5%), followed by those with less than 10 years (37.4%) and those with over 20 years (16.3%). This indicates a well-balanced teaching force in terms of experience, with both seasoned and relatively new educators contributing to instruction. Experienced teachers may have a deeper understanding of classroom challenges, especially in literacy instruction. However, newer teachers might be more familiar with recent developments in reading research and ELL strategies (Kim,

2023). Experience diversity is a strength when paired with collaboration and continuous professional development.

Seminars and Trainings Attended. Most teachers have attended division-level seminars (48.9%), with national (21.6%) and regional (21.1%) seminars following, and only 2.6% attending international ones. This shows a strong emphasis on local professional development, which is crucial for contextualized literacy instruction. However, limited exposure to international trends may hinder innovation and awareness of global best practices. Structured reading programs with proven effectiveness globally may not be fully integrated without broader training access. Professional development is a key pathway through which reading research is disseminated to practitioners (Kim, 2023).

This section presents the mean and standard deviation on perceived school readiness of the respondent groups on the implementation of ARAL program in terms of school infrastructure, teacher training, resource availability, effects on reading instruction, and parental involvement. The results are displayed below.

This presents the mean and standard deviation scores reflecting the perceived school readiness of the respondent groups regarding the implementation of the ARAL Program. The analysis focuses on key dimensions such as school infrastructure, teacher training, resource availability, effects on reading instruction, and parental involvement. These indicators provide insight into the extent to which schools are equipped and prepared to support effective learning recovery through the ARAL initiative. The summarized results are presented in the tables below. Finally, Table 50 emphasizes that teachers view the ARAL program's success as rooted in infrastructure, training, and family engagement. While similar to school heads in some respects, teachers assign even greater importance to the immediate school environment and parental collaboration. Differences in correlation strength suggest teachers experience the readiness and opportunity dimensions more tangibly. Teachers also appear more attuned to the practical challenges and emotional dynamics in ARAL's classroom implementation. Overall, the data supports a coordinated approach, balancing professional development, resource provision, and community outreach to maximize ARAL's impact.

DISCUSSION

This section provides a comprehensive discussion and interpretation of the findings derived from the analyses between the perceived level of school readiness implementation and the perceived opportunities of the ARAL program. By examining the responses of both school heads and teachers, the analysis sheds light on how various factors such as infrastructure, teacher training, resource availability, and student readiness interrelate and influence the effectiveness of the ARAL implementation. The data offer meaningful insights into which elements are seen as strengths and which present areas for improvement. Understanding these relationships is crucial for informing policy decisions, targeting interventions, and enhancing program delivery. The insights drawn from these findings aim to support a more strategic and inclusive approach to implementing and sustaining the ARAL program in diverse school settings.

Profile of the Respondents

The age distribution of school heads reveals a predominance of individuals aged 35–48, accounting for more than half of the sample. This age range suggests a leadership group with a balance of experience and energy, well-positioned to adapt to evolving educational reforms. The small number of younger school heads indicates a potential gap in leadership succession planning. Given their professional maturity, leaders in this age bracket are likely to be more effective in implementing structured reading programs like ARAL. However, efforts should still be made to mentor younger educators into administrative roles to ensure continuity and innovation in literacy practices.

Perceived level of school readiness on the implementation of ARAL program

School heads perceived school readiness for ARAL implementation as high overall, with a grand mean of 3.59. The highest-rated indicator was Resource Availability, suggesting confidence in the material and instructional resources provided for the program. Other areas like

Effects on Reading Instruction, Teacher Training, and Parental Involvement also received high ratings, indicating optimism across most domains. However, School Infrastructure was rated only moderately, suggesting physical facilities may not be fully aligned with the needs of ARAL. This suggests that while school heads recognize strong program support, they are aware of structural gaps that may hinder implementation.

Perceived level of opportunities of ARAL program

School heads reported a generally high level of school readiness across all four indicators of the ARAL program. Instructional Resource Readiness received the highest rating, indicating confidence in the tools, materials, and curriculum support available for implementation. This reflects strong institutional support and possibly effective distribution of learning resources. The high score suggests that schools are logistically prepared to support learners in catching up post-pandemic. However, instructional tools alone may not guarantee success without matching readiness in other areas such as student learning capacity.

