
IMPLEMENTATION OF ACADEMIC RECOVERY AND ACCESSIBLE LEARNING (ARAL) PROGRAM: ITS NEEDS AND CHALLENGES

***Agnes D. Minerva and Wilson F. Tosino**

Guimaras State University-Graduate School.

Article Received: 01 July 2026, Article Revised: 21 July 2026, Published on: 08 August 2026

***Corresponding Author: Agnes D. Minerva**

Guimaras State University-Graduate School.

Doi: <https://doi-org/101555/ijarp.2093>

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) program as well as its needs and challenges in the Schools Division of Iloilo, Philippines, for School Year 2025-2026. The respondents of the study were the 386 junior high school teachers selected through stratified random sampling using fishbowl technique. The statistical tools used were frequency count, percentage, ANOVA, and Pearson's r and the level of significance was set at 0.05. Findings revealed that the extent of implementation of ARAL program was very great as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and classified by highest educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district; for the respondents the resources in the implementation of ARAL program were mostly needed to effectively achieve its desired goals and the challenges in the implementation of ARAL program which hinder the achievement of its desired goals were occasionally experienced; there were no significant differences in the extent of implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when grouped by highest educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size and congressional district; there were significant differences in the needs in the implementation when respondents were grouped by highest educational attainment, grade level taught, school size and congressional district but not when grouped by length of service; there were significant differences in the challenges encountered when respondents were grouped by educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught but not when grouped by school size, and congressional district; and finally, there were significant relationships among implementation, needs and challenges of ARAL program.

KEYWORDS: Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program, Needs, Challenges.

INTRODUCTION

The Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program is a national learning recovery initiative of the Department of Education (DepEd) launched in 2022 as an urgent response to the significant learning losses experienced by Filipino learners during the COVID-19 pandemic. With prolonged school closures and reduced exposure to formal instruction, many students demonstrated declining proficiency in literacy, numeracy, and essential academic skills. To address these gaps, the ARAL Program was implemented to provide targeted remediation, structured learning support, and accessible intervention sessions designed to help learners recover lost competencies and achieve grade-level mastery. The program's purpose is to strengthen foundational skills, reduce learning disparities, and ensure that struggling learners receive adequate instructional assistance as schools transition fully back to face-to-face instruction.

The ARAL Program provides a strong policy foundation for learning recovery, the effectiveness of these efforts depends greatly on their implementation at the school level. Teachers, as frontline implementers, are responsible for designing intervention plans, facilitating remediation sessions, monitoring learner progress, and adapting instructional strategies to address diverse learning needs. However, teachers often face various needs and challenges.

Given these considerations, this study sought to determine the extent of implementation of the ARAL Program in the Schools Division of Iloilo and to identify the accompanying needs and challenges. By examining the extent of ARAL implementation and documenting teachers' needs and challenges, this study aimed to generate evidence-based insights that can guide program enhancement, strengthen teacher support mechanisms, and improve the overall delivery of learning recovery initiatives. Thus, this study was conducted.

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to determine the implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program, its needs and challenges in the Schools Division of Iloilo, Philippines for School Year 2025-2026.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
2. What is the extent of implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
3. What are the needs in the implementation of ARA program as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
4. What are the challenges in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole and when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
5. Are there significant differences in the extent of implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
6. Are there significant differences in the needs in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
7. Are there significant differences in the challenges in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district?
8. Are there significant relationships among the implementation of ARAL program, its needs, and challenges?

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to determine the implementation of academic recovery and accessible learning (ARAL) program, its needs and challenges in the Schools Division of Iloilo for the School Year 2025-2026. The respondents of this study were the 376 junior high school teachers in the Schools Division of Iloilo who were selected through stratified random sampling using fishbowl technique. Respondents' categorization included educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district. Data were gathered using a duly validated and reliability-tested researcher-made questionnaire. For statistical analysis, frequency count, percentage, mean and was employed as descriptive statistics while ANOVA, and Pearson's r Correlation was used as inferential statistics set at

.05 alpha level of significance. Data analyses were done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 22.0.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Educational attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District

The data in table 1 show that the total number of respondents is 385. In terms of educational attainment, majority held master's degree at 204 or 53.0%. Followed by 124 or 32.20% with bachelor's degree, and 57 or 14.80 percent held doctorate degree. In terms of length of service, nearly half or 187 or 48.60% of the respondents have 6-15 years of experience. 145 or 37.70% have served for 16 years or more and only 53 or 13.80% have below 6 years of service. Regarding grade level taught, majority handled Grade 10 at 120 or 31.20%, followed by teachers who handled Grade 9 at 104 or 27.00%, Grade 8 at 95 or 24.70% and Grade 7 at 66 or 17.10%. In terms of school size, majority of the teachers were from large schools at 213 or 55.30%. 131 or 34.00% were from medium schools and only 41 or 10.60% were from small schools. Finally, in terms of Congressional District, majority were from the Fifth Congressional District with 105 or 27.30% teachers. This is followed by Third Congressional District with 95 or 24.70%, Fourth Congressional District with 63 or 16.40% while the First and Second District have an equal representation with 61 or 15.80% respondents each.

