International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications
ISSN (Online): 2581-6187

Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES
Email address: verlyn.castillejo@deped.gov.ph

Abstract*—The present study evaluates the relationship and effectiveness of the BRIGHT (Building Reading Improvement through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool as a multimedia supplementary material as intervention designed to further enhance students' engagement and viewing comprehension skills in the English Subject. The study assessed the level of the BRIGHT Tool in terms of its Components, Features and Students' Engagement. Also, it sought to find out the students' comprehension skills. It also examined its relationship to Students' Engagement. More so, it evaluated its effectiveness towards the students' comprehension skills. The study further employed descriptive-correlational research design, with a quantitative approach to measure and describe the levels of components and features of the BRIGHT tool material. The respondents were 90 selected students from grade 10 from a localized Integrated National High School. Data were collected utilizing a researcher-made BRIGHT tool, self-made questionnaires and comprehension test. Data were analyzed using Mean and Standard Deviation in the level of BRIGHT Tools components, features, engagement and performance, while Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the relationship and effect of the BRIGHT Tools components, features, students' engagement, and students' comprehension skills. Findings reveal that the BRIGHT Tool demonstrated an acceptable level when it comes to its components and features, while students' engagement showed an engaged level. Furthermore, results showed that the students' s comprehension skills were revealed as satisfactory. Statistical analysis further showed that a significant relationship was found between the BRIGHT Tool components and features on students' engagement. Finally, no significant effect was found on the use of the BRIGHT tool on students' comprehension skills. The study furthermore revealed that the tool has a significant relationship between the components, features and students' engagement leading to rejection of the hypothesis. However, no effect was found on the BRIGHT Tool's components, features, and students' comprehension skills, thus, acceptance of the null hypothesis was evident. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the BRIGHT Tool be enhanced and redesigned by incorporating evidence-based interactive and adaptive features that may enhance students' learning needs and comprehension development. Furthermore, continuous evaluation may be conducted to ensure that improvements effectively address the gaps identified in the study.*

***Keywords*—** *BRIGHT Tool, multimedia learning, students' engagement, viewing comprehension, supplementary instructional material*

I. INTRODUCTION

Proficiency in the English language is unquestionably vital for both lifetime learning and academic performance. It is a vital and pivotal teaching tool and the main gateway to profound knowledge. However, reading comprehension still remains an undying issue for Filipino students, this in turn becomes a ripple effect towards the student's engagement in learning. Students' inability to generate mental representations for language, which results in fragmented knowledge processing, is a major contributing cause to language comprehension issues. As a result, even though these students are making an attempt to recall linguistic inputs, learners may come across as distracted or disinterested (Quinonez, 2023).

Considering the usage of existing materials and techniques, traditional text-based solutions frequently still fall short when it comes to meeting the various requirements of students, particularly those who struggle with reading. This is alarming not only for the teachers, but also for the whole department since the 2018 Program for International Student Assessment or known as PISA results. Since comprehension skill remains a pivotal factor in reading, this in turn became the focus of various interventions in developing one's skill. Consequently, various interventions and remediations arose from then on. Educators continuously try to seek a probable method where learners' reading, and comprehension skills are alleviated. This implies that in order to enhance comprehension and engagement results, innovative approaches that integrate several learning modalities must be used (Javed, 2023).

The BRIGHT Tool (Building Reading Improvement through Guided Hearing and Text) was created as an innovative teaching tool initiative in order to solve above-mentioned learning issues. The BRIGHT Tool incorporates technology which makes reading more engaging and approachable by fusing visual scaffolding with predictive listening exercises. Through the use of both text and hearing to interpret meaning, improve retention, and boost learners' confidence, the audio-visual learning intervention tool aids comprehension concerns. Its design guarantees both relevance and usability in the classroom by still being in line with the curriculum and the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) established by the Department of Education (DepEd).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship and effectiveness of Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text (BRIGHT) Tool in Improving the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills;

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to:
   1.1 Objective;
   1.2 Content;
   1.3 Activity; and
   1.4 Assessment?
2. What is the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Features with regards to:
   2.1 Instructional Value;
   2.2 Technical Quality; and
   2.3 Aesthetic Appeal?
3. What is the level of Students' Engagement in terms of:
   3.1 Cognitive;
   3.2 Behavioral; and
   3.3 Emotional?
4. What is the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Engagement?
6. Is there a significant effect on the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Comprehension Skills?

II. Methodology

The study employed descriptive-correlational research design, with a quantitative approach to measure and describe the levels of components and features of the BRIGHT tool material. The respondents were 90 selected students from grade 10 from a localized Integrated National High School. Data were collected utilizing a researcher-made BRIGHT tool, self-made questionnaires and comprehension test. Data were analyzed using Mean and Standard Deviation in the level of BRIGHT Tools components, features, engagement and performance, while Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the relationship and effect of the BRIGHT Tools components, features, students' engagement, and students' comprehension skills.

III. Results and Discussion

This part presented the results and their discussion in reference to the gathered, assessed, and interpreted data as it targeted to answer the research problems and findings of the present study.

Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components

In this study, the level of BRIGHT (Building Reading Improvement through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool in terms of Components refers to Objective, Content, Activity, and Assessment.

