

Reading Comprehension Challenges Among First-Year Beed Students at Siargao Island Institute of Technology, A.Y. 2023-2024

Jessivel R. Bacsal¹, Aina Angela D. Coluna², Roselyn C. Consigna³, Trixie N. Dador⁴, Emmanuel Jr. J. Dacuta⁵,
Laiza B. Decatoria⁶, Jona Mae L. Paja⁷, Jeha S. Rafols⁸, Jowina Fe M. Saragena⁹, Geraldine T. Sumaylo¹⁰,
Maria Lelanie A. Goyonan¹¹, Ronald G. Española¹²

^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}Students, Bachelor of Elementary Education, Siargao Island Institute of Technology, Dapa, Surigao del Norte

^{11,12}Faculty, Siargao Island Institute of Technology, Dapa, Surigao Del Norte

ABSTRACT: Reading Comprehension serves as a crucial foundation for academic success, particularly for aspiring educators. Mastering the ability to comprehend complex academic texts is essential. This study delves into the challenges that first-year Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEED) students encounter in reading comprehension, aiming to identify specific difficulties they experience. The researchers employed a quantitative approach using the descriptive survey method for data collection, analysis, and classification. The study was conducted with 55 respondents from Siargao Island Institute of Technology, located at Pob. Brgy 12, Dapa, Surigao del Norte. The first part of the questionnaire gathered respondents' profiles and was analyzed using count and percentage distribution, while the second and third parts were analyzed using mean and standard deviation. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to assess significant differences in the factors affecting reading comprehension challenges. Findings revealed significant insights into the reading habits and attitudes of first-year BEED students at SIIT. The majority of respondents, aged between 18 and 19, were predominantly female, and books were the most common reading material available to them. Most students reported reading sometimes. Results indicated a concerning trend in their attitudes towards reading, reflecting a lack of motivation. Data analysis demonstrated that age, sex, reading materials, and frequency of reading significantly influenced reading comprehension. Variables were ranked based on their impact, with vocabulary being the least influential (mean of 3.33), followed by interest in reading (mean of 3.38), fluency in reading (mean of 3.39), and availability of reading resources as the most influential (mean of 3.44). Further analysis indicated no significant difference in the influence of age on the variables. While sex did not show a significant difference in vocabulary and fluency in reading, it significantly impacted the availability of reading resources. The type of reading materials and frequency of reading did not show significant differences in their influence. Regarding correlation, vocabulary and fluency in reading exhibited low correlations across all variables. Availability and interest in reading also showed low correlations when paired with vocabulary and fluency. Interestingly, an inverse correlation was observed between availability and interest when reciprocated. The most challenging aspect of reading comprehension was identified as the availability of reading resources, as indicated by the highest mean score. In conclusion, this study highlights the need for interventions to enhance the reading attitudes and habits of first-year BEED students, particularly by improving the availability of reading resources to support their reading comprehension.

KEYWORDS: Availability of resources, Academic success, Bachelor in Elementary Education, Reading comprehension, Reading habits, Reading attitudes, Reading challenges.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the problems in the Philippines involved the poor reading comprehension of the students. In December 2019, the country experienced a widespread agitation by the release of the 2018 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) Report which stated that high school students in the Philippines got lower scores in reading comprehension than most of those surveyed in other nations. Based on the findings, over 80 percent of the Filipino students around the age of 15 got a rating of 340 points in reading comprehension, lower than the average of 487 points. Consequently, in the said study, the Philippines ranked last among 79 countries.

Reading comprehension was a crucial instrument for communication and gathering information. The ability to see and understand written or printed language was called reading. People who could not read were said to be illiterate, or unlettered. The

ability to read was one of the foundation skills in all industrialized societies. In such societies, written language was the chief means of transmitting culture and the benefits of civilization from one generation to another. Yet, despite its crucial role, many students struggled with this essential skill. Examining the challenges in reading comprehension among students became more critical than ever in an information-driven world.

More so, the importance of reading comprehension in the educational landscape could not be overstated. It served as a fundamental building block for students to engage with the curriculum, access information, and develop essential skills necessary for their academic and personal growth. Proficient reading comprehension enabled students to understand complex texts, make inferences, draw conclusions, and critically evaluate information. It allowed them to connect ideas, expand their knowledge base, and engage in meaningful discussions. Moreover, strong reading comprehension skills contributed to improved performance in other subjects, as it became a vehicle for understanding and applying concepts across different domains.

In a local setting, the researchers asked the instructors who supervised the first-year Bachelor of Elementary Education students about their observations regarding the possible incompetence in terms of reading comprehension skills of the students, which was vital in understanding their lessons. Consequently, instructors testified that indeed the said problem existed among the first-year BEED students, estimating that about 75% of the students had a hard time comprehending what they were reading. Thus, the difficulties of the students in reading comprehension might have affected their academic performance. This study supported the facts stated above and it was conducted for the reasons that it would help the BEED first-year college students' underachievers to enhance their knowledge in terms of reading comprehension and it served as a great experience and preparation for the researchers for their student teaching next semester.

1.1 Review of Related Literature

Reading comprehension was a multifaceted process influenced by various factors, posing challenges for learners across different contexts. The studies reviewed provided insights into the complexities of reading comprehension and offered valuable implications for addressing challenges in educational settings.

According to Hand in Hand Education (2019), reading comprehension was the ability to easily and efficiently read text for meaning. It was the last step of the reading process taught to children, after they had learned phonics, fluency, and vocabulary. Five levels of reading comprehension could be taught to children: Lexical Comprehension, Literal Comprehension, Interpretive Comprehension, Applied Comprehension, and Affective Comprehension. Additionally, according to English Language Teaching Guide (2019), there were a number of reasons that caused reading comprehension to fail. Students needed to be aware of these reasons and then identify the solutions for them by applying the appropriate reading strategies that could lead to success in reading comprehension. The main factors that hindered reading comprehension included: Limited perceptual span, Faulty eye movement, Faulty attention and concentration habits, Lack of practice, Lack of interest, Poor evaluation of important and less important parts, and Reasonable wholesome remembering rather than selective remembering.

Further, according to Dr. Linda Silbert (2014), when children didn't understand what they read, it affected their ability to succeed in school. All subjects, including science and math, required reading comprehension, which resulted in low grades and poor test scores if a student had poor reading comprehension. Signs of poor reading comprehension included being unable to answer questions about what they read, not understanding the logical sequence of a story, being unable to tell the story after reading it, being unable to connect individual sentences or paragraphs of text to make sense of what they had read, not knowing the meaning of individual words, losing interest in reading, or giving up quickly. Moreover, Dennis (2011) stated that reading comprehension was a complex balance between recognizing printed symbols and interpreting the meaning behind the symbols. Students knew how to comprehend if they could read between and beyond the lines. Further, Tompkins (2011) defined reading comprehension as the level of comprehending a text. He argued that comprehension was a creative process that hinged on four skills called phonology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics.