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Educational attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District.

Variables	F	%
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	124	32.20
Master's Degree	204	53.00
Doctorate Degree	57	14.80
Length of Service		
Below 6 years	53	13.80
6-15 years	187	48.60
16 years or more	145	37.70
Grade Level Taught		
Grade 7	66	17.10
Grade 8	95	24.70
Grade 9	104	27.00
Grade 10	120	31.20
School Size		
Small	41	10.60
Medium	131	34.00

Large	213	55.30
Congressional District		
First	61	15.80
Second	61	15.80
Third	95	24.70
Fourth	63	16.40
Fifth	105	27.30
Total	385	100.00

Extent of Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents when taken as a Whole

The data in table 2 show that the ARAL program was implemented to a very great extent ($M = 4.32$) as assessed by the respondents when taken as a whole. This means that all secondary schools have executed the ARAL program by providing targeted remediation, academic support, and accessible activities for learners who are at risk or performing below proficiency levels. For all items, the extent of implementation was rated as “to a very great extent” except for items “the guidelines provided for the implementation of the ARAL Program are strictly followed” ($M = 4.19$) and “teachers’ communicate with parents or guardians about the learners’ involvement in ARAL” ($M = 4.17$) which got great extent. For the items which were rated to a very great extent, “appropriate teaching strategies to address learners’ academic gaps during ARAL” ($M = 4.5$) got the highest mean, followed by “ARAL sessions are conducted according to the recommended schedule ($M = 4.46$) and “ARAL activities are delivered consistently and effectively ($M = 4.43$) were among which earned the highest mean.

Table 2. Extent of Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents when taken as a Whole.

Items	Mean	Description
the guidelines provided for the implementation of the ARAL Program are strictly followed.	4.19	To a Great Extent
the ARAL modules provided by the DepEd are utilized.	4.39	To a Very Great Extent
ARAL sessions are conducted according to the recommended schedule.	4.46	To a Very Great Extent
appropriate teaching strategies are used to address learners’ academic gaps during ARAL.	4.50	To a Very Great Extent
activities are delivered consistently and effectively.	4.43	To a Very Great Extent
instructional materials prepared are specifically tailored for ARAL learners.	4.36	To a Very Great Extent
records of learners’ attendance and performance in ARAL sessions are well kept.	4.36	To a Very Great Extent
learners are regularly assessed to monitor their progress in	4.32	To a Very Great Extent

the ARAL Program.		
instruction are adjusted based on learners' needs during ARAL sessions.	4.28	To a Very Great Extent
teachers coordinate with their fellow teachers regarding ARAL implementation procedures.	4.25	To a Very Great Extent
teachers communicate with parents or guardians about the learners' involvement in ARAL.	4.17	To a Great Extent
ARAL activities are implemented despite time constraints and competing tasks.	4.22	To a Very Great Extent
teachers receive and utilize feedback to improve ARAL implementation practices.	4.29	To a Very Great Extent
the ARAL sessions are accessible and supportive for struggling learners.	4.28	To a Very Great Extent
reporting and documentation adheres to the requirements of the ARAL Program.	4.34	To a Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.32	To a Very Great Extent

Legend; 4.21 - 5.00 – To a Very Great Extent, 3.41 - 4.20 – To a Great Extent, 2.61 - 3.40 – To a Moderate Extent, 1.81 - 2.60 – To a Low Extent and 1.00 - 1.80 – To a Very Low Extent

Extent of Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents when Classified According to Educational attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District

The data in table 3 show the extent of implementation of ARAL program was very great as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment with a sub-mean = 4.29, the lowest among the profile variables, length of service (sub-mean = 4.33), the highest rating, grade level taught (sub-mean = 4.32), school size (sub-mean = 4.31), and congressional district with a sub-mean of 4.32. This means that all schools have executed the ARAL program by providing targeted remediation, academic support, and accessible activities for learners who are at risk or performing below proficiency level.

Further, results reveal that when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment, the bachelor's degree holder gave the highest rating ($M = 4.40$) and those with doctorate degree had the lowest assessment rating ($M = 4.16$) who considered the extent of implementation of ARAL program as great.

