



TEACHERS' TEACHING PEDAGOGIES, LEVEL OF LITERACY, AND READING PERFORMANCE OF GRADE 1 STUDENTS

Vincent E Lontes

Teacher

Department of Education, Schools Division of Catbalogan

Samar, Philippines

Email: saff.catinoy@gmail.com

Abstract

The 21st Century describes a modern view of literacy that reflects multiple communication forms and contexts of cultural and linguistic diversity within a globalized society. However, teaching reading to young learners carries numerous difficulties, including diverse student backgrounds, varying levels of pre-literacy skills, and differing rates of learning. This study assessed the relationship among the teaching pedagogies of teachers, level of literacy, and reading performance of Grade 1 students in the District of Catbalogan III, Schools Division of Catbalogan City, Philippines, during School Year 2022–2023. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, the study found a moderate level of literacy among students based on a grand weighted mean of 3.26, indicating that they could hardly read. The teacher-respondents oftentimes used different teaching strategies in teaching literacy, based on a grand weighted mean of 3.67, indicating that they exerted effort in teaching literacy to Grade 1 students. The student-respondents performed exemplarily in reading based on a median grade of 82 ($MAD = 2$). Only the gross monthly family income of the student-respondents was significantly related to their level of literacy; teachers' teaching position and attitude toward teaching were significantly related to their extent of use of teaching pedagogies; and student reading performance was significantly related to both their level of literacy and their teachers' teaching pedagogy. Based on these findings, a reading enhancement intervention, Project Let'S READ Lit, is proposed to strengthen letter-sound recognition and phonological awareness among Grade 1 learners.

Keywords: *Teaching pedagogy, literacy, reading performance, reading, Grade 1*



1. Introduction

Improving literacy and reading performance is a global education priority, yet many intervention efforts assume students face common, uniform barriers to proficiency. In practice, teachers need pedagogies matched to their students' varied literacy needs. UNESCO defines literacy as the capacity to recognize, understand, interpret, produce, communicate, and compute using written and printed resources — a continuum of learning, rather than a fixed skill, that helps people reach their goals and participate fully in society (Vasquez et al., 2019). Children who receive high-quality early literacy exposure are better equipped to acquire this continuum, though not all children develop these skills at the same rate (Bao et al., 2020).

In the Philippines, the Philippine Statistics Authority reported a 2021 functional literacy rate of 99.27 percent, yet the World Bank found that roughly nine in ten ten-year-old Filipino children struggled to read and understand simple text, and classified 90 percent of them as “learning poor” in 2022 — a stark gap between the official literacy rate and children's actual reading comprehension (Lu, 2024). National reading assessments echo this gap: the 2014 Early Grade Reading Assessment found 10–25 percent of test-takers unable to identify a single letter-sound, and Philippine students posted below-OECD-average reading scores on the 2018 and 2022 PISA administrations, with grade repeaters and children with less early-childhood-education exposure scoring markedly lower (De la Fuente, 2024).

Because teaching reading to Grade 1 learners involves diverse student backgrounds, varying pre-literacy skills, and differing learning rates, effective instruction depends on teachers adopting pedagogies suited to these differences (Capricho et al., 2024) — consistent with the 1987 Philippine Constitution's mandate to make quality education accessible to all. Locally, the District of Catbalogan III had shown improving mean percentage scores in Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) and Filipino from 2019 to 2020 across its constituent schools, yet 2020 Phil-IRI results still placed 68 percent of students at the frustration reading level, and Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) results classified 73.67 percent of students as needing some form of reading refresher. These figures, while within passing ranges, motivated this study's assessment of whether teachers' teaching pedagogies were the missing link between students' literacy and reading performance in this district.

1.1 Purpose and Research Questions

This study assessed the relationship among the teaching pedagogies of teachers, level of literacy, and reading performance of Grade 1 students in the District of Catbalogan III, Schools Division of Catbalogan City, School Year 2022–2023. Specifically, it described the profile of student-respondents (age and sex, nutritional status, parents' highest educational attainment, parents' occupation, gross monthly family income, and attitude toward schooling) and of teacher-respondents (age and sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, gross monthly family income, teaching position, years in teaching, latest IPCRF performance rating, relevant in-service trainings, and attitude toward teaching); assessed students' level of literacy and its relationship to their profile variates; assessed the extent to which teachers used different pedagogies in teaching literacy and its relationship to their profile variates; assessed students' reading performance (based on untransmuted grade ranges for the first and second quarters of SY 2022–2023) and its relationship to their level of literacy and teachers' pedagogies; and, on this basis, derived an intervention program to strengthen reading performance.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

This study drew on four complementary theories. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory frames literacy development as socially mediated: children have a zone of proximal development (ZPD) — the gap between what they can do independently and what they can do with guidance from a more knowledgeable other (MKO), such as a teacher — and teachers who organize instruction within this zone can scaffold learners toward independent mastery (Kendra, 2024; McLeod, 2024). Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development situates Grade 1 learners (ages 6–7) in the late preoperational stage, when language skills and symbolic thought expand rapidly, implying that literacy



instruction and assessment should track individual developmental progress rather than uniform, same-age standards (Beck, 2024; Gill, 2024). Chall's Six Stages of Reading Development places Grade 1 learners in Stage 1 (Initial Reading and Decoding), where children begin linking sounds to symbols and reading simple, high-frequency-word texts — implying that pedagogy should be matched to this specific decoding stage (Hudson et al., 2020; Parlindungan, 2019). Finally, van Manen's Theory of Pedagogy frames teachers as pedagogues whose everyday instructional choices carry lasting influence on how children learn to act in and understand their world, underscoring that pedagogical content knowledge and a community of practice around literacy instruction matter as much as curriculum content itself (Gupta, 2021; Tummons et al., 2020). Together, these theories position teaching pedagogy as a plausible driver of Grade 1 learners' literacy and reading outcomes — the relationship this study set out to test.

1.3 Related Literature

Literacy is increasingly understood as multiliterate: a combination of visual, audio, spatial, and gestural modes of meaning-making suited to a digital, globalized society, rather than a narrow decoding skill (UNESCO, 2017). Its foundational components — phonemic awareness, sight-word knowledge, and decoding — develop progressively through early grades (Foorman et al., 2016; Herrera et al., 2021), and teachers play a decisive role