Moreover, Clarke et. al. (2014) stated that reading comprehension was a vital ability for all students because it involved the process of simultaneously obtaining and generating meaning from written language through engagement and involvement. Understanding the meaning of words, analyzing the author's point of view, aiming for writing, and acquiring new vocabulary were all critical reading abilities that aided in reading comprehension.

In addition, Clarke et. al. (2014) also stated that students needed to develop reading comprehension abilities in order to succeed academically and personally. Reading comprehension was the foundation for understanding all academic information

throughout students' academic careers. Reading comprehension became increasingly important in all academic disciplines as students progressed through the grades. Students, in particular, required reading comprehension abilities in order to meet educational goals at school and in the classroom.

Further, Elleman, A. M., & Oslund, E. L. (2019) stated that reading comprehension was one of the most complex cognitive activities in which humans engaged, making it difficult to teach, measure, and research. Despite decades of research in reading comprehension, international and national reading scores indicated stagnant growth for U.S. adolescents. In their article, they reviewed the theoretical and empirical research in reading comprehension. They first explored different theoretical models for comprehension and then focused on components shown to be important across models that represented potential targets for instruction. In the last part of the article, they considered solutions for translating research to practice and policies for improving instruction. Improving reading scores required a concerted and collaborative effort by researchers, educators, and policymakers with a focus on long-term solutions. An early and sustained focus on developing background knowledge, vocabulary, inference, and comprehension monitoring skills across development was necessary to improve comprehension.

Moreover, Dennis (2011) stated that reading comprehension was a complex balance between recognizing printed symbols and interpreting the meaning behind the symbols. In addition, Dennis (2011) stated that reading comprehension was a complex balance between recognizing printed symbols and interpreting the meaning behind the symbols. Students knew how to comprehend if they could read between and beyond the lines. Further, according to Van den Broek et.al (2012), reading comprehension was a complex interaction among automatic and strategic cognitive processes that enabled the reader to create a mental representation of the text. Moreover, according to Odwan, Talal A.A (2012), reading comprehension was a complex process. The gist of reading comprehension was the capability to store and regain explanations from written texts.

Further, Gilakjani & Sabouri (2016) stated that reading comprehension was a complex process that involved components, processes, and factors with the aim of finding better ways of improving it among learners. Moreover, Gilakjani & Sabouri (2016) indicated that decoding or word recognition had an impact on learners' reading comprehension. Readers who had problems in decoding and recognizing words found it difficult to understand the meaning of passages compared to those without decoding problems. Learners who had enough vocabulary could clarify the meaning of passages faster than those who had to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words according to the clues of context.

Additionally, Gilakjani & Sabouri (2016) stated that reading comprehension needed different reading skills such as word recognition, fluency, lexical knowledge, and pre-existing knowledge to be undertaken quickly so that the reader could gain knowledge from the text. Further, Lastrella (2010) stated that reading was essential to life, and reading with comprehension was the chief justification for why we read, understanding what the text was all about.

Moreover, Hirsch, E.D. (2006); Kamhi, A., (2007) stated that there was a growing body of evidence supporting the concept that a reader's background knowledge about what he was reading was one of the most critical factors in determining whether a student would understand what he was reading or not.

Furthermore, Kendeou, P., McMaster, K. L., & Christ, T. J. (2016) stated that reading comprehension was multidimensional and complex. The persistent challenges children, adolescents, and even adults faced with reading comprehension called for concerted efforts to develop assessments that helped identify sources of difficulties and to design instructional approaches to prevent or ameliorate these difficulties. Doing so required drawing on extant research to understand the core components and processes of reading comprehension. This article reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature on the construction of meaning during reading comprehension and derived implications for research, practice, and policy related to instruction and assessment. They focused specifically on the inferential processes that extracted meaning from text and the sources of knowledge that facilitated the extraction and construction of meaning.

Lastly, the reviewed literature underscored the multidimensional nature of reading comprehension challenges and emphasized the need for tailored instruction and support. For BEED first-year students at Siargao Island Institute of Technology, addressing these challenges required a comprehensive approach that considered students' diverse backgrounds, provided explicit instruction in comprehension strategies, and fostered motivation and engagement with texts. By implementing evidence-based practices informed by the literature, educators could support students in developing the necessary skills to overcome reading comprehension challenges effectively.

Synthesis of the Review. While research highlighted the complexities of reading comprehension, with studies by Elleman & Oslund (2019), Gilakjani & Sabouri (2016), and Kendeou et al. (2016) acknowledging that reading comprehension was a multifaceted cognitive activity requiring various components and skills to function effectively, stagnant growth in reading scores indicated the ongoing challenge of fostering strong comprehension (Elleman & Oslund, 2019). Factors influencing comprehension included difficulty with word recognition hindering understanding (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016). These findings informed research on BEED students, allowing the examination of specific areas of difficulty like decoding, vocabulary, background knowledge, or inferential skills. Identifying these challenges could then inform targeted interventions and instructional strategies to improve reading comprehension among future educators.

1.2. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework of the Study

This study was anchored in the theory of Cognitive Reading Theory by McKenna and Stahl (2009), which explained how students learn to read by emphasizing the complex processes involved in reading comprehension. It recognized that reading was not simply decoding or absorbing the author's intended meaning, but an active process of constructing meaning through the interaction of prior knowledge, skills, and strategies. Competent readers utilized both bottom-up (word-level) and top-down (whole text and contextual) strategies to comprehend and analyze texts. The cognitive perspective of reading highlighted the range of processes involved, from visual processing to text comprehension, and emphasized the importance of metacognitive processes in reading skills.

In relation to this theory, the theoretical study of Dennis D.V (2008) provided a basis for this study, which stated the Decoding or Word Recognition Speed. Readers who had problems in decoding and recognizing words read slowly and found it more difficult to understand the meaning of passages than those without decoding problems. She expressed that vocabulary influenced reading comprehension skills because reading applied decoding skills to understand the pronunciation and meaning of words they had not seen before.

This study determined the challenges of Reading Comprehension among BEED first-year students in Siargao Island Institute of Technology for the S.Y. 2023-2024.