In terms of length of service, all groups got a consistent remark of to "a great extent". Both the new teachers with below 6 years of teaching experience and the most experienced with 16 years shared the highest rating ($M = 4.33$). while those in the mid-career bracket with 6-15 years of experience followed almost identical ($M = 4.32$).

As to grade level taught, teachers in Grade 9 and Grade 10 reported the highest implementation ratings ($M = 4.38$), followed closely by Grade 7 ($M = 4.36$) all falling within the “to a very great extent” category. However, Grade 8 teachers ($M = 4.17$) reported a slightly lesser extent, described as “to a great extent.”

When respondents were grouped by school size, the program was consistently implemented “to a very great extent” across all categories, with those from medium schools ($M = 4.37$) reporting the highest rating, followed by those from large ($M = 4.30$) and small ($m = 4.27$) schools.

These results conform with the findings in the study of Calingayan (2025) which emphasizes that the implementation of remedial programs is contingent upon the quality of teaching strategies employed and the active participation of students. Teachers in remedial settings often rely on flexible and adaptive teaching methods, such as peer teaching and re-teaching, to accommodate the diverse needs of students. Peer interactions can significantly enhance learning outcomes in remedial programs, especially when students actively collaborate with one another.

Table 3. Extent Of Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District.

Variables	Mean	Description
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.40	To a Very Great Extent
Master's Degree	4.32	To a Very Great Extent
Doctorate Degree	4.16	To a Great Extent
Sub-Mean	4.29	To a Very Great Extent
Length of Service		
Below 6 years	4.33	To a Very Great Extent
6-15 years	4.32	To a Very Great Extent
16 years or more	4.33	To a Very Great Extent
Sub-Mean	4.33	To a Very Great Extent
Grade Level Taught		
Grade 7	4.36	To a Very Great Extent
Grade 8	4.17	To a Great Extent
Grade 9	4.38	To a Very Great Extent
Grade 10	4.38	To a Very Great Extent
Sub- Mean	4.32	To a Very Great Extent
School Size		
Small	4.27	To a Very Great Extent
Medium	4.37	To a Very Great Extent

Large	4.30	To a Very Great Extent
Sub – Mean	4.31	To a Very Great Extent
Congressional District		
First	4.28	To a Very Great Extent
Second	4.21	To a Very Great Extent
Third	4.41	To a Very Great Extent
Fourth	4.43	To a Very Great Extent
Fifth	4.27	To a Very Great Extent
Sub Mean	4.32	To a Very Great Extent

Legend; 4.21 - 5.00 – To a Very Great Extent, 3.41 - 4.20 – To a Great Extent, 2.61 - 3.40 – To a Moderate Extent, 1.81 - 2.60 – To a Low Extent and 1.00 - 1.80 – To a Very Low Extent

Needs in the Implementation of ARAL Program as Assessed by the Respondents When Taken As a Whole

The results in table 4 show that when respondents were taken as a whole ($M = 2.43$), they considered the resources very essential in the implementation of ARAL program to effectively achieve its desired goals particularly sufficient teaching materials and resources ($M = 2.56$), more time allocated to conduct ARAL sessions ($M = 2.55$), and support from school administrators like supplies, and food ($M = 2.52$), where “policies that recognize and support teachers through DepEd and/or LGU” ($M = 2.37$), “additional training on ARAL instructional strategies” ($M = 2.34$), and feedback and monitoring to improve ARAL teaching practices ($M = 2.34$) were among the needs given the lowest rating.

The result of the study supports the study of Acita et al. (2022) which emphasizes the importance of teacher adaptation and instructional strategies in ensuring the success of remedial reading programs.

Table 4. Needs in the Implementation of ARAL Program as Assessed by the Respondents when Taken as a Whole.

Items	Mean	Description
additional training on ARAL instructional strategies.	2.34	Needed
sufficient teaching materials and resources for ARAL sessions.	2.56	Mostly Needed
more time allocated to conduct ARAL sessions effectively.	2.55	Mostly Needed
support from school administrators to implement ARAL smoothly like school supplies, food etc.	2.52	Mostly Needed
clear guidelines on how to assess learners during ARAL sessions.	2.49	Mostly Needed
access to technology and digital tools to enhance ARAL instruction.	2.43	Mostly Needed
collaboration opportunities with other teachers for ARAL planning.	2.44	Mostly

		Needed
assistance in managing learners with different academic levels.	2.46	Mostly Needed
professional development programs focused on remediation techniques.	2.38	Mostly Needed
adequate classroom space to conduct ARAL sessions.	2.41	Mostly Needed
additional instructional materials such as worksheets and activity sheets.	2.41	Mostly Needed
support from parents or guardians to ensure learners' participation.	2.39	Mostly Needed
guidance on prioritizing tasks between ARAL and regular class responsibilities.	2.39	Mostly Needed
feedback and mentoring to improve my ARAL teaching practices.	2.32	Needed
policies that recognize and support teachers through incentive from DepEd and/or LGU in implementing ARAL Program.	2.37	Mostly Needed
Overall Mean	2.43	Mostly Needed