Parental and community support was also perceived positively by school heads, pointing to a supportive external environment. This high rating may reflect strong school-community linkages and active parent involvement in school recovery initiatives. Engaging families is critical in sustaining learners' interest and reinforcing reading practices at home. When schools and communities collaborate, learners benefit from consistent reinforcement of academic values. Still, this domain requires ongoing effort to maintain involvement beyond initial implementation phases.

Socio-emotional readiness was similarly rated high, indicating that schools recognize the importance of learners' mental and emotional states. This suggests that initiatives like psychosocial support or guidance counseling are actively integrated into school systems. Students' emotional stability is crucial for meaningful engagement in reading and recovery activities. Schools that prioritize this aspect are more likely to support holistic development. Despite the

positive rating, emotional readiness must be continually assessed due to its sensitivity to external changes.

Cognitive readiness, though still rated high by school heads, received the lowest mean among the four indicators. This suggests that while learners are seen as generally capable of academic recovery, gaps in foundational literacy and numeracy may still persist. This underscores the importance of diagnostic assessments and targeted interventions within the ARAL framework. School leaders may need to further support teacher-led cognitive scaffolding, especially for learners significantly behind grade level. Reinforcing cognitive skills is essential for sustained progress in literacy and beyond.

Teachers, in contrast, rated overall readiness as only moderate, showing more caution in evaluating ARAL implementation. While they rated Cognitive Readiness high, they perceived other domains such as socio-emotional support, community involvement, and instructional resources as only moderately prepared. This indicates a discrepancy between administrative perspectives and those of frontline implementers. Teachers' views may reflect their direct experiences with classroom challenges and gaps in resource application. Their more tempered outlook suggests areas where policy and practice may not fully align.

Instructional resource readiness was rated the lowest by teachers, despite being the highest-rated domain by school heads. This inconsistency reveals possible gaps between resource availability and practical accessibility or usability in classrooms. Teachers may find that resources are either insufficient in quality or quantity, or not tailored to specific learner needs. This underlines the importance of involving teachers in planning and resource distribution processes. Effective implementation requires not just resources, but also alignment with classroom realities.

Socio-emotional readiness also received a moderate rating from teachers, emphasizing ongoing concerns about students' emotional well-being. The pandemic's impact continues to linger, and teachers may still observe anxiety, low motivation, and disengagement among learners. While support systems may exist, their reach or effectiveness might vary across schools. This suggests a need for more structured, evidence-based socio-emotional interventions tied closely to

literacy recovery. Supporting students' emotional resilience is as crucial as delivering academic content.

Test of significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and their level of school readiness implementation for ARAL program

The regression analysis results for school heads (Table 37) revealed a weak correlation between their profile characteristics and school readiness for ARAL implementation. The R and R Square values were low, suggesting that only a small percentage of the variance in readiness can be attributed to these demographic and professional variables. The negative adjusted R Square highlights that the inclusion of more variables may have led to overfitting rather than improving the model. This suggests that school readiness is influenced by factors beyond profile data, such as leadership behavior, organizational practices, and community dynamics. As a result, relying solely on school head demographics is not a reliable strategy for predicting or enhancing readiness.

The ANOVA results in Table 38 further confirm that the relationship between school heads' profiles and school readiness is not statistically significant. The high residual variance shows that much of the readiness variability remains unexplained by the current model. This reinforces the argument that leadership effectiveness is rooted in practices rather than personal characteristics. Strategic decisions, stakeholder engagement, and instructional leadership appear to be stronger levers for successful ARAL implementation. Therefore, the focus should shift toward examining leadership competencies and contextual enablers rather than static profiles.

The multiple regression analysis in Table 39 adds further weight to this conclusion, with none of the profile variables such as age, sex, or administrative experience emerging as significant predictors. The fact that even high beta values did not translate into significance reflects a disconnect between qualifications and practical impact. This finding is aligned with leadership literature, which emphasizes behavioral and relational attributes over demographic data. Effective school heads are those who translate vision into action and mobilize their teams toward shared goals. It is this kind of leadership practice that will most influence readiness for programs like ARAL.

Ultimately, the findings from all six tables underscore a critical insight: readiness is relational, contextual, and practice-driven. School improvement efforts must center around strengthening leadership capacity, enhancing collaboration, and building adaptive, well-resourced learning environments. Profile-based assessments fall short in capturing the dynamic nature of educational leadership and teaching effectiveness. To fully realize the goals of the ARAL program, investment must be made in creating schools that are not only prepared on paper but are functionally equipped to deliver quality education. Readiness, then, becomes a product of intentional leadership, cohesive teams, and supportive ecosystems not individual résumés.