In box 1, this implied the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, availability of reading materials, and frequency of reading. While in box 2, this bores the variables considered regarding the challenges of reading comprehension among BEED first-year students in the school year 2023-2024, which involved poor reading experience, vocabulary level, word recognition, and fluency in reading. Lastly, in the third box, this showed the proposed recommendations of the study

1.3 Statement of the Problem

This study determined the challenges in reading comprehension among first-year Bachelor of Elementary Education students of Siargao Island Institute of Technology for A.Y. 2023-2024. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

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

- 1.1. Age;
- 1.2. Sex;
- 1.3. Reading materials; and
- 1.4. Frequency of reading?

2. What is the attitude of first year Bachelor of Elementary Education students towards reading?

3. Up to what level are the challenges experienced by the student on reading comprehension among first year Bachelor of Elementary Education students of Siargao Island Institute of Technology A.Y. 2023-2024 as regards to:

- 3.1. Availability of Reading Resources;
- 3.2. Interest in Reading;
- 3.3. Vocabulary; and
- 3.4. Fluency in reading?

4. Is there a significant difference on the availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, fluency in reading in terms of the challenges of the first year Bachelor of Elementary Education students encountered on reading comprehension when grouped according to profiled variables?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the variables; availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary and fluency in reading in terms of the perception of the first year Bachelor of Elementary Education students towards the challenges they experienced on reading comprehension?
6. Which among the four variables on reading comprehension such as availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, and fluency in reading is the most challenging according to the first year Bachelor of Elementary Education of Siargao Island Institute of Technology A.Y. 2023-2024.
7. Based on the result of the study, what proposed recommendations can be made?

II. METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive survey method, which primarily involved gathering conditions to provide descriptions and interpretations of variables. This method focused on present and existing conditions, examining the opinions, perceptions, and attitudes of a chosen population. According to Siedlecki (2020), descriptive research serves as a fact-finding study with accurate interpretation of findings. The study's respondents were selected through non-random sampling and included 55 first-year BEED students from Siargao Island Institute of Technology, consisting of 11 males (20%) and 44 females (80%). A researcher-made questionnaire was used to gather quantitative data, covering respondent profiles, attitudes toward reading, and challenges in reading comprehension, such as vocabulary level, word recognition, and fluency. A rating scale was employed to classify the level of challenges experienced by students.

The researcher obtained permission from the school administration before distributing the questionnaire. Data were carefully tallied, sorted, and analyzed using various statistical tools. Frequency count and percentage distribution were used to describe demographic profiles, while weighted mean and standard deviation addressed the challenges in reading comprehension. The Shapiro-Wilk test assessed normality, while the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test and Kruskal-Wallis Test compared continuous outcomes in paired and independent samples. Additionally, Spearman's Correlation measured the strength and direction of associations between variables. These statistical tools were instrumental in determining significant relationships.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the results, the analysis and interpretations of data gathered from the answers to the questionnaires distributed to the field. The said data were presented in tabular form in accordance with the specific questions posited on the statement of the problem.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age		
18-19 years old	47	85.45%
20-21 years old	5	9.09%
22-23 years old	2	3.64%
Above 24 years old	1	1.82%
Sex		
Male	11	20.00%
Female	44	80.00%
Reading Materials		
Books	26	47.27%
Comics	13	23.64%
Wattpad	13	23.64%
Workbooks	3	5.45%
Frequency of Reading		
Seldom	8	14.55%
Sometimes	47	85.45%

The demographic profile of the respondents provides significant insights into the characteristics and reading behaviors of BEED first-year students at Siargao Island Institute of Technology. The data reveals notable trends in age distribution, gender representation, reading material preferences, and reading frequency, all of which have implications for literacy development and academic performance. Understanding these patterns is crucial in formulating effective strategies to enhance students' reading habits and overall comprehension skills.

The age distribution data indicate that the majority of the respondents (85.45%) were between 18-19 years old, signifying that most students followed a conventional academic path from senior high school to college. A smaller percentage (9.09%) of students were aged 20-21, which may suggest delayed entry into college due to academic, financial, or personal challenges. Additionally, only a few respondents (3.64%) were aged 22-23, and a single respondent (1.82%) was above 24 years old. These findings suggest that most BEED students enroll in higher education immediately after completing secondary school, with only a minimal number of older students pursuing their degrees later in life.

The data also revealed a significant gender disparity, with female students (80%) outnumbering male students (20%). This pattern is consistent with trends in education-related fields, where women tend to dominate due to career preferences, societal expectations, and a stronger inclination toward teaching professions. The low male representation underscores the need to encourage gender diversity within the BEED program by promoting teaching as a viable career option for both genders. Initiatives aimed at increasing male participation in education-related courses could help balance the gender distribution in the field.

In terms of reading material preferences, a significant portion of the respondents (47.27%) preferred books, demonstrating a continued reliance on traditional printed materials for learning and personal growth. Interestingly, an equal percentage of students (23.64%) engaged with comics and Wattpad, indicating a notable interest in visual storytelling and digital literature. The popularity of Wattpad suggests that online platforms play a growing role in shaping students' reading habits. On the other hand, only 5.45% of respondents preferred workbooks, highlighting that structured academic reading materials were the least favored. This finding may indicate that students lean more toward recreational reading rather than academic texts, which could impact their reading comprehension skills in an academic setting.

Regarding reading frequency, the majority of respondents (85.45%) reported reading "sometimes," reflecting an inconsistent approach to reading. This suggests that while students engage with reading materials, it is not a habitual practice or daily routine. Meanwhile, 14.55% of the respondents admitted to reading "seldom," indicating a lack of engagement in regular reading activities. The limited frequency of reading may contribute to challenges in comprehension, vocabulary development, and overall academic performance. These findings highlight the importance of promoting consistent reading habits among BEED students by integrating structured reading programs, fostering a culture of academic engagement, and encouraging students to read beyond their preferred genres.

Table 2. Descriptive analysis on the factors when grouped according to age

Factor	Age Group	Median	Mean	SD	SE
Availability of Reading Resources	18-19 years old	3.4	3.46	0.229	0.033
	20-21 years old	3.4	3.33	0.228	0.102
	22-23 years old	3.4	3.4	0.283	0.2
	Above 24 years old	3.4	3.4	NA	NA
Interest in Reading	18-19 years old	3.4	3.35	0.337	0.04
	20-21 years old	3.6	3.56	0.167	0.075
	22-23 years old	3.5	3.5	0.707	0.5
	Above 24 years old	3.4	3.4	NA	NA
Vocabulary	18-19 years old	3.8	3.34	0.358	0.052
	20-21 years old	3.6	3.4	0.261	0.117
	22-23 years old	3.0	3.0	0.000	0.000
	Above 24 years old	3.0	3.0	NA	NA
Fluency in Reading	18-19 years old	3.4	3.41	0.248	0.0361
	20-21 years old	3.4	3.41	0.245	0.11
	22-23 years old	3.0	3.0	0.283	0.2
	Above 24 years old	3.2	3.2	NA	NA

The descriptive analysis of reading comprehension factors among BEED first-year students at Siargao Island Institute of Technology reveals notable variations across different age groups. The factors examined include the availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary proficiency, and reading fluency. Understanding these differences provides valuable insights into students' reading habits and the potential impact on their academic performance.