Legend: (2.35 – 3.00 – Mostly Needed, 1.68 – 2.34 – Slightly Needed, and 1.00 – 1.67 – Least Needed)

Needs in the Implementation of ARAL Program as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District

Table 5 presents the respondents' assessment of the needs in the implementation of the ARAL Program when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district. The overall mean of 2.43, interpreted as Mostly Needed, indicates that the identified needs were generally assessed as mostly needed by the respondents.

In terms of educational attainment, respondents with a Bachelor's Degree obtained the highest mean of 2.61 (Mostly Needed), followed by those with a Master's Degree with a mean of 2.39 (Mostly Needed). Respondents with a Doctorate Degree recorded the lowest mean of 2.18, interpreted as Slightly Needed.

When classified according to length of service, respondents with below 6 years of service obtained the highest mean of 2.56 (Mostly Needed), followed by those with 16 years or more with a mean of 2.43 (Mostly Needed), while respondents with 6–15 years of service registered the lowest mean of 2.40 (Mostly Needed).

Based on grade level taught, Grade 10 teachers registered the highest mean of 2.56 (Mostly Needed), followed by Grade 7 teachers with a mean of 2.46 (Mostly Needed) and Grade 8

teachers with 2.37 (Mostly Needed). Grade 9 teachers recorded the lowest mean of 2.32, interpreted as Slightly Needed.

For school size, respondents from medium-sized schools obtained the highest mean of 2.49 (Mostly Needed), followed by those from large schools with a mean of 2.44 (Mostly Needed). Respondents from small schools recorded the lowest mean of 2.22, interpreted as Slightly Needed.

In terms of congressional district, respondents from the First Congressional District obtained the highest mean of 2.71 (Mostly Needed). This was followed by the Third and Fourth Congressional Districts, both with a mean of 2.45 (Mostly Needed), and the Fifth Congressional District with 2.37 (Mostly Needed). The Second Congressional District registered the lowest mean of 2.21, interpreted as Slightly Needed. Overall, the findings show that most respondent groups assessed the identified needs in the implementation of the ARAL Program as Mostly Needed, while only a few groups rated them as Slightly Needed.

Table 5. Needs in the Implementation of ARAL Program as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District.

Variables	Mean	Description
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	2.61	Mostly Needed
Master's Degree	2.39	Mostly Needed
Doctorate Degree	2.18	Slightly Needed
Length of Service		
Below 6 years	2.56	Mostly Needed
6-15 years	2.40	Mostly Needed
16 years or more	2.43	Mostly Needed
Grade Level Taught		
Grade 7	2.46	Mostly Needed
Grade 8	2.37	Mostly Needed
Grade 9	2.32	Slightly Needed
Grade 10	2.56	Mostly Needed
School Size		
Small	2.22	Slightly Needed
Medium	2.49	Mostly Needed
Large	2.44	Mostly Needed
Congressional District		
First	2.71	Mostly Needed
Second	2.21	Slightly Needed
Third	2.45	Mostly Needed
Fourth	2.45	Mostly Needed
Fifth	2.37	Mostly Needed
Overall	2.43	Mostly Needed

Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents when taken as a Whole

The data in table 6 show that for the respondents when taken as a whole, the challenges were slightly encountered in the implementation of ARAL. Over-all $M = 2.15$. This means that the difficulties in the implementation of ARAL program which hinder the achievement of its goals were occasionally experienced. The top challenge was "learners' irregular attendance in ARAL sessions" ($M = 2.25$), indicating that inconsistent learners' participation is the primary barrier to academic recovery. This was followed closely by "difficulty in preparing sufficient instructional materials for ARAL" ($M = 2.23$) and a tie between "struggle to address the diverse learning needs of students during ARAL" and "experience difficulty in implementing ARAL due to unclear guidelines or instructions" ($M = 2.18$).

The result of the study conforms to the study of Du & Lipscomb (2023) which states the effectiveness of remedial programs depends not only on student participation but also on the quality of the instruction and the methods used. The use of diagnostic assessments and differentiated pedagogy is crucial in tailoring interventions to meet the specific needs of students.

The result further supports the study of Dela Cruz (2023) which states that strong school leadership and collaborative teacher efforts played a crucial role in facilitating the smoother implementation of the program. The findings point out that sustained support, adequate resources, and continuous professional development are essential for ensuring the success of ARAL. Teachers also emphasized the need for clearer guidelines, more teacher training, and reduced teacher workload to enhance the program's impact.