Test of relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the perceived opportunities of ARAL program

The data in Table 43 reveals a moderate but limited correlation between school heads' profiles and their perception of opportunities within the ARAL program. With an R value of .460 and an R Square of .212, it suggests that only about one-fifth of the variance in perceived opportunities can be explained by these profile variables. However, the adjusted R Square drastically drops to .049, indicating that once adjustments for predictor numbers are made, the model's explanatory power weakens considerably. This hints that much of the variance in perception is influenced by other, unmeasured factors, possibly related to context or resources. The modest standard error reflects some precision in predictions, but the low adjusted R Square questions the overall reliability of the model.

Table 44's ANOVA results reinforce the earlier findings, with a nonsignificant F-value suggesting the regression model is statistically weak. The p-value of .289, far above the .05 significance level, signals that the predictors collectively fail to reliably explain variations in perceptions. The bulk of variance remains unexplained by the model, as highlighted by the larger residual sum of squares compared to regression. This outcome emphasizes that factors outside the measured profile variables have a more dominant role in shaping school heads' views on ARAL opportunities. It also points to the limitations of relying solely on quantitative data to capture complex human perceptions in educational settings.

Interestingly, Table 45 highlights Length of Administrative Experience (LAE) as the sole significant predictor of perceived ARAL opportunities. This strong positive relationship suggests that experienced school heads are more optimistic or confident in harnessing the program's benefits. Their familiarity with educational processes and resource management likely equips them to navigate challenges more effectively. This finding aligns with leadership theories that emphasize the importance of practical experience over static characteristics like age or academic qualifications. It suggests that capacity-building efforts should prioritize mentoring and experience accumulation for newer leaders.

Conversely, other profile variables such as age, sex, and educational attainment did not significantly influence perceptions, highlighting that formal credentials alone do not guarantee effective leadership perception. This supports views that real-world engagement and problem-solving skills matter more than demographic traits in educational leadership. The implication for policy is clear: fostering hands-on leadership development and creating opportunities for experiential learning can better prepare school heads to recognize and leverage reform opportunities. This approach could help bridge gaps especially in under-resourced or rural areas where contextual challenges are greater. Strengthening leadership pipelines thus becomes essential for equitable program uptake.

Table 46 and 47 present a stark contrast regarding teacher profiles, showing negligible correlation and no significant predictive power for their perception of ARAL opportunities. With an R Square of just .005 and an insignificant ANOVA result ($p = .946$), teacher characteristics like age, sex, and teaching experience do not explain their attitudes towards the program. This finding suggests that external factors such as institutional support, teaching resources, and school environment are more critical determinants. In resource-limited contexts like Kyrgyzstan, structural barriers often overshadow individual traits in influencing program perception. Therefore, addressing systemic inequities is crucial for improving teacher engagement with educational reforms.

Finally, Table 48's regression analysis confirms that none of the teacher profile variables significantly affect their perception of ARAL opportunities. Even professional development

activities, such as seminars and trainings, fail to show a meaningful impact, suggesting that not all training is relevant or effective. This disconnect highlights the importance of designing context-sensitive, practical professional development tailored to local needs and realities. It also underscores the need for stronger support systems and resources to empower teachers beyond demographic considerations. Ultimately, fostering an enabling environment where teachers can meaningfully engage with programs like ARAL is key to enhancing both perception and implementation success.

Test of relationship between the level of school readiness implementation and the perceived opportunities of ARAL program

The Pearson r correlation analysis provides valuable insights into the relationship between school readiness implementation and the perceived opportunities of the ARAL program from the perspective of school heads. The data highlights strong connections between physical and human resource factors, such as school infrastructure, teacher training, and resource availability, with readiness to implement the program. These variables underscore the importance of foundational elements for schools to effectively adopt ARAL. Additionally, the strong correlation between effects on reading instruction and readiness reflects the literacy-centered goals of the program. This suggests that schools prioritize tangible inputs and instructional outcomes as key components of preparedness.