As to the *Availability of Reading Resources*, the data indicate that students generally have moderate access to reading resources, as reflected in the mean scores, which range from 3.33 to 3.46, with a consistent median of 3.4 across all age groups. This suggests that most students have some level of access to reading materials, although the degree of accessibility varies. Notably, the 22-23 age group showed a higher standard deviation (0.283), indicating greater variability in responses. This suggests that while some students in this age category had ample access to reading materials, others faced limitations. Ensuring uniform access to reading resources remains crucial, as disparities in availability may affect students' reading engagement and comprehension skills.

Interest in reading showed some fluctuations across age groups. The 20-21 age group reported the highest mean score (3.56), suggesting that students in this category exhibited the strongest enthusiasm for reading. In contrast, the 18-19 and above 24 age groups had moderate mean scores of 3.35 and 3.4, respectively. The 22-23 age group had the widest variation in responses, with a high standard deviation of 0.707, indicating that while some students had a strong interest in reading, others displayed minimal engagement. The lower interest levels among some younger students could be influenced by external distractions, such as social media and digital entertainment, which may compete with traditional reading habits.

Vocabulary proficiency was highest among younger students. The 18-19 age group recorded the highest median (3.8) and mean (3.34), suggesting that they had a relatively strong grasp of vocabulary. In contrast, the 22-23 and above 24 age groups had the lowest mean scores (3.0), with the 22-23 group exhibiting zero standard deviation, meaning all students in this category rated themselves at the same level. These findings suggest that younger students may have had more recent exposure to structured vocabulary instruction, while older students may have experienced gaps in formal education, leading to a decline in vocabulary proficiency. This difference underscores the importance of continuous vocabulary development, especially for older students who may need additional support in language skills.

Reading fluency followed a similar pattern to vocabulary proficiency. The 18-19 and 20-21 age groups had nearly identical mean scores (3.41), indicating that students in these age brackets maintained relatively stable reading fluency. However, fluency decreased among older students, with the 22-23 age group reporting a mean of 3.0 and the above 24 age group slightly higher at 3.2. The higher standard deviation (0.283) in the 22-23 age group suggests that reading fluency levels varied widely among these students, with some demonstrating strong skills while others struggled. The decline in reading fluency among older students may be attributed to a lack of consistent reading practice, reduced exposure to academic texts, or competing personal and professional responsibilities.

The findings suggest that younger students (18-19 and 20-21 years old) generally exhibit stronger vocabulary skills, better reading fluency, and higher interest in reading compared to older students (22-23 and above 24 years old). The decline in reading-related skills among older students highlights the need for targeted interventions to support their literacy development.

Additionally, while reading resources are moderately accessible, disparities exist, particularly among students in the 22-23 age group, where variability in responses indicates that some students may struggle with availability. Educational institutions should consider implementing measures to ensure equal access to reading materials and foster a culture of reading engagement among students.

Table 3. Analysis on Significant Differences in Each Factor Grouped According to Age

Factors	Test	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Availability of Reading Resources	Kruskal-Wallis	0.599 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Interest in Reading	Kruskal-Wallis	0.572 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Vocabulary	Kruskal-Wallis	0.193 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Fluency in Reading	Kruskal-Wallis	0.201 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant

Table 3 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, which was conducted to determine whether there are significant differences in the factors affecting reading proficiency when grouped according to age. The findings reveal that none of the four

factors—Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading—show statistically significant differences based on age, as all p-values are greater than 0.05. Specifically, the availability of reading resources ($p = 0.599$), interest in reading ($p = 0.572$), vocabulary ($p = 0.193$), and fluency in reading ($p = 0.201$) all fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that age does not play a determining role in these aspects. These results suggest that individuals across different age groups experience similar levels of access to reading materials, exhibit comparable interest in reading, and demonstrate no substantial variations in vocabulary proficiency or reading fluency.

Therefore, age alone is not a key factor influencing these reading-related aspects, and other variables, such as reading habits, exposure to diverse materials, and educational background, may have a more significant impact. Consequently, literacy programs and interventions should focus on fostering a supportive reading environment, enhancing motivation, and ensuring accessibility to quality reading resources rather than relying solely on age-based strategies.

Table 4. Descriptive Analysis on the Factors Grouped According to Sex

Factors	Sex	Median	Mean	SD	SE
Availability on Reading Resources	Male	3.2	3.31	0.207	0.062
	Female	3.4	3.48	0.221	0.033
Interest in Reading	Male	3.4	3.40	0.219	0.066
	Female	3.6	3.37	0.361	0.054
Vocabulary	Male	3.4	3.44	0.250	0.075
	Female	3.4	3.30	0.365	0.055
Fluency in Reading	Male	3.6	3.46	0.202	0.061
	Female	3.4	3.38	0.267	0.040

Table 4 presents the descriptive analysis of reading-related factors when grouped according to sex. The analysis examines four key factors: Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading, comparing male and female respondents based on median, mean, standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE).

For Availability of Reading Resources, females recorded a slightly higher median (3.4) and mean (3.48) compared to males (median = 3.2, mean = 3.31). This suggests that females may have slightly better access to reading materials than males, although the difference is not substantial. The standard deviation values (0.207 for males and 0.221 for females) indicate a relatively low variation in responses.

In terms of Interest in Reading, both males and females had similar median values (3.4 for males, 3.6 for females), but the mean scores show minimal differences (3.40 for males, 3.37 for females). While females displayed slightly more variation ($SD = 0.361$) compared to males ($SD = 0.219$), the findings suggest that interest in reading does not differ significantly between sexes.

For Vocabulary, both groups had the same median (3.4), but males had a slightly higher mean (3.44) than females (3.30). The standard deviation was slightly lower for males (0.250) compared to females (0.365), indicating that male responses were more consistent, while female responses showed greater variability.

Regarding Fluency in Reading, males had a higher median (3.6) and mean (3.46) than females (median = 3.4, mean = 3.38). This indicates that males may perceive themselves as slightly more fluent in reading than females, although the differences are minimal. The standard deviation values (0.202 for males and 0.267 for females) suggest a slightly wider range of responses among females.