Table 6. Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents when taken as a Whole.

Items	Mean	Description
difficulty in managing time between ARAL sessions and regular classes.	2.09	Slightly Encountered
learners' have irregular attendance in ARAL sessions.	2.25	Slightly Encountered
difficulty in preparing sufficient instructional materials for ARAL.	2.23	Slightly Encountered
struggle to address the diverse learning needs of students during ARAL.	2.18	Slightly Encountered
experience limited support from school administrators in implementing ARAL.	2.15	Slightly Encountered

difficulty in motivating learners to actively participate in ARAL activities.	2.13	Slightly Encountered
occurrence of problems in coordinating with other teachers for effective ARAL implementation.	2.13	Slightly Encountered
difficulty in monitoring and assessing learners' progress in ARAL.	2.17	Slightly Encountered
feel overwhelmed by the additional workload caused by ARAL responsibilities.	2.17	Slightly Encountered
difficulty in using technology or digital tools for ARAL instruction.	2.09	Slightly Encountered
inadequate classroom space to conduct ARAL sessions effectively.	2.05	Slightly Encountered
lack of parental support in encouraging learners to attend ARAL sessions.	2.13	Slightly Encountered
struggle to balance ARAL program demands with other school tasks or requirements.	2.12	Slightly Encountered
difficulty in applying ARAL strategies to learners with varying levels of understanding.	2.17	Slightly Encountered
difficulty in implementing ARAL due to unclear guidelines or instructions.	2.18	Slightly Encountered
Overall Mean	2.15	Slightly Encountered
Legend: 2.35 – 3.00 – Mostly Encountered, 1.68 – 2.34 – Slightly Encountered, and 1.00 – 1.67 – Least Encountered		

Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District

Table 7 presents the respondents' assessment of the challenges encountered in the implementation of the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district. The overall mean of 2.15, interpreted as Slightly Encountered, indicates that the identified challenges were generally assessed as slightly encountered by the respondents.

In terms of educational attainment, respondents with a Bachelor's Degree obtained the highest mean of 2.46 (Mostly Encountered), followed by those with a Doctorate Degree with a mean of 2.08 (Slightly Encountered). Respondents with a Master's Degree recorded the lowest mean of 1.98, interpreted as Slightly Encountered.

When classified according to length of service, respondents with below 6 years of service obtained the highest mean of 2.41 (Mostly Encountered), followed by those with 6–15 years

of service with a mean of 2.20 (Slightly Encountered), while respondents with 16 years or more registered the lowest mean of 1.99 (Slightly Encountered).

Based on grade level taught, Grade 7 and Grade 8 teachers both registered the highest mean of 2.29 (Slightly Encountered), followed by Grade 9 teachers with a mean of 2.09 (Slightly Encountered). Grade 10 teachers recorded the lowest mean of 2.06, also interpreted as Slightly Encountered.

For school size, respondents from medium-sized schools obtained the highest mean of 2.25 (Slightly Encountered), followed by those from small schools with a mean of 2.08 (Slightly Encountered). Respondents from large schools recorded the lowest mean of 1.97, interpreted as Slightly Encountered.

In terms of congressional district, respondents from the Third Congressional District obtained the highest mean of 2.26 (Slightly Encountered). This was followed by the Fourth Congressional District with a mean of 2.18 (Slightly Encountered), the First Congressional District with 2.15 (Slightly Encountered), the Fifth Congressional District with 2.10 (Slightly Encountered), and the Second Congressional District with 2.05 (Slightly Encountered). Overall, the findings show that respondents across all classifications generally assessed the challenges encountered in the implementation of the ARAL Program as Slightly Encountered, with only respondents holding a Bachelor's Degree and those with below six years of service rating the challenges as Mostly Encountered.

Table 7. Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program as Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size, and Congressional District

Variables	Mean	Description
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	2.46	Mostly Encountered
Master's Degree	1.98	Slightly Encountered
Doctorate Degree	2.08	Slightly Encountered
Length of Service		
Below 6 years	2.41	Mostly Encountered
6-15 years	2.20	Slightly Encountered
16 years or more	1.99	Slightly Encountered
Grade Level Taught		
Grade 7	2.29	Slightly Encountered
Grade 8	2.29	Slightly Encountered
Grade 9	2.09	Slightly Encountered
Grade 10	2.06	Slightly Encountered

School Size		
Small	2.08	Slightly Encountered
Medium	2.25	Slightly Encountered
Large	1.97	Slightly Encountered
Congressional District		
First	2.15	Slightly Encountered
Second	2.05	Slightly Encountered
Third	2.26	Slightly Encountered
Fourth	2.18	Slightly Encountered
Fifth	2.10	Slightly Encountered
Overall	2.15	Slightly Encountered

Significant Differences in the Extent of Implementation of ARAL Program As Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size and Congressional District

Table 8 shows no significant differences in the extent of implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment ($F = 2.77$, $p = .104$), length of service ($F = .016$, $p = .984$), grade level taught ($F = 2.110$, $p = .099$), school size ($F = .513$, $p = .599$), and congressional district ($F = 1.393$, $p = .236$). All the p -values are greater than 0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there are no significant differences in the extent of implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size and congressional district was not rejected. This means that the respondents had the same assessment of the extent of implementation of ARAL program regardless of their educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size and congressional district.