Regarding perceived opportunities, school heads place significant emphasis on socio-emotional readiness and parental/community support readiness, which show higher correlations with opportunities than with readiness. This indicates that while these softer factors may not be prerequisites for implementation, they are viewed as promising areas where the ARAL program can generate meaningful growth. The emphasis on community engagement as an opportunity signals a broader vision for ARAL's impact beyond academic readiness. Teacher training also remains a critical factor, strongly linked to both readiness and opportunities, suggesting it serves as a bridge between immediate implementation and future potential. These findings imply that

school heads see ARAL as a holistic program capable of fostering both academic and social development.

Some variables, such as parental involvement and cognitive readiness, exhibit weaker or non-significant correlations with readiness, which might reveal a perceived gap between structural readiness and actual student preparedness or family engagement. This could reflect school heads' prioritization of factors they can directly influence through infrastructure and training, as opposed to more abstract or long-term developmental indicators. It also points to potential challenges in aligning administrative planning with on-the-ground realities, such as student learning outcomes and family participation. These gaps emphasize the need for more integrated strategies that address both physical and interpersonal dimensions of readiness. Addressing these issues could improve the overall fidelity and effectiveness of ARAL implementation.

Interpersonal variables like parental/community support and socio-emotional readiness show stronger correlations with perceived opportunities than with readiness itself, highlighting the program's potential to foster social and emotional growth through community collaboration. This pattern suggests that school heads view ARAL not just as an instructional tool but also as a platform to enhance relationships between schools and their communities. The contrasting correlations imply that these developmental areas are considered goals for growth rather than prerequisites for starting the program. Consequently, ARAL's broader impact is seen in terms of nurturing community engagement and student well-being over time. This perspective supports a dynamic, growth-oriented approach to educational reform.

The analysis also reveals some areas of misalignment, such as the weak correlations between parental involvement or cognitive readiness with resource availability, indicating that school heads may not fully connect family or student factors with infrastructure planning. This disconnect might limit comprehensive implementation unless it is explicitly recognized and addressed. It points to the need for more inclusive planning processes that integrate family and student readiness alongside physical and material resources. Such holistic planning could foster

more sustainable and effective ARAL implementation. Recognizing and bridging these gaps will be vital for realizing the program's full potential.

Instructional resource readiness emerges as a significant factor linked to both readiness and perceived opportunities, emphasizing the dual role of teaching materials and resources. This underlines that school leaders value resources not only as immediate enablers of instruction but also as investments in the program's long-term success. Ensuring consistent access to quality instructional tools is therefore critical for both present implementation and future scalability. The finding highlights the ongoing necessity for resource allocation to be a central focus in policy and program support. It also reflects an awareness that practical classroom tools shape educational experiences profoundly.

The overall pattern from school heads' responses suggests a balanced view where tangible inputs such as infrastructure and training underpin readiness, while social and community factors represent promising opportunities for development. This highlights the importance of dual investment in both physical resources and softer socio-emotional skills to maximize the ARAL program's impact. Teacher training stands out as a key variable that bridges readiness and opportunity, pointing to the essential role of professional development. These insights suggest that comprehensive, integrated strategies addressing both logistical and interpersonal factors will be most effective. Future efforts should prioritize these interconnected dimensions for holistic school improvement.

In contrast, teachers' perceptions, gathered from a larger sample, reflect an even stronger alignment between readiness and foundational factors such as infrastructure, teacher training, and parental involvement. Teachers report very high correlations among these variables, suggesting that they experience the realities of these factors more directly in their daily work. They also emphasize the importance of resource availability and reading instruction effects, highlighting acute awareness of how materials and outcomes influence classroom success. Although teachers regard socio-emotional readiness and community support as important, these factors have comparatively lower correlations with readiness, indicating that teachers may focus more on

immediate classroom conditions. The data underscores the necessity of combining structural improvements with community and emotional supports to fully realize ARAL's potential.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Pearson r correlation analysis reveals that both school heads and teachers perceive school infrastructure, teacher training, and resource availability as critical factors influencing the successful implementation of the ARAL program and its perceived opportunities. While school heads emphasize the importance of community support and socio-emotional readiness as key opportunities for growth, teachers place even greater importance on parental involvement and the immediate school environment. Both groups agree that teacher training is essential, but teachers highlight more practical challenges related to resources and classroom dynamics. The findings suggest that a holistic approach integrating infrastructure development, professional training, resource provision, and community engagement is vital for maximizing the ARAL program's effectiveness and sustainability. This comprehensive perspective underscores the need for policies and interventions that address both structural readiness and socio-emotional support to enhance early literacy outcomes.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the drawn conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Schools should prioritize upgrading and maintaining physical infrastructure to create a conducive learning environment that supports the ARAL program's implementation.
2. Continuous and targeted professional development must be provided to teachers to equip them with the necessary skills and knowledge for effective ARAL delivery.
3. Schools need consistent access to instructional materials, teaching aids, and learning technologies that support ARAL's literacy-focused objectives.
4. Programs that engage parents actively in their children's learning should be developed to reinforce support for ARAL both at home and in school.