The table shows the statement, mean, standard deviation. remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

The Multimedia Comprehension Tool plays a vital role in enhancing students' ability to interpret, analyze, and understand information presented through various multimedia formats such as images, videos, animations, and other visual-auditory materials. By engaging with these resources, learners are guided to actively construct meaning by integrating visual and textual information, which deepens their understanding of the learning content. As the process and intervention allowed the students to go beyond where surface-level interpretation encompasses, this enables learners to further identify key ideas, recognize relationships amongst concepts, and interpret texts more effectively and accurately. Such specific skill is highly essential when it comes to the development of reading comprehension for the learners, as it encourages them to become active participants through the learning process rather than just being passive recipients of information. Through consistent exposure to multimedia-based instruction, students are trained to process information critically, evaluate content meaningfully, and draw logical conclusions from what they see and hear. Furthermore, it justly strengthens one's higher-order thinking skills in terms of analysis, inference, synthesis, and evaluation, all of which are extremely crucial for academic success across different learning areas for learners.

Table 1 below presents the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of its Components with regards to the Objectives.

Table 1. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to Objective

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Are clearly stated at the beginning of each lesson.	4.13	0.81	Agree
Align well with the lesson's expected learning outcomes	4.12	0.76	Agree
Guide a clear direction for the learning activities.	4.17	0.80	Agree
Match grade level and learning abilities.	3.92	0.90	Agree
Help understand what is expected to achieve.	4.02	0.87	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.07		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

With the statements stated, the highest mean garnered was from "Guide a clear direction for the learning activities" with a mean score of 4.17 and a standard deviation of 0.80 which is interpreted as "Agree." This simply suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively provides clear instructional direction that supports the organization and flow of learning activities. Overall, the weighted mean of 4.07 with a standard deviation of 0.83, interpreted as "Acceptable," shows that the objective component of the BRIGHT Tool is generally well-implemented and effectively supports the learning process.

Table 2 presents the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to the Content.

As stated from the five indicators, the highest mean yielded from the statement "Organizes ideas logically and coherently" with a mean score of 4.17 and a standard deviation of 0.81, which is interpreted as "Agree." This suggests simply that the BRIGHT Tool effectively shows content in a very structured and understandable way to which that supports learners' reading comprehension. The lowest

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

mean score (4.06) was garnered in the statement "Presents accurate and correct information," which is still interpreted as "Agree," although this indicates that the content is generally reliable, still it is given that there is still room for further enhancement in terms of accuracy and clarity. Overall, the weighted mean of 4.11 with a standard deviation of 0.83, interpreted as "Acceptable," shows indication that the Content component of the BRIGHT Tool is evidently well-developed and effectively supports the delivery of instructional material for proper intervention.

Table 2. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to Content

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Presents accurate and correct information.	4.06	0.85	Agree
Relates clearly to the lesson objectives.	4.08	0.84	Agree
Explains ideas in a way one can understand it easily.	4.10	0.81	Agree
Develops essential skills in line with the competencies.	4.16	0.83	Agree
Organizes ideas logically and coherently.	4.17	0.81	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.11		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

Overall, the findings stand on the idea that the Content component of the BRIGHT Tool is properly well-developed, as it is reflected in its acceptable rating and consistent with the agreement across indicators, particularly with organizing ideas clearly and coherently. Nevertheless, the content is generally accurate and reliable, there still remains a slight chance for improvement in such a manner, especially in further enhancing precision and alignment with the specific learners' needs. Moreover, the results suggest that the structured and meaningful presentation of content contributes to better comprehension and supports more effective learning experiences among students. In addition, well-organized and relevant content helps sustain learners' attention and promote deeper cognitive engagement, enabling them to process information more efficiently and apply their understanding in various learning tasks.

Table 3 presents the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to the activities.

Table 3. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to Activities

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Engage actively in the learning process.	4.02	0.76	Agree
Encourage active participation in class tasks.	3.92	0.82	Agree
Match level of ability and understanding.	3.91	0.87	Agree
Develop critical and higher-order thinking skills.	3.99	0.84	Agree
Makes the transfer of the vocabulary skills learned in the game to real-world communication	3.99	0.84	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.97		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

Out of all the indicators, the highest mean was recorded alongside the statement of "Engage actively in the learning process" with a mean score of 4.02 and a standard deviation of 0.76, which was interpreted as "Agree." This simply suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively promotes overall active involvement among learners during their learning tasks and activities. The lowest mean which garnered 3.91 was observed in the statement of "Match level of ability and understanding," which is still interpreted as "Agree," this indicates that while the activities are generally appropriate, there is still undeniably a need to better align them within the learners' different abilities and learning. Overall, the weighted mean of 3.97 with a standard deviation of 0.83, interpreted as "Acceptable," stipulates that the tool moderately supports active engagement, deep thinking, and skill application, while allowing room for further improvement in terms of educational alignment and engagement.

Table 4 presents the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to the assessment.