Table 8. Significant Differences in the Extent of Implementation of ARAL Program As Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size and Congressional District.

Variables		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p-value	Remarks
Educational Attainment	Between Groups	2.183	1.092	2.277	.104	Not Significant
	Within Groups	183.109	.479			
Length of Service	Between Groups	.016	.008	.016	.984	Not Significant
	Within Groups	185.276	.485			
Grade Level Taught	Between Groups	3.028	1.009	2.110	.099	Not Significant
	Within Groups	182.264	.478			
School Size	Between Groups	.497	.248	.513	.599	Not Significant
	Within Groups	184.795	.484			
Congressional District	Between Groups	2.678	.669	1.393	.236	Not Significant
	Within Groups	182.614	.481			

Significant Differences in the Needs in the Implementation of ARAL Program As Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size and Congressional District

Data in table 9 show significant differences in the extent of implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified by educational attainment ($F = 13.324$, $p = .000$), grade level taught ($F = 4.077$, $p = .007$), school size ($F = 3.803$, $p = .023$), and congressional district ($F = 6.795$, $p = .000$). All the p-values are less than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there are no significant differences in the needs in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment, grade level taught, school size, and congressional district was rejected. This means that the respondents considered different needs in the implementation of ARAL program depending on their educational attainment, grade level they are teaching, the size of their school, and congressional district. However, when the respondents were grouped according to their length of service, no significant differences were noted in the needs they identified in the implementation of ARAL program ($F = 1.709$, $p = .182$) where the p-values is greater than 0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there are no significant differences in the needs in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when grouped by length of service was rejected. This illustrates that the respondents identified similar needs in ARAL program implementation when their length of service was considered.

Table 9. Significant Differences in the Needs in the Implementation of ARAL Program As Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size and Congressional District.

Variables		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p-value	Remarks
Educational Attainment	Between Groups	7.881	3.941	13.324	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	112.982	.296			
Length of Service	Between Groups	1.072	.536	1.709	.182	Not Significant
	Within Groups	119.791	.314			
Grade Level Taught	Between Groups	3.759	1.253	4.077	.007	Significant
	Within Groups	117.104	.307			
School Size	Between Groups	2.359	1.180	3.803	.023	Significant
	Within Groups	118.504	.310			
Congressional District	Between Groups	8.068	2.017	6.795	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	112.795	.297			

Significant Differences in the Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of ARAL Program As Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size and Congressional District

Table 10 shows significant differences in the challenges encountered in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified according to educational attainment ($F = 24.132$, $p = .000$), length of service ($F = 10.789$, $p = .000$), and grade level taught ($F = 3.421$, $p = .000$). All the p -values are less than 0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there are significant differences in challenges encountered in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when classified by educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught was rejected. This means that the respondents identified varying challenges encountered in the implementation of ARAL program when their educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught were considered. However, when the respondents were classified by school size ($F = 2.208$, $p = .111$) and congressional district ($F = 1.059$, $p = .377$), no significant differences were noted in the challenges encountered where the p -values are greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there are no significant differences in the implementation of ARAL program as assessed by the respondents when grouped by school size and congressional district was not rejected. This means that the respondents identified challenges encountered in the implementation of ARAL program depending on their school size and location of their school.

Table 10. Significant Differences in the Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of ARAL Program As Assessed by the Respondents When Classified According to Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Grade Level Taught, School Size and Congressional District.

Variables		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p-value	Remarks
Educational Attainment	Between Groups	20.614	10.307	24.132	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	163.160	.427			
Length of Service	Between Groups	9.826	4.913	10.789	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	173.949	.455			
Grade Level Taught	Between Groups	4.821	1.607	3.421	.017	Significant
	Within Groups	178.953	.470			
School Size	Between Groups	2.100	1.050	2.208	.111	Not Significant
	Within Groups	181.674	.476			
Congressional District	Between Groups	2.025	.506	1.059	.377	Not Significant
	Within Groups	181.749	.478			

Significant Relationships Among Implementation, Needs and Challenges of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program

Table 11 shows that there was a significant relationship between the Implementation and Needs in ARAL Program ($r = .431$, $p = .000$). The p-value .000 is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. This means that the null hypothesis which stated that there was no significant relationship between implementation and needs was rejected. This indicates a moderate positive correlation, which means that as the extent of implementation increases, the identified needs of the program also tend to become more apparent.