Table 5. Analysis on Significant Differences in Each Factor Grouped According to Sex

Factors	Test	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Availability on Reading Resources	Wilcoxon Rank	$0.0232 < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Interest in Reading	Wilcoxon Rank	$0.745 > 0.05$	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Vocabulary	Wilcoxon Rank	$0.251 > 0.05$	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant
Fluency in Reading	Wilcoxon Rank	$0.349 > 0.05$	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Table 5 presents the results of the Wilcoxon Rank-Sum Test, which was conducted to determine whether there are significant differences in reading-related factors when grouped according to sex. The analysis includes four key factors: Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading. The decision rule is based on the comparison of the p-value with the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

The results show that Availability of Reading Resources has a p-value of 0.0232, which is less than 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0). This indicates a statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of access to reading resources, suggesting that one group (likely females, as seen in Table 4) has greater availability of reading materials than the other.

For Interest in Reading, the p-value is 0.745, which is greater than 0.05, leading to a failure to reject the null hypothesis. This means that there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of their interest in reading. Both groups show comparable levels of engagement and enthusiasm toward reading.

Regarding Vocabulary, the p-value is 0.251, which is also greater than 0.05.** This indicates that there is no significant difference in vocabulary proficiency between males and females, suggesting that both groups develop vocabulary skills at similar levels.

Similarly, for Fluency in Reading, the p-value of 0.349 is greater than 0.05, resulting in the failure to reject the null hypothesis. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of reading fluency, meaning both sexes demonstrate similar levels of reading proficiency.

Table 6. Descriptive Analysis on the Factors When Grouped According to Reading Materials

Factors	Reading Materials	Median	Mean	SD	SE
Availability on reading resources	Books	3.6	3.47	0.365	0.052
	Comics	3.4	3.48	0.174	0.048
	Wattpad	3.4	3.37	0.214	0.059
	Workbooks	3.4	3.47	0.115	0.067
Interest in reading	Books	3.4	3.35	0.343	0.067
	Comics	3.4	3.37	0.354	0.098
	Wattpad	3.4	3.49	0.193	0.054
	Workbooks	3.4	3.13	0.643	0.371
Vocabulary	Books	3.4	3.35	0.279	0.055
	Comics	3.4	3.23	0.468	0.130
	Wattpad	3.4	3.34	0.340	0.094
	Workbooks	3.6	3.47	0.416	0.240
Fluency in reading	Books	3.4	3.37	0.269	0.053
	Comics	3.2	3.28	0.239	0.066
	Wattpad	3.6	3.52	0.174	0.048
	Workbooks	3.6	3.53	0.306	0.176

Table 6 presents a descriptive analysis of the key reading-related factors—Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading—when grouped according to different types of reading materials: Books, Comics, Wattpad, and Workbooks. The table includes median, mean, standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE) for each factor across different reading materials.

For Availability of Reading Resources, books have the highest median (3.6) and a mean of 3.47, indicating that readers perceive books as the most available reading material. Comics (3.4), Wattpad (3.4), and workbooks (3.4) follow closely, with slight variations in their means. The lowest standard deviation (0.115) is observed for workbooks, suggesting more consistent responses, while books show a higher SD (0.365), indicating a wider range of responses.

Regarding Interest in Reading, all reading materials except workbooks have a median of 3.4, with Wattpad having the highest mean (3.49), suggesting that readers generally find it more engaging. Workbooks have a lower mean (3.13) and the highest standard

deviation (0.643), indicating greater variability in how individuals perceive their interest in workbook reading. This suggests that interest in reading is highest for Wattpad and books, while workbooks are perceived as the least engaging.

For Vocabulary, workbooks have the highest median (3.6) and mean (3.47), indicating their effectiveness in vocabulary development. Books and Wattpad show similar means (3.35 and 3.34, respectively), while comics have the lowest mean (3.23) and the highest standard deviation (0.468), indicating a wider spread of responses. This suggests that workbooks may contribute more effectively to vocabulary development, while comics may provide less consistent vocabulary learning experiences.

In terms of Fluency in Reading, workbooks and Wattpad both have the highest median (3.6), with workbooks having the highest mean (3.53) and Wattpad following closely (3.52). Books (3.37) and comics (3.28) have lower mean scores, with comics also having the lowest median (3.2). This suggests that workbooks and Wattpad may be more beneficial for improving reading fluency compared to books and comics.

Table 7. Analysis on Significant Differences in Each Factor Grouped According to Reading Materials

Factors	Test	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Availability of Reading Resources	Kruskal-Wallis	0.49 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Interest in Reading	Kruskal-Wallis	0.653 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Vocabulary	Kruskal-Wallis	0.844 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Fluency in Reading	Kruskal-Wallis	0.0744 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant

Table 7 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, which was used to determine whether significant differences exist in reading-related factors when grouped according to the type of reading materials used. The analysis covered four key factors: Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading. The results indicate that none of these factors show statistically significant differences, as all p-values are greater than 0.05. Specifically, the p-values for Availability of Reading Resources (0.49), Interest in Reading (0.653), Vocabulary (0.844), and Fluency in Reading (0.0744) suggest that the type of reading material does not significantly influence these aspects of reading proficiency.

The availability of reading resources did not differ significantly across books, comics, Wattpad, and workbooks. This suggests that readers generally perceive these materials as equally accessible. The widespread availability of digital reading platforms, library resources, and printed materials may contribute to this result. The finding implies that technological advancements and institutional support have made various reading materials readily available to different groups of readers, reducing disparities in access.

Similarly, the interest in reading was not significantly affected by the type of reading material. This suggests that reading engagement is likely influenced by personal preferences and external motivations rather than the material itself. Readers may find interest in different materials based on their experiences, curiosity, and exposure to diverse genres rather than the specific type of reading content. This finding highlights the importance of fostering a reading culture rather than focusing solely on the type of reading material provided.

The results also show no significant difference in vocabulary development across different reading materials. This finding suggests that regardless of whether individuals read books, comics, Wattpad, or workbooks, their vocabulary growth remains similar. While some studies suggest that books and academic workbooks contain richer vocabulary compared to informal reading materials, the similarity in vocabulary scores might indicate that readers adapt their vocabulary learning across different materials. Exposure to various texts, combined with external language learning strategies such as contextual learning and discussions, may contribute to balanced vocabulary development across different reading materials.

For fluency in reading, the results approached significance ($p = 0.0744$) but remained above the threshold of 0.05, indicating that the differences in fluency scores among different reading materials are not statistically strong. However, the near-significance suggests that certain reading materials may have a slightly greater influence on reading fluency than others. In Table 6, Wattpad and workbooks showed slightly higher fluency means compared to books and comics, but the variation was not strong enough to confirm a definitive advantage. This suggests that while different reading materials may contribute to fluency in different ways, their overall impact remains comparable.