Table 4. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to Assessment

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Reflects the skills taught in the lesson	4.08	0.82	Agree
Provides opportunities to demonstrate learning.	4.00	0.83	Agree
Matches the difficulty level of the lesson.	3.97	0.84	Agree
Helps identify areas for improvement.	4.07	0.80	Agree
Measures the stated learning objectives.	4.06	0.81	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.03		
SD	0.82		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

Based on the statements above, the highest mean was recorded with the statement "Reflects the skills taught in the lesson" depicting a mean of 4.08 and a standard deviation of 0.82, whereas interpreted "Agree." This simply suggests that the assessment component of the BRIGHT Tool effectively aligns with the skills and content taught in the lesson as the verdict shown by data. The lowest mean (3.97) was observed from the statement "Matches the difficulty level of the lesson," which is still interpreted as "Agree," in any way the indication that the assessments are generally appropriate, there are still instances where slight adjustments may still be required to better match varying challenging levels. Taken together, the weighted mean of 4.03 alongside a standard deviation of 0.82, interpreted as "Acceptable," shows indication that the assessment component of the BRIGHT Tool is by large effective in the measuring learning outcomes given, identifying such areas for improvement, and also supporting the achievement of learning goals.

All in all, the assessment component of the BRIGHT Tool is deemed to be effective and acceptable, this shows strong alignment with lesson content and learning outcomes of the material, as reflected in its generally positive evaluation and tabulation. Moreover, it accurately reflects the skills taught in the lessons provided, indicating that it is well-designed to assess intended learning objectives and support instructional objectives. However, while the results are truly favorable, there were minor improvements seen which are still needed regarding calibrating task difficulty to better suit the varying learner levels and ensure its consistency across different evaluations.

The results from the above-mentioned analyses and synthesis indicate that the BRIGHT Tool demonstrated a consistently acceptable level across all of the components,

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

such as its objectives, content, activities, and assessment. Essentially, the students generally agreed that the tool provided much more clear guidance, accurate and well-organized content, engaging tasks, and meaningful assessments that fully supported their learning navigation and comprehension skills. The data suggest also that the BRIGHT Tool is a reliable and structured instructional material for the learners that enhances student reading comprehension. Additionally, its balanced design across all components reflects its capability or competence to address different aspects and phases of the learning process, from simply understanding objectives to deeply applying skills and evaluating outcomes on their own accord. While overall perceptions are positive, minor improvements are needed and higher-order thinking skills could go further and strengthen their effectiveness.

Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Features

In the present study, the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Features as it refers to Instructional Value**,** Technical Quality**,** and Aesthetic Appeal are studied. These features were evaluated to determine the effectiveness and suitability of the BRIGHT Tool as a supplementary learning material for students. The assessment of these features provided insights into how the BRIGHT Tool supports students' learning experiences, engagement, and overall academic performance.

Table 5 depicts the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to the material's Instructional Value.

Table 5. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Features with regards to Instructional Value

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Justifies the relevance and significance of learning experiences.	3.96	0.82	Agree
Enables to effectively explain and interpret the concepts of the lesson.	3.89	0.81	Agree
Allows to apply and execute new skills within the material.	3.91	0.83	Agree
Facilitates ability to implement learned knowledge to construct solutions	3.83	0.85	Agree
Supports the capacity to organize and manage learning independently.	3.94	0.87	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.91		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

In the statements indicated above, the highest mean was recorded along the statement "Justifies the relevance and significance of learning experiences" with a mean of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.82, interpreted as "Agree." This further suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively aids the learners understand the importance of their learning experiences. The lowest mean (3.83) was also observed in the statement of "Facilitates ability to implement learned knowledge to construct solutions," which still falls under the interpretation "Agree," implying that although the tool is generally effective, there is still necessary to strengthen its support for applying knowledge in problem-solving skills. Overall, the weighted mean of 3.91 (SD = 0.83), interpreted as "Acceptable," depicts that this component of the BRIGHT Tool is overall effective but may still be improved in enhancing and developing the students' higher-order thinking capabilities.

Table 6 demonstrates the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to the technical value.

Table 6. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Features with regards to Technical Quality

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Ensures students can easily locate and select required features for use.	3.93	0.80	Agree
Allows to clearly discern the content provided by the audio and visual elements.	3.99	0.81	Agree
Reliably functions, ensuring all materials load or play seamlessly.	3.92	0.84	Agree
Presents instructions that allows to accurately execute the steps for operation.	3.93	0.86	Agree
Is consistent and maintains performance across various devices.	3.90	0.85	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.94		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

As per the indicators shown, the highest mean was shown in the statement "Allows to clearly discern the content provided by the audio and visual elements" with a mean of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.81, thus interpreted as "Agree." This simply suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively delivers towards clear and understandable multimedia content that fully supports learning. However, the lowest mean (3.90) was observed in the statement "Is consistent and maintains performance across various devices," although it still falls under "Agree," shows indication that while the tool performs reliably, there is still however a need to further develop and improve its consistency across various platforms. Other indicators shown as well, such as ease of navigation, functionality, and clarity of instructions, also received "Agree" interpretations, reflecting generally onto the positive user experiences. Overall, the weighted mean of 3.94 (SD = 0.83), interpreted as "Acceptable," shows further that the technical aspect of the BRIGHT Tool is evidently generally effective, though minor progress in system consistency and performance still further improve the usability.