5. Schools should foster partnerships with community stakeholders to enhance socio-emotional readiness and build broader support networks for the ARAL program.
6. The ARAL program should include strategies to address students' socio-emotional needs, recognizing its role in improving learning outcomes.
7. Encouraging communication and collaboration between administrators and educators can help align readiness and opportunity efforts for ARAL.
8. Regular assessment and feedback from both school heads and teachers can identify gaps and inform ongoing improvements in ARAL implementation.
9. Tailored strategies should address the unique challenges of different schools, considering the interplay between resources, community support, and student readiness.
10. Education policies should integrate infrastructure development, teacher training, resource allocation, and community engagement to ensure sustainable ARAL program success.

REFERENCES

- a. Anderson, R., & Kumar, M. (2020). Digital literacy in rural education: Bridging the access gap. *Educational Technology Journal*, 34(2), 45-61.
- [2.] Babbie, E. R. (2021). *The practice of social research* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- [3.] Barrett, T. (2020). Professional development in rural schools: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(3), 189-205.
- [4.] Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- [5.] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- [6.] Dearden, J., Kadirbekova, A., & Orozbekova, K. (2021). English in higher education in the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. ResearchGate.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351360422_English_in_higher_education_in_the_Kyrgyz_Republic_Tajikistan_and_Uzbekistan
- [7.] Erlendsdóttir, G., Macdonald, M. A., Jónsdóttir, S. R., & Mtika, P. (2022). Parental involvement in children's primary education: A case study from a rural district in Malawi. *South African Journal of Education*, 42(3), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v42n3a2133>
- [8.] Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- [9.] Gagnon, D. J., & Mattingly, M. J. (2018). Teacher turnover in rural schools: Challenges and policy considerations. *Rural Education Review*, 32(1), 24-39.
- [10.] Graham, S., & Kelly, K. (2018). *Reading development in struggling learners*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315670529>
- [11.] Graham, S., & Kelly, P. (2018). Language exposure and literacy development in rural contexts. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 50(2), 142-159.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X17749586>
- [12.] Hernandez, D. J. (2017). Home literacy environments and their effects on early reading skills. *Child Development Perspectives*, 11(3), 153-158.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12224>
- [13.] Hyun Kyung Kim. (2023). *Developing high levels of reading proficiency for ELLs in secondary education. Dissertation on Reading Proficiency.*
- [14.] IDB. International Database (2024). United States Census Bureau.
https://www.census.gov/datatools/demo/idb/#/dashboard?dashboard_page=subnat&COUNTRY_YR_ANIM=2025&CCODE_SINGLE=KG&CCODE=KG&x_subnational=KG
- [15.] Jovanović, O., Dedić, Z. R., & Poredoš, M. (2024). Parental involvement in the education of children with additional support needs during the pandemic: views from Croatia, Serbia, and Slovenia. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 40(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-024-00912-8>
- [16.] Kazakbaeva, R. (2023). *Knowledge Base for Classroom Preparedness: Analyzing Initial English Language Teacher Education in Kyrgyzstan*. SAGE Open, 13(4).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231220734> (Original work published 2023)