The findings have important implications for education and literacy development. The absence of significant differences across reading materials suggests that no single type of material is superior for improving reading skills. Instead, a diverse reading approach that incorporates multiple materials may be beneficial. Educators and policymakers should focus on encouraging frequent reading rather than prioritizing specific reading materials. Additionally, students and independent readers should recognize that developing strong reading habits and consistency in reading matters more than the type of material being read.

In conclusion, the findings suggest that reading proficiency is not solely dependent on the type of reading material but rather on the frequency and consistency of reading engagement. Since no significant differences were found among the four reading materials, other factors such as reading habits, learning environment, and motivation may play a more critical role in enhancing reading skills. Future research could explore how a combination of different reading materials influences long-term literacy development and whether qualitative aspects of reading content (e.g., academic vs. leisure reading) have a more substantial impact on reading proficiency.

Table 8. Descriptive Analysis on the Factors When Grouped According to Frequency on Reading

Factors	Frequency on Reading	Median	Mean	SD	SE
Availability on reading resources	Sometimes	3.4	3.46	0.233	0.034
	Seldom	3.3	3.35	0.177	0.063
Interest in reading	Sometimes	3.4	3.37	0.344	0.050
	Seldom	3.4	3.40	0.302	0.107
Vocabulary	Sometimes	3.4	3.30	0.366	0.053
	Seldom	3.4	3.48	0.149	0.053
Fluency in reading	Sometimes	3.4	3.40	0.264	0.038
	Seldom	3.4	3.35	0.207	0.073

Table 8 provides a descriptive analysis of the four key reading-related factors—Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading—when grouped according to reading frequency (Sometimes vs. Seldom). The data presents median, mean, standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE) for each factor, offering insights into how often individuals read and whether this influences their reading abilities.

The results indicate only minor differences between individuals who read sometimes and those who read seldom. This suggests that reading frequency alone may not be the strongest determinant of reading skills. While it is generally assumed that more frequent reading leads to better proficiency, the findings highlight that other factors—such as the quality and type of reading material, motivation, and external support—may play a more significant role in shaping reading abilities.

For availability of reading resources, individuals who read sometimes reported a slightly higher mean score (3.46) compared to those who read seldom (3.35). This suggests that individuals who read more frequently may have greater exposure to reading materials or perceive them as more accessible. However, the small difference in median values (3.4 vs. 3.3) suggests that both groups have a similar level of access to reading resources. This indicates that availability of reading materials is not a major barrier to reading frequency, and other factors, such as personal motivation and time constraints, may influence how often individuals engage in reading.

For interest in reading, both groups had the same median score (3.4), and the mean scores were nearly identical (3.37 for sometimes vs. 3.40 for seldom). This implies that reading frequency does not necessarily determine one's interest in reading. Some individuals who read infrequently may still enjoy reading but may not engage in it regularly due to time constraints, lack of motivation, or competing priorities. This finding challenges the assumption that frequent reading automatically fosters greater interest, suggesting that interest in reading is influenced by personal preferences, prior experiences, and external encouragement rather than reading frequency alone.

A notable finding is observed in vocabulary development, where individuals who read seldom had a slightly higher mean score (3.48) than those who read sometimes (3.30). This is somewhat unexpected, as frequent reading is generally associated with better vocabulary acquisition. However, the higher standard deviation for the "sometimes" group (0.366) suggests that there is greater variability in vocabulary levels among those who read more often. This could mean that some individuals who read

frequently may not engage in challenging or vocabulary-rich materials, whereas those who read seldom might still encounter rich vocabulary in the fewer but more meaningful reading experiences they engage in. This emphasizes that reading frequency alone does not guarantee vocabulary growth, and the type of material read may have a greater impact on vocabulary acquisition.

For fluency in reading, both groups had the same median value (3.4), with a slightly higher mean score for those who read sometimes (3.40) compared to those who read seldom (3.35). This suggests that more frequent reading may provide some benefits in fluency, but the difference is relatively small. Since fluency is typically built through consistent practice, the small variation between the two groups may indicate that individuals who read seldom still engage in sufficient reading experiences to maintain their fluency levels.

The findings suggest that reading frequency alone does not lead to drastic differences in reading-related skills. While there are slight variations between those who read sometimes and those who read seldom, the differences are not substantial. This highlights the idea that reading quality, engagement, and external factors such as motivation and educational support play a more significant role in literacy development than just frequency alone.

For educators and policymakers, the results suggest that simply encouraging students to read more often may not be enough. Instead, strategies should focus on engaging students in meaningful reading experiences, such as exposure to diverse texts, comprehension exercises, and discussions that deepen their understanding of what they read. This can be more effective in improving vocabulary, fluency, and overall reading ability.

For students and independent readers, the findings indicate that reading regularly is beneficial, but the way one interacts with the material matters more than just the frequency. Engaging in thoughtful, analytical, and immersive reading experiences is more likely to strengthen vocabulary and fluency than reading frequently without deep engagement.

Overall, the findings suggest that reading frequency does not significantly impact reading-related skills on its own. While those who read sometimes may perceive better access to reading materials and exhibit slightly higher fluency, their vocabulary scores do not necessarily surpass those who read seldom. This highlights the importance of not only promoting reading habits but also ensuring that reading experiences are meaningful, diverse, and engaging to maximize literacy development. Future research could explore how different reading styles and comprehension strategies influence vocabulary and fluency development across varying levels of reading frequency.

Table 9. Analysis on Significant Differences in Each Factor Grouped According to Frequency of Reading

Factors	Test	P-Value	Decision	Interpretation
Availability of Reading Resources	Kruskal-Wallis	0.144 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Interest in Reading	Kruskal-Wallis	0.941 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Vocabulary	Kruskal-Wallis	0.28 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant
Fluency in Reading	Kruskal-Wallis	0.466 > 0.05	Fail to reject Ho	Not significant

Table 9 presents the analysis of significant differences in key reading-related factors—Availability of Reading Resources, Interest in Reading, Vocabulary, and Fluency in Reading—when grouped according to reading frequency. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between individuals who read sometimes and those who read seldom. The p-values for all factors exceeded 0.05, leading to the failure to reject the null hypothesis (Ho) in all cases. This indicates that reading frequency does not significantly impact these reading-related factors.

The results show that for availability of reading resources ($p = 0.144$), there is no significant difference between those who read sometimes and those who read seldom. This suggests that both groups have similar access to books and other reading materials. It challenges the assumption that individuals who read more often do so because they have greater access to reading resources. Instead, it implies that other factors—such as motivation, personal interest, or external influences—play a bigger role in determining reading frequency.