Table 7 shows the level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to the technical value.

The statement "Uses visuals that effectively focus and maintain my concentration on the material" with a mean of 4.03 and a standard deviation of 0.81 yielded the highest statement scores among the rest, which is interpreted as "Agree." This suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively utilizes the visuals of the material in order to sustain learners' attention and engagement. The lowest mean (3.97) was seen in the statement "Ensures one can effortlessly read and comprehend the text due to appropriate font choices," but still considered under "Agree," employing that while readability is generally effective, small and little improvements in font selection may further enhance comprehension of the students. Overall, the weighted mean of 4.00 (SD = 0.82), interpreted as "Acceptable," depicted that the visual design component of

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

the BRIGHT Tool is genuinely highly effective in supporting learning and maintaining user engagement for its entirety.

Table 7. Level of BRIGHT Tool in terms of Features with regards to Aesthetic Appeal

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Leads to judge the visual design as appealing and professional.	3.99	0.80	Agree
Enables to structure and organize the information presented due to the clear layout.	4.02	0.82	Agree
Uses colours and graphics that is valued as significantly contributing to the learning process.	4.00	0.83	Agree
Ensures one can effortlessly read and comprehend the text due to appropriate font choices.	3.97	0.83	Agree
Uses visuals that effectively focus and maintain my concentration on the material.	4.03	0.81	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.00		
SD	0.82		
Verbal Interpretation	Acceptable		

Level of Students' Engagement

In this study, the level of BRIGHT (Building Reading Improvement through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool as supplementary material on Students' Engagement refers to Cognitive, Behavioral, and Emotional variables.

The following tables present the summarized results of the respondents' perspectives on these dimensions. Specifically, they include the statements used to measure each variable, along with the corresponding mean and standard deviation, which indicate the average responses and the variability of those responses.

Table 8 shows the level of the BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to cognitive engagement.

Table 8. Level of Students' Engagement in terms of Cognitive Engagement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Encourages to analyse and critique complex ideas.	3.98	0.83	Agree
Helps integrate new information with my prior knowledge.	3,91	0.80	Agree
Challenges to devise and execute solutions to problems.	3.88	0.80	Agree
Prompts to evaluate and justify my responses for accuracy and logic.	3.92	0.84	Agree
Motivates to interpret and distinguish the core concepts of the lesson.	3.97	0.84	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.93		
SD	0.82		
Verbal Interpretation	Engaged		

Upon consideration of the five indicators, the highest mean was noted in the statement "Encourages to analyse and critique complex ideas" with a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.83, interpreted as "Agree." This generally suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively promotes the learners' HOTS or higher-order thinking skills, particularly in terms of analyzing and evaluating complex concepts. The lowest mean (3.88) was also observed in the statement "Challenges to devise and execute solutions to problems," which still falls under "Agree," in a sense that while learners are generally challenged, there is a chance to further strengthen problem-solving opportunities and abilities. Other indicators, such as integrating prior knowledge (M = 3.91), evaluating responses (M = 3.92), and interpreting core concepts (M = 3.97), also received greatly positive ratings, whereas indications of reflecting consistent engagement across thinking skills. Overall, the weighted mean of 3.93 (SD = 0.82), interpreted as "Engaged," indicates in the entirety of this study's phase that the component of BRIGHT Tool effectively embodies active thinking and learner engagement, with little to minor areas for enhancement in problem-solving activities.

Table 9 shows the level of the BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to behavioral engagement. The results indicate how the BRIGHT Tool influence students' participation, attentiveness, and involvement in learning tasks.

Table 9. Level of Students' Engagement in terms of Behavioral Engagement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Leads to actively execute and perform the required tasks.	3.96	0.83	Agree
Ensures one's finish all assigned activities and segments.	3.82	0.86	Agree
Adheres strictly to the provided guidelines and instructions.	3.78	0.83	Agree
Allows to concentrate and maintain focus throughout the activities.	3.74	0.86	Agree
Helps organize and plan my time effectively to complete the tasks.	3.82	0.80	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.82		
SD	0.83		
Verbal Interpretation	Engaged		

Amongst the five indicators indicated above, the highest mean was recorded from the statement "Leads to actively execute and perform the required tasks" with a mean score of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.83, with interpretation of "Agree." This simply suggests that the BRIGHT Tool effectively encourages the students to actively engage in and accomplish their assigned activities. The lowest mean (3.74) was evaluated from statement "Allows to concentrate and maintain focus throughout the activities," which still falls under "Agree", although with indications of whilst focus is generally supported, it may still need further developing and strengthening. Overall, the weighted mean of 3.82 (SD = 0.83), with interpretation of "Engaged," indicates as well that this component of the BRIGHT Tool effectively supports learners' task completion and engagement capabilities, with some areas for improvement in need and instructional adherence are reportedly to be required.

Table 10 shows the level of the BRIGHT Tool in terms of Components with regards to emotional engagement.

In the statements indicated, the highest mean was seen in the statement "Makes feel driven and eager to participate in the learning process" with a mean of 3.90 (SD = 0.85), which is interpreted as "Agree," this employs that the BRIGHT Tool effectively promotes student motivation and participation. The lowest mean (3.71) was observed along the statement "Captures curiosity, making me want to explore the content further," which, while still rated "Agree," suggestively represents a need to further improve the tool's ability to stimulate and navigate curiosity and deeper exploration.