There was a significant relationship between the Needs and Challenges in ARAL Program ($r = .487$, $p = .000$). The p-value .000 is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. This means that the null hypothesis which stated that there was no significant relationship between Needs and Challenges was rejected. This illustrates that the more needs are there the more challenges encountered in the program.

There was a significant relationship between implementation and challenges ($r = .233$, $p = .000$). The p-value .000 is lower than the 0.05 level of significance. This means that the null hypothesis which stated that there was no significant relationship between implementation and challenges was rejected.

This means that the extent in the implementation of ARAL program, the more challenges are encountered. A high-level execution reveals the necessity for enhanced systemic support. This rise in identified needs is strongly linked to an increase in the challenges encountered ($r = .487$), which represents the strongest relationship in the study and proves that unfulfilled requirements directly manifest as more intense operational obstacles. While a very great extent of implementation is maintained despite these growing hurdles ($r = .233$), the overall findings confirm that the program's long-term sustainability depends on bridging the gap between pedagogical effort and systemic support to ensure that the high extent of implementation is maintained.

Table 11. Significant Relationships Among Implementation, Needs and Challenges of Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program.

Correlations		implementation	needs	challenges	Remarks
implementation	Pearson Correlation		.431**		
	p-value		.000		Significant
	N		385		
needs	Pearson Correlation			.487**	
	p-value			.000	Significant
	N			385	

challenges	Pearson Correlation	.233**			
	p-value	.000			Significant
	N	385			

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Most of the respondents are master's degree holder, in service for 6-15 years, teaching in Grade 10, from large schools and from the fifth congressional district.
2. All junior high schools in the division of Iloilo have executed the ARAL program by providing targeted remediation, academic support, and accessible activities for learners who are at risk or performing below proficient levels.
3. For the junior high school teachers in the Schools division of Iloilo, the resources in the implementation of ARAL program are very essential to effectively achieve its desired goals particularly on sufficiency of teaching materials and resources, more time allocated to conduct ARAL sessions, and support from school administrators.
4. For the junior high school teachers in the Schools division of Iloilo, the difficulties in the implementation of ARAL program which hinder the achievement of its goals are occasionally experienced focusing most on learners' irregular attendance in ARAL sessions and difficulty in preparing sufficient instructional materials.
5. The junior high school teachers in the Schools division of Iloilo have similar assessment of the extent of implementation of ARAL program regardless of their educational attainment, length of service, grade level taught, school size and congressional district.
6. The teachers have different assessment of the needs in the implementation of ARAL program when their educational attainment, grade level taught, school size and congressional district are considered but similar when grouped by length of service.
7. The teachers have different assessment of the challenges encountered in the implementation of ARAL program when their educational attainment, length of service, and grade level taught but similar when grouped by school size and congressional district.
8. There are significant relationships among implementation of ARAL program, its needs and challenges.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations based on the foregoing findings and conclusions by the researcher:

1. The Department of Education (DepEd) officials may continue the execution of standardized guidelines of ARAL program to sustain its very great extent of implementation but ensure that resources necessary for the conduct of ARAL sessions particularly on instructional materials and other learning resources will be well provided.
2. School heads may enhance their administrative support by creating a more balanced schedule that reduces the conflict between ARAL sessions and regular classes and initiate improvement in the policies pertaining to giving of incentives to ARAL tutors.
3. School head may design a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation of the delivery of ARAL program for a better participation of learners in ARAL sessions, enhance parents and other stakeholders' support.
4. Teachers are encouraged to utilize collaborative mentoring or Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions where experienced educators share effective strategies with newer teachers to help them manage the high intensity of challenges. Educators should also continue to focus on differentiated instruction to better serve the diverse learning needs of the learners identified in this study.
5. Future researchers are encouraged to conduct qualitative studies to explore the "why" behind learner absenteeism and parental lack of support. Additionally, a longitudinal study to measure the long-term impact of the ARAL program on learners' performance to see if implementation translates into significant academic gains.