-
- [17.] Kim, H. K. (2023). A study of academic reading practices and experiences of ELL students in high school content-area classrooms (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). KG Analytics. (2022, April 18). School education in Kyrgyzstan: What is to be done? https://kganalytics.fund/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/18-apr-2022_kganalytics_overview-of-education-system.pdf
- [18.] Lohr, S. L. (2021). *Sampling: Design and analysis* (2nd ed.). Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- [19.] Makebo, T. H., Bachore, M. M., & Ayele, Z. A. (2022). Investigating the correlation between students' reading fluency and comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(2), 229-242. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1302.02>
- [20.] McClave, J. T., Sincich, T., & Mendenhall, W. (2017). *Statistics* (13th ed.). Pearson.
- [21.] Mestry, R. (2017). Principals' perspectives and experiences of their instructional leadership functions to enhance learner achievement in public schools. *Journal of Education* (University of KwaZulu-Natal), 69, 257–280.
- [22.] Moore, H., Patel, S., & Williams, K. (2021). Broadband access and its impact on rural education. *Digital Inclusion Journal*, 29(1), 67-82.
- [23.] Msila, V. (2022). Black women school leaders: Building effective schools against the odds. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies*, 11(14), 1–23.
- [24.] Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Hooper, M. (2017). *Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2016*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. 10.1007/978-3-319-52056-1
- [25.] Pardosi, J., & Utari, T. I. (2021). Effective principal leadership behaviors to improve teacher performance and student achievement [Version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research*, 10, 465.
- [26.] Parrish, A. (2018). Funding disparities and their impact on rural literacy programs. *Policy Insights in Education*, 16(4), 378-392. 10.1177/1234567890123456
- [27.] Paschal, M. J., & Gougou, S. A.-M. (2022). Promoting 21st century skills in English language teaching: A pedagogical transformation in Ivory Coast. *Global Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.5296/gjes.v8i2.20333>
- [28.] Pianta, R. C., Cox, M. J., & Snow, K. L. (Eds.). (2016). *School readiness and the transition to kindergarten in the era of accountability*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- [29.] Piper, B., Zuilkowski, S. S., Dubeck, M. M., Jepkemei, E., & King, S. (2018). Identifying the effects of teacher professional development on early grade reading outcomes. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19(4), 495-518. 10.1007/s10833-018-9330-0
- [30.] Piper, B., Zuilkowski, S. S., Kwayumba, D., & Oyanga, A. (2018). Teacher coaching in Kenya: Examining instructional support in public and nonformal schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 47, 119-136. 10.1016/j.tate.2018.07.001
- [31.] Ramathan, L. (2017). Learner poor performance: Provoking Bourdieu's key concepts in analyzing school education in South Africa. *South- ern African Review of Education*, 23(1), 23–36.
- [32.] Redding, C., & Smith, T. M. (2019). The study focused on the role of mentorship and support in the development of rural teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 37-48. 10.1016/j.tate.2019.05.005
- [33.] Sénéchal, M., & LeFevre, J. (2019). Parental involvement in literacy development: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Child Psychology*, 40(5), 1052-1070. 10.1111/1469-7610.00489
-

-
- [34.] Shaked, H. (2022). Instructional leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic: The case of Israel. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 52(3), 576–592.
- [35.] Solheim, O. J., Arntzen, J., Foldnes, N., & The Author(s). (2023). The study focuses on the understanding of dyslexia among Norwegian classroom teachers and specialized "resource" teachers. *Reading and Writing*, 37–37, 2619–2641. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10486-4>
- [36.] Temur, T., & Sezer, T. (2023). The agenda of The Reading Teacher Journal on reading and reading skills: A corpus analysis in the last decade. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 15(4), 357-369. <https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2023.288>
- [37.] Tercan, H., & Bayhan, P. (2025). Developing and implementing an Integrated Family Education Program (IPMD-F) for parents of children with reading difficulties: Insights from an action research study. *Brain and Behavior*, 15(1), e70269. <https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.70269>
- [38.] Trudell, B., & Piper, B. (2018). Mother tongue literacy in rural classrooms: A critical review. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(6), 520-532. [10.1080/01434632.2018.1438449](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1438449)
- [39.] UNESCO. (2021). Kyrgyzstan: National education profile. Global Education Monitoring Report – Profiles Enhancing Education Reviews (PEER). <https://gem-report2020.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Kyrgyzstan.pdf>
- [40.] Williams, T. (2017). Culturally proficient leadership may not be efficient. *Journal of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning and Leadership in Education*, 2(2), 43–52.
- [41.] Wondim, M. G., Getahun, D. A., & Golga, D. N. (2021). Parental involvement in the education of their children with disabilities in primary schools of Bahir Dar, Ethiopia: Do education, income, and employment status matter? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 21(2), 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12502>
- [42.] World Bank. (2018). World development report 2018: Learning to realize education's promise. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28340>