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

Overall, the weighted mean of 3.84 (SD = 0.82), represented as "Engaged," shows that this aspect of the BRIGHT Tool effectively elevates learner invigoration and engagement, with minor areas for improvement in adhering curiosity.

Table 10. Level of Students' Engagement in terms of Emotional Engagement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Makes feel driven and eager to participate in the learning process.	3.90	0.85	Agree
Stimulates to value and appreciate the activities within the tool.	3.88	0.82	Agree
Affirms ability to use the tool successfully for learning.	3.83	0.84	Agree
Captures curiosity, making me want to explore the content further.	3.71	0.80	Agree
Contributes significantly to overall positive perception of learning.	3.88	0.80	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.84		
SD	0.82		
Verbal Interpretation	Engaged		

Level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing

In the present study, the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing were utilized on topics such as: Argumentative Writing, Informative Writing, Persuasive Writing, Critique, and Critique: Using Formalist Approach.

Table 11 presents the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Argumentative Writing).

Table 11. Level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Argumentative Writing)

Score	Argumentative Writing		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
9 - 10	11	12.22	Outstanding
7 - 8	38	42.22	Very Satisfactory
5 - 6	23	25.56	Satisfactory
3 - 4	9	10.00	Fairly Satisfactory
1 - 2	9	10.00	Did Not Meet Expectation
Total	90	100	
Weighted Mean		6.27	
SD		2.26	
Verbal Interpretation		Satisfactory	

The table illustrates the scores of ninety respondents among the learners that served as respondents, with a weighted mean of 6.27 and a standard deviation of 2.26, the results rendered varying levels of performance in the argumentative writing part. The data also revealed that most of the students performed at a "Very Satisfactory" level (42.22%), this was followed by those who are classified as "Satisfactory" (25.56%) and "Outstanding" (12.22%). However, it was quite notable on the proportion of students who fell under "Fairly Satisfactory" and "Did Not Meet Expectation," all of each accounting for 10.00% of the overall percentage, this indicates that there were differences or variations in students' performance levels.

Upon derivation, Table 11 shows that the students' comprehension skills in terms of viewing argumentative writing are generally satisfactory in that regard, more so, it was shown with most performing at a "Very Satisfactory" level. This furthermore indicates on the adequate understanding and performance among most of respondents. However, the presence of students in the "Fairly Satisfactory" and "Did Not Meet Expectation" categories suggest as well that there were remaining learning gaps and concerns. While results are generally deemed positive, further instructional support is still needed in order to improve comprehension skills, most especially for lower or under-performing students in the context of the study. Providing additional learning activities and guided exercises may help students better understand the lessons presented in the BRIGHT Tool. Teachers may also employ differentiated instruction strategies to address the varying learning needs and abilities of students. Moreover, regular monitoring and feedback can assist learners in identifying areas that require improvement. Through these interventions, students may develop stronger comprehension skills and become more confident in their learning process.

Table 12 presents the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Informative Writing).

Table 12. Level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Informative Writing)

Score	Informative Writing		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
9 - 10	15	16.67	Outstanding
7 - 8	39	43.33	Very Satisfactory
5 - 6	20	22.22	Satisfactory
3 - 4	10	11.11	Fairly Satisfactory
1 - 2	6	6.67	Did Not Meet Expectation
Total	90	100	
Weighted Mean	6.51		
SD	2.14		
Verbal Interpretation	Satisfactory		

Comprised of the total population of ninety (90) respondents scores were obtained, and together with this is a weighted mean of 6.51 and a standard deviation of 2.14. The mentioned data reveal that majority of the learners performed at a "Very Satisfactory" level (43.33%) in the material's informative writing, this is followed by those in the "Satisfactory" (22.22%) and "Outstanding" (16.67%) levels. However, a proportion of students still fell under "Fairly Satisfactory" (11.11%) level and "Did Not Meet Expectation" (6.67%) level unfortunately, this implies that some variation in the learners' writing performance levels were not in the favorable performances.

Given the data and interpretations, the results show a verdict of generally satisfactory level of performance in terms of informative writing (WM = 6.51, SD = 2.14). For the majority of the students achieved a "Very Satisfactory" rating, while the rest fell under "Satisfactory" and "Outstanding" categories, indicating adequate competence level in their assessment. However, the students whose presence of "Fairly Satisfactory" and "Did Not Meet Expectation" results sincerely suggest that performance differences are still there and the need for further instructional support are needed, so that learners at poor level are guided and aided.

Table 13 presents the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Persuasive Writing).