REFERENCES

1. Acita et al. (2022). Challenges, Difficulties, and Effective Enactment of Remedial
2. Reading Programs: A Qualitative-Phenomenological Approach. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7325200
3. Alsraisri, N. & Amjad, F. (2025). Exploring Remedial Teaching Interventions For
4. Students Facing Persistent Learning Challenges. <https://doi.org/10.52152/801712>
5. Alvarez, D. D., Futralan, M. C. Z., & Sedillo, E. N. (2025). Challenges faced and
6. strategies employed by teachers in handling mainstreaming classes in secondary schools. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(7). <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=27531>
7. Al-Zahrani, A. A. (2023). Prospective Role of the Remedial Programs to Improve the

8. Performance of Low Achievers in English Language Courses. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 226-237. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.903020>
9. Bacus, R., & Tagalog, R. (2024). Exploring teachers' needs with the Philippine
10. professional standards for teachers' domains as framework: A case in basic education. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 13(8), 65-79. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24082>
11. Batistisa, I. & Siat G. (2025). Experiences of Teachers in the Implementation of the Aral
12. Program. <http://www.ijrpr.com/> <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V6ISSUE11/IJRPR56310.pdf>
13. Bazzaz, H. (2022, May 24). Teachers need our support. Harvard Graduate School of
14. Education. <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/ideas/ed-magazine/22/05/teachers-need-our-support>
15. Calingayan, F. M. (2025). Experiences of Teachers in The Implementation of Project
16. Anus (Actively Nurturing Understanding among Students). *Journal of Education, Learning, and Management*, 2(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.69739/jelm.v2i1.260>
17. Department of Education (2025). DO No. 018 s. 2025. [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2025_064r.pdf)
18. [content/uploads/DM_s2025_064r.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2025_064r.pdf)
19. Department of Education. (2024, December 17). DepEd swiftly moves to implement
20. ARAL Program Act to tackle learning loss. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/12/17/deped-swiftly-moves-to-implement-aral-program-act-to-tackle-learning-loss/>
21. Du, K., & Lipscomb, T. J. (2023). The Effects of a Mathematics Remedial Program on
22. Mathematics Success and Achievement among Beginning Mathematics Major Students : A regression discontinuity analysis. *Journal of Research in Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 6(1), 21-39. <https://doi.org/10.31756/jrsmte.613>
23. Ferlazzo, L. (2025, October 28). How these teachers are solving their biggest
24. challenges. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-how-these-teachers-are-solving-their-biggest-challenges/2025/10>
25. Horikoshi, K. (2023). The positive psychology of challenge: Towards interdisciplinary
26. studies of activities and processes involving challenges. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1090069>
27. Mananggolo, A. (2025). Teachers' Challenges and Practices on Conducting Remedial
28. Class in Mathematics. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 37(8), 844-867. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.370806>
29. Nyandwi, C., F. Mugiraneza, and K. M. Letanzio. "Influence of Remedial Classes on

30. Students' Learning Outcomes in Public Secondary Schools in Rwanda, a Case of Kamonyi District, Rwanda". International Journal of Management and Development Studies, vol. 13, no. 8, Aug. 2024, pp. 43-62, doi:10.53983/ijmds.v13n8.004.
31. Papadogiannis, I., Wallace, M., Pouloupoulos, V., Vassilakis, C., Lepouras, G., & Platis, N.
32. (2023). An Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Remedial Teaching Education Policy. Knowledge, 3(3), 349-363. <https://doi.org/10.3390/knowledge3030024>
33. Paulin, M. & Mugiraneza, F. (2023). Effects of Remedial Activities on Students'
34. Competences in Mathematics Subjects in Public Secondary Schools in Rwanda: A Case of Ngororero District. DOI:10.47760/cognizance.2023.v03i12.008
35. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2019, June 10). Teacher training
36. misaligned with classroom needs — PIDS. <https://pids.gov.ph/details/news/press-releases/teacher-training-misaligned-with-classroom-needs-pids-2>
37. Prodigy Education. (2024, May 14). 15 biggest challenges of teaching in 2024 and how
38. to overcome them. Prodigy Blog. <https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/challenges-of-teaching>
39. Rai H. and Penjor, S. (2020). The Impact of Remedial Class on Students' Learning
40. Achievement. <https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewCETR2020010203>
41. Rom, G. B. (2026). Barriers and challenges in the implementation of the ARAL Program in a public elementary school. World Education Connect Multidisciplinary E-
42. Publication, 6(1), 209–222. <https://www.pinagpalapublishing.com/publications/world-education-connect-multidisciplinary-e-publication/wec-2026-issues/wec-vol-vi-issue-i-january-2026/barriers-and-challenges-in-the-implementation-of-the-aral-program-in-a-publ>
43. Singua, C. & Saldana, J. (2023). Bridging Learning Opportunity Gaps (BLOG) Project: A
44. Pandemic Remedial Intervention in Junior High School Science. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v2i2.1555>
45. Supreme Court E-Library (2024). REPUBLIC ACT NO. 12028, October 16, 2024.
46. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/97912>