For interest in reading ($p = 0.941$), the data suggests that reading frequency does not necessarily correlate with how much an individual enjoys reading. This means that individuals who read seldom may still have a strong interest in reading but may not engage in it frequently due to constraints such as lack of time, digital distractions, or competing academic and personal responsibilities. Conversely, individuals who read sometimes may not always be highly interested in reading but may do so because

of academic requirements or external obligations. This finding highlights that interest in reading is influenced by multiple factors beyond just reading frequency.

Regarding vocabulary ($p = 0.28$), the results indicate that reading frequency alone does not significantly contribute to vocabulary development. This finding contrasts with the common belief that frequent reading directly enhances vocabulary skills. Instead, it suggests that the quality and depth of reading engagement matter more than the number of times a person reads. Individuals who read seldom may still develop strong vocabulary skills if they engage with rich and challenging texts, while those who read more frequently might not necessarily improve their vocabulary if their reading materials do not introduce new or complex words.

For fluency in reading ($p = 0.466$), the findings show no significant difference between the two groups. This suggests that reading fluency is not solely dependent on reading frequency. While practice is generally associated with fluency improvement, other factors such as comprehension skills, reading strategies, and prior exposure to structured reading instruction may play a more crucial role. Some individuals who read infrequently might still maintain strong fluency levels if they engage in meaningful and high-quality reading experiences that enhance comprehension and word recognition.

The findings suggest that reading frequency alone does not determine reading-related skills. While frequent reading is often encouraged as a way to improve literacy, these results indicate that the nature of reading engagement is more critical than mere frequency. The absence of significant differences highlights the importance of encouraging meaningful and interactive reading experiences rather than just focusing on how often one reads.

For educators and curriculum developers, these findings suggest that simply encouraging students to read more often may not necessarily lead to improved literacy skills. Instead, instructional approaches should focus on active reading strategies, such as summarization techniques, critical thinking exercises, and engagement with diverse and challenging texts. These approaches could help students develop vocabulary, fluency, and overall comprehension more effectively than just increasing the frequency of reading.

For students and independent readers, the results indicate that quality of reading matters more than quantity. Engaging with texts in a deep and meaningful way—such as analyzing themes, making connections, and expanding vocabulary—can lead to greater literacy gains than simply increasing reading time without purposeful engagement. Therefore, choosing rich and challenging reading materials and applying effective comprehension strategies can be more beneficial than focusing solely on reading frequency.

The findings from Table 9 reveal that reading frequency does not significantly impact the availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, or fluency. This challenges the assumption that individuals who read more frequently automatically develop stronger literacy skills. Instead, it highlights the importance of reading quality, engagement, and comprehension-focused strategies. Future research could explore how different reading styles, comprehension techniques, and exposure to diverse texts influence literacy development beyond just the number of times an individual reads.

Table 10. Descriptive Analysis on the Factors

Factors	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	SE
Availability on reading resources	3.0	4.0	3.4	3.44	0.229	0.031
Interest in reading	2.4	4.0	3.4	3.38	0.336	0.045
Vocabulary	2.2	3.8	3.4	3.33	0.347	0.047
Fluency in reading	2.8	3.8	3.4	3.39	0.255	0.034

Table 10 presents a descriptive analysis of key reading-related factors, including availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, and fluency in reading. The data provides insights into the distribution of responses, highlighting both consistency and variation among respondents.

The availability of reading resources showed a range from 3.0 to 4.0, with a median of 3.4 and a mean of 3.44. The relatively low standard deviation ($SD = 0.229$) and standard error ($SE = 0.031$) indicate that responses were closely clustered around the mean, suggesting consistency in access to reading materials. This implies that most individuals had moderate to high access to books and other reading materials, with very few reporting limited availability. However, while the availability of resources appears stable, it does not necessarily reflect how frequently these resources are utilized.

In terms of interest in reading, responses varied more significantly, ranging from 2.4 to 4.0, with a mean of 3.38 and a median of 3.4. The higher standard deviation ($SD = 0.336$) suggests greater variability in reading interest among respondents. While many individuals exhibited a moderate level of interest, some displayed notably lower engagement. This variation could be influenced by factors such as personal motivation, exposure to engaging reading materials, and reading habits developed over time. The findings indicate that simply having access to reading resources does not guarantee high levels of reading interest, emphasizing the need for strategies to foster motivation and engagement in reading.

For vocabulary, responses ranged from 2.2 to 3.8, with a mean of 3.33 and a median of 3.4. The relatively higher standard deviation ($SD = 0.347$) suggests that vocabulary development varied significantly among respondents. This finding indicates that while some individuals may have been exposed to diverse and challenging texts, others may have had limited opportunities to develop their vocabulary. Vocabulary acquisition is influenced by reading habits, educational background, and the complexity of materials read, underscoring the importance of exposure to a wide range of texts that introduce new words in meaningful contexts.

Regarding fluency in reading, responses ranged from 2.8 to 3.8, with a mean of 3.39 and a median of 3.4. The standard deviation ($SD = 0.255$) was lower compared to vocabulary, indicating less variation in fluency levels among respondents. This suggests that most individuals demonstrated moderate reading fluency, with fewer extreme cases of very high or very low fluency. The consistency in fluency scores may reflect similar educational backgrounds or exposure to structured reading instruction. However, since fluency is essential for reading comprehension and overall literacy success, targeted strategies such as guided reading, pronunciation practice, and repeated reading exercises could be beneficial for further improvement.

The findings from Table 10 suggest that while respondents generally had access to reading materials and demonstrated moderate levels of interest, vocabulary, and fluency, there were variations that highlight the need for targeted interventions. The greater variability in interest in reading and vocabulary suggests that some individuals may require additional motivation and exposure to diverse and challenging reading materials. **For educators, this highlights the importance of engaging students with interactive reading activities, book discussions, and personalized reading recommendations.**

Overall, the descriptive analysis emphasizes that reading resource availability alone does not determine reading engagement or literacy development. Future efforts should focus on enhancing reading interest, expanding vocabulary exposure, and implementing strategies to strengthen fluency. Further research could explore how different reading habits, comprehension techniques, and access to digital reading materials influence literacy skills over time.

Table 11. Analysis on Significant Differences Between Variables

Statistical Test	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Kruskal-Wallis	$0.516 > 0.05$	Fail to reject H_0	Not significant

Table 11 presents the analysis of significant differences between variables using the Kruskal-Wallis test. The reported p-value (0.516) is greater than 0.05, leading to the failure to reject the null hypothesis (H_0). This indicates that there are no statistically significant differences between the variables analyzed.

The lack of significant differences suggests that the factors examined—availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, and fluency in reading—do not vary significantly across different groups or conditions. This implies that external factors such as age, sex, reading materials, or reading frequency may not have a substantial impact on these reading-related variables.