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

Table 13. Level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Persuasive Writing)

Score	Persuasive Writing		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
9 - 10	14	15.56	Outstanding
7 - 8	39	43.33	Very Satisfactory
5 - 6	23	25.56	Satisfactory
3 - 4	7	7.78	Fairly Satisfactory
1 - 2	7	7.78	Did Not Meet Expectation
Total	90	100	
Weighted Mean	6.52		
SD	2.13		
Verbal Interpretation	Satisfactory		

In the totality of the ninety (90) respondents among the scores of the total population of the present study garnered a weighted mean of 6.52 and a standard deviation of 2.13 within the scope of the learners' comprehension skills. The data above revealed that most of the students performed at a "Very Satisfactory" level (43.33%) in persuasive writing, this was followed by those in the "Satisfactory" (25.56%) and "Outstanding" (15.56%) levels. However, an alarming number of students fell under "Fairly Satisfactory" (7.78%) and "Did Not Meet Expectation" (7.78%), although considered a small percentage but it still indicates that some variation in students' writing performance levels are present, for some reason.

Naturally, results of this nature indicate above that while many students can present their arguments and support good ideas effectively, there is still the presence of lower-performing groups which highlights the gaps in students' ability, that were not often seen, to consistently apply the persuasive techniques. The results imply as well a need for improved instructional techniques that look at developing critical thinking, argumentation skills, and logical organization with their communicative competence.

Table 14 presents the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Critique).

Table 14. Level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Critique)

Score	Critique		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
9 - 10	16	17.77	Outstanding
7 - 8	39	43.33	Very Satisfactory
5 - 6	25	27.78	Satisfactory
3 - 4	3	3.33	Fairly Satisfactory
1 - 2	7	7.78	Did Not Meet Expectation
Total	90	100	
Weighted Mean	6.74		
SD	2.09		
Verbal Interpretation	Satisfactory		

From the scores of the total population of ninety respondents within the context of the research, the students showed a weighted mean of 6.74 and a standard deviation of 2.09 which data revealed that majority of learners performed at a "Very Satisfactory" level (43.33%) in critique writing topic, followed by those in the "Satisfactory" (27.78%) and "Outstanding" (17.77%) levels. Notwithstanding, a smaller proportion of students also fell under "Did Not Meet Expectation" (7.78%) and "Fairly Satisfactory" (3.33%), indications that some variation in students' performance levels is also present at the said topic or content matter.

All encompassing, the results stated that learners demonstrate a generally satisfactory level of performance when it comes to the topic of critique writing. Given that most learners achieved a "Very Satisfactory" rating, while others are distributed across "Satisfactory" and "Outstanding" levels, showing acceptable writing proficiency skills among the many respondents, there is still however, the presence of learners in the "Did Not Meet Expectation" and "Fairly Satisfactory" classifications. This further entails on the variability in performance and highlights the need and necessity for continued instructional support and guidance from stakeholders to further strengthen critique writing skills of learners today.

Table 15 presents the level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Critique Formalist Approach).

Table 15. Level of Students' Comprehension Skill in terms of Raw Score in Viewing (Critique: Formalist Approach)

Score	Critique		Descriptive Equivalent
	f	%	
9 - 10	12	13.33	Outstanding
7 - 8	36	40.00	Very Satisfactory
5 - 6	24	26 67	Satisfactory
3 - 4	10	11.11	Fairly Satisfactory
1 - 2	8	8.89	Did Not Meet Expectation
Total	90	100	
Weighted Mean	6.31		
SD	2.18		
Verbal Interpretation	Satisfactory		

As shown among the scores of the total population of ninety (90) respondents of the present research, a weighted mean of 6.31 and a standard deviation of 2.18 was deliberated. In the data that was revealed, it was clear that the majority of students performed at a "Very Satisfactory" level (40.00%) in critique writing using the formalist approach, it was then followed by those in the "Satisfactory" (26.67%) and "Outstanding" (13.33%) classifications. However, there is still a notable number of students who fell under "Fairly Satisfactory" (11.11%) and "Did Not Meet Expectation" (8.89%), insinuating on the variability in students' performance levels.

Additionally, findings denote that while a majority of learners are able to demonstrate basic macro skills in analyzing and evaluating texts, a considerable percentage or number of students still struggle with the critical aspects of the material such as forming well-founded judgments, organizing evaluative thoughts, and applying substantiate analytical thinking. The presence of the learners in the lower score ranges have highlighted the gaps in higher-order thinking skills, as well as in critique-writing competencies that were conducted. Also, the results presuppose that there is a dire need to strengthen instructional strategies and techniques that will be the focus on enhancing critical, analytical thinking and evidence-based evaluations.

Generally, results across Tables 11–15 indicate that students' comprehension skills in viewing, as they are

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

reflected in their performance in argumentative, informative, persuasive, and critique writing, have been consistently fallen within the "Satisfactory" level, with a total or weighted means ranging from 6.27 to 6.74. Most students were altogether categorized as "Satisfactory," this exhibits that many learners possess the adequate level with regards to strong comprehension and writing abilities. However, some there were students in the lower performance levels and the relatively moderate standard deviations suggestively showed noticeable variability in skill levels and incomplete mastery of higher-order competencies as noted. These findings imply that while students generally demonstrate acceptable comprehension and writing performance, there is still a need for continuous enhancement of their analytical and critical thinking skills. The variation in scores also indicates that some learners may require additional instructional support and reinforcement activities to achieve higher levels of proficiency. Furthermore, the results highlight the importance of utilizing effective supplementary learning materials, such as the BRIGHT Tool, to strengthen students' understanding and application of viewing comprehension skills. Through consistent practice and guided instruction, learners may further improve their performance in various forms of writing tasks.

Significant Relationship between the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Engagement

To test the significant relationship between the supplementary material or BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Engagement in terms of Cognitive, Behavioral, and Emotional they were statistically treated utilizing the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Table 16 shows the Significant Relationship between the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Engagement

As per the Objective component of the study, it simply shows a strong positive relationship with students' cognitive (r = .846), behavioral (r = .691), and emotional (r = .590) engagements, all collectively with significant p-values of .000. In a simpler sense, this exhibits that clearly defined learning objectives are strongly incorporated within learners' improved understanding, positive learning behavior, and emotional engagement amongst them. Similarly, the Content component of the study demonstrates strong positive correlations with the cognitive (r = .756), behavioral (r = .647), and emotional (r = .591) domains as well, more to this is that all are significant at .000, this suggests that well-organized and relevant content encourages good and quality comprehension, participation, and positive emotional reactions.

In the same contextual data, the Activity component is also positively relative to the cognitive (r = .647), behavioral (r = .611), and emotional (r = .601) factors, showing that engaging activities develops understanding, promote active learning behavior, and gauge onto learners' interest. In a similar way, the Assessment component depicts significant positive relationships with cognitive (r = .736), behavioral (r = .598), and emotional (r = .573) factors, betokening that an appropriate assessment practice truly reinforce learning, encourage favorable behaviors, and support positive emotional encounter within a given task.

Table 16. Significant Relationship between the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Engagement

Bright Tool		Cognitive	Behavioral	Emotional
Objective	Pearson Correlation	.846**	.691**	.590**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90
Content	Pearson Correlation	.756**	.647**	.591**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90
Activity	Pearson Correlation	.647	.611**	.601*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90
Assessment	Pearson Correlation	.736*	.598**	.573**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90
Instructional Value	Pearson Correlation	.824	.684	.540
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90
Technical Quality	Pearson Correlation	.838	.803**	.633
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90
Aesthetic Appeal	Pearson Correlation	.880*	.749**	.662**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	90	90	90

More to this is the Instructional Value component of the material, in which it was revealed that strong positive correlations with cognitive (r = .824), behavioral (r = .684), and emotional (r = .540) domains were present. This proposes that high instructional quality ameliorate one's thinking skills, engagement, and emotional engagement. In addition to the said data and evaluation, the Technical Quality component also shows very strong relationships with cognitive (r = .838), behavioral (r = .803), and emotional (r = .633) factors, highlighting also on the importance of functionality and reliability in supporting learning performances and achievement.

Finally, the Aesthetic Appeal component of the material demonstrates on the strongest correlations across all domains, which were the cognitive (r = .880), behavioral (r = .749), and emotional (r = .662) factors, further indicating on the idea that visually appealing and well-designed materials fundamentally enhance as well learner's comprehension, engagement, and emotional connection to learning.

Overall, the findings have shown that all components of the BRIGHT Tool have significant positive relationships with each of its own, namely with the students' cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement domains. This furthermore indicates that well-designed instructional elements of an instructional and supplementary material, such

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

as the clear objectives, relevant content, engaging activities, and appropriate assessment, altogether enhances learning outcomes, progression and student engagement. Particularly speaking, instructional value, technical quality, and aesthetic appeal as the study's main focus, show strong to very strong correlations within variables, with aesthetic appeal having the greatest influence across all mentioned. Collectively, the results suggest also that an integrated and well-designed instructional tool effectively supports holistic student learning and engagement.

Significant Effect of the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Engagement

To test the significant effect on the BRIGHT Tool's Components, Features and Students' Comprehension Skills they were treated statistically using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Table 17 aims to determine whether the objectives, content, activities, assessment, instructional value, technical quality, and aesthetic appeal of the BRIGHT Tool have a measurable effect on students' performance in the said writing tasks. Specifically, it examines the extent to which these components influence learners' outcomes across different writing domains. In addition, the table provides evidence on whether improvements in the design and implementation of the BRIGHT Tool correspond to better student performance.

Table 17. Significant Effect of BRIGHT Tools' Components, Features, and Student's Comprehension Skills

Bright Tool		A W	I W	P W	C	C F A
Objective	t-stats	0.249	-0.808	-1.516	0.363	0.196
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.804	.421	.133	0.717	0.845
	N	90	90	90	90	90
Content	t-stats	1.282	-0.003	-0.502	0.801	-0.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.203	.998	.617	0.423	0.905
	N	90	90	90	90	90
Activity	t-stats	0.094	-1.107	-0.553	0.431	-0.932
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.926	.271	.582	0.667	0.354
	N	90	90	90	90	90
Assessment	t-stats	0.534	-0.103	-0.344	0.055	-0.254
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.595	.918	.732	0.956	0.800
	N	90	90	90	90	90
Instructional Value	t-stats	0.831	-0.081	-0.294	-0.434	0.439
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.408	.935	.770	0.666	0.662
	N	90	90	90	90	90
Technical Quality	t-stats	0.024	-0.550	-0.855	-0.562	0.442
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.981	.583	.395	0.575	0.659
	N	90	90	90	90	90
Aesthetic Appeal	t-stats	0.559	0.062	-0.412	-0.380	0.509
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.578	.950	.678	0.705	0.612
	N	90	90	90	90	90

The Objective component shows no significant difference across all writing skills, including argumentative writing (t = 0.249, p = .804), informative writing (t = -0.808, p = .421), persuasive writing (t = -1.516, p = .133), critique (t = 0.363, p = .717), and critique formalist approach (t = 0.196, p = .845). This also further indicates that the learning objectives did not significantly affect the students' performance in any of the writing domains utilized in the context of the present research.