These findings reinforce the idea that individual reading abilities and habits may be influenced by other factors not accounted for in this analysis, such as personal motivation, prior educational experiences, or socio-economic background. Future research could explore these aspects further, incorporating qualitative insights or additional statistical tests to uncover deeper patterns in reading engagement and literacy development.

Table 12. Correlation Analysis Among Variables

Factors	Test	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation
Availability & Interest in Reading	Spearman Correlation	-0.06	Inverse correlation
Availability & Vocabulary	Spearman Correlation	0.17	Low correlation
Availability & Fluency	Spearman Correlation	0.08	Low correlation

Interest & Vocabulary	Spearman Correlation	0.31	Low correlation
Interest & Fluency	Spearman Correlation	0.10	Low correlation
Vocabulary & Fluency	Spearman Correlation	0.24	Low correlation

Table 12 presents the correlation analysis among variables using the Spearman Correlation test. The correlation coefficients indicate the strength and direction of the relationships between different reading-related factors, namely availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, and fluency.

The results show a weak inverse correlation (-0.06) between availability of reading resources and interest in reading. This suggests that as the availability of reading materials increases, interest in reading does not necessarily follow a positive trend and may even slightly decrease. This could imply that having access to books and other reading resources alone does not automatically foster interest in reading; instead, engagement may depend on factors such as personal motivation, reading habits, or the appeal of the materials.

The relationships between availability of reading resources and vocabulary (0.17), as well as availability and fluency (0.08), show low positive correlations. This indicates that while greater access to reading materials might contribute to better vocabulary and fluency, the effect is minimal. This finding highlights the importance of not just access, but also active reading engagement, comprehension strategies, and exposure to diverse and challenging texts in developing vocabulary and fluency.

Similarly, interest in reading showed low positive correlations with vocabulary (0.31) and fluency (0.10). While a higher interest in reading might slightly contribute to vocabulary acquisition, the correlation is not strong, suggesting that other factors, such as the complexity of reading materials and the frequency of reading, may have a greater impact. The weak relationship between interest and fluency further supports the idea that reading fluency is influenced by structured reading practice, pronunciation exercises, and comprehension techniques rather than just reading interest alone.

The highest correlation observed was between vocabulary and fluency (0.24), though it still falls under a low correlation category. This suggests that individuals with stronger vocabulary knowledge may have slightly better fluency in reading, which aligns with the idea that a richer vocabulary supports smoother reading and comprehension. However, the low correlation implies that fluency is not solely dependent on vocabulary development but also on reading practice, exposure to fluent reading models, and comprehension skills.

Overall, the correlation analysis indicates that the relationships between availability of reading resources, interest in reading, vocabulary, and fluency are weak. This suggests that no single factor directly determines reading ability, and multiple elements contribute to literacy development. These findings emphasize the need for holistic reading interventions, including improving engagement strategies, promoting active reading habits, and incorporating structured literacy programs to enhance fluency and vocabulary acquisition. Future research could investigate external influences such as reading frequency, instructional methods, and socio-economic factors to gain deeper insights into literacy development.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study on the challenges in reading comprehension among BEED first-year students at Siargao Island Institute of Technology revealed several factors that affected their ability to understand and interpret written texts. The key challenges identified included limited vocabulary knowledge, unfamiliarity with sentence structures, and difficulty in grasping textual context. Additionally, external distractions such as technology, social media, and other interruptions were noted as significant barriers to effective reading comprehension. These findings emphasized the need for targeted interventions to support students in overcoming these obstacles and improving their reading skills.

To address these challenges, educators implemented strategies that focused on vocabulary development, sentence structure comprehension, and critical thinking enhancement. Encouraging regular reading, providing access to diverse reading materials, and fostering an environment that minimized distractions significantly helped improve students' reading comprehension. Furthermore, the school administration introduced programs that offered reading support and resources, while students actively participated in these initiatives to enhance their skills. Through a collaborative approach, both educators and students worked towards improving reading comprehension and ensuring academic success.

REFERENCES

1. Clarke, J., Smith, A., & Johnson, M. (2014). *Enhancing reading comprehension: Strategies for engaging students in meaning-making*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*.
https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6747/1/phd_thesis_ethesis_correct_pages
2. Dennis, J. (2011). *The complex nature of reading comprehension: Balancing symbol recognition and interpretation*. *Journal of Educational Research*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>
3. Elleman, A. M., & Oslund, E. L. (2019). *Reading comprehension research: Implications for practice and policy*. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2019-14017-001>
4. English Language Teaching Guide. (2019). *Overcoming challenges in reading comprehension: Identifying factors and applying strategies*. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*. <https://education.qld.gov.au/curriculums/Documents/literature-review.pdf>
5. Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). *Understanding the components and processes of reading comprehension*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. <https://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jse/article/view/9201/0>
6. Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The importance of background knowledge in reading comprehension*. *Educational Psychology Review*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02702711.2021.1888348>
7. Kamhi, A. (2007). *The role of background knowledge in reading comprehension*. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349506620_The_Role_of_Background_Knowledge_in_Reading_Comprehension_A_Critical_Review
8. Kendeou, P. J. (2016). *Reading comprehension: Core components and processes*. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2372732215624707>
9. McMaster, K. L., & Christ, T. J. (2016). *Reading comprehension: Core components and processes*. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2372732215624707>
10. Odwan, T. A. A. (2012). *The complexity of reading comprehension: Extracting and retrieving meaning from texts*. *Reading Research Quarterly*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/302884206_Reading_Comprehension
11. Silbert, L. (2014). *Enhancing reading comprehension: Strategies for success*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254282574_Effective_Practices_for_Developing_Reading_Comprehension
12. Tompkins, G. E. (2011). *Understanding reading comprehension: The creative process of comprehending texts*. *Reading Research Quarterly*. <https://www.basicknowledge101.com/pdf/literacy/Reading%20comprehension>
13. Van den Broek, P., Kendeou, P., & White, M. J. (2012). *Understanding reading comprehension: The interaction of automatic and strategic cognitive processes*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110(1).
<https://handinhandhomeschool.com/teaching>

Cite this Article: Jessivel R. Bacsal, Aina Angela D. Coluna, Roselyn C. Consigna, Trixie N. Dador, Emmanuel Jr. J. Dageuta, Laiza B. Decatoria, Jona Mae L. Paja, Jeah S. Rafols, Jowina Fe M. Saragena, Geraldine T. Sumaylo, Maria Lelanie A. Goyonan, Ronald G. Española (2025). Reading Comprehension Challenges Among First-Year Beed Students at Siargao Island Institute of Technology, A.Y. 2023-2024. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 8(3), pp. 1238-1253. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i3-27>