Similar to the text above, the Content component of the BRIGHT Tool also reveals that there were no significant differences across the argumentative writing (t = 1.282, p = .203), informative writing (t = -0.003, p = .998), persuasive writing (t = -0.502, p = .617), critique (t = 0.801, p = .423), and critique formalist approach (t = -0.119, p = .905) topics. This further suggests as well that content quality, while they are deemed important, did not significantly influence the learners' writing performance across the assessed tasks integrated.

In the same way, the Activity component shows no significant differences in argumentative writing (t = 0.094, p = .926), informative writing (t = -1.107, p = .271), persuasive writing (t = -0.553, p = .582), critique (t = 0.431, p = .667), and critique formalist approach (t = -0.932, p = .354), indicating that learning activities did not produce statistically significant variations in students' writing outcomes.

Likewise, the Assessment component demonstrates no significant differences across argumentative writing (t = 0.534, p = .595), informative writing (t = -0.103, p = .918), persuasive writing (t = -0.344, p = .732), critique (t = 0.055, p = .956), and critique formalist approach (t = -0.254, p = .800). This implies that assessment practices did not significantly affect performance across writing types.

Moreover, the Instructional Value component also shows no significant differences in argumentative writing (t = 0.831, p = .408), informative writing (t = -0.081, p = .935), persuasive writing (t = -0.294, p = .770), critique (t = -0.434, p = .666), and critique formalist approach (t = 0.439, p = .662), suggesting a consistent but non-significant effect on students' writing performance.

In addition, the Technical Quality component reveals no significant differences across argumentative writing (t = 0.024, p = .981), informative writing (t = -0.550, p = .583), persuasive writing (t = -0.855, p = .395), critique (t = -0.562, p = .575), and critique formalist approach (t = 0.442, p = .659), indicating that system functionality and reliability did not significantly influence writing outcomes.

Finally, the Aesthetic Appeal component likewise shows no significant differences in argumentative writing (t = 0.559, p = .578), informative writing (t = 0.062, p = .950), persuasive writing (t = -0.412, p = .678), critique (t = -0.380, p = .705), and critique formalist approach (t = 0.509, p = .612), suggesting that visual design did not significantly affect students' performance in any writing domain.

Overall, all components of the BRIGHT Tool show no statistically significant differences across all writing skills, as all p-values are greater than .05. This implies that while the tool may support learning, its components did not significantly influence students' writing performance in the different domains tested.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship found between the BRIGHT tools' components, features, and the students' engagement spearheading to the rejection of the hypothesis. This result signifies that the BRIGHT tool has influenced and enhanced students'

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.

engagement effectively and significantly, making it a valuable factor in promoting active learning participation.

On another note, findings also revealed that there is no significant effect on the BRIGHT tools' components, features, and students' comprehension skills which leads to the acceptance of null hypothesis. This result denotes that the BRIGHT tool's components and features do not have influence significantly to the students' comprehension skills, suggesting that other factors may play a more vital role in developing comprehension amongst the learners.

The following suggestions were made in light of the study's results and conclusions:

Students may continue using the BRIGHT tool as a supplementary learning resource while actively engaging in reading and comprehension activities to further strengthen their understanding and academic performance.

Teachers may use further techniques or resources in addition to the BRIGHT Tool to enhance students' viewing comprehension performance because comprehension abilities remained largely satisfactory. As per the BRIGHT Tool Video lessons, it may be improved and developed for further use and application in lessons.

School administrators may support the continued use of the BRIGHT tool as a supplementary instructional resource and to provide teachers with training on how to integrate it effectively into lessons.

Future researchers may further investigate other factors that might have an effect or relationship on students' comprehension skills or engagement. They may also look into other fields of study where the BRIGHT Tool can be used if applied. Since the effect of significance within the variables were not suitable to the sampling of respondents and statistical analysis, researchers may adapt the study with a larger sample size.

REFERENCE

[1]. Javed, M. (2023). The effectiveness of different teaching methods in education: a comprehensive review. Journal of Social Signs Review, 1(1), 17-24. Retrieved from DOI: https://www.socialsignsreivew.com/index.php/12/article/view/3

[2]. Quinonez, K. S. (2023). Meaningful Participation in Individual Education Program (IEP) Meetings: Understanding the Students' Perspective (Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University Chicago). Accessed from DOI: https://www.proquest.com/openview/c382531ba8fdc528ca7de6603330f58a/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Verlyn Cabit Castillejo, "Bright (Building Reading Improvement Through Guided Hearing and Text) Tool on the Student's Engagement and Comprehension Skills," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 157-166, June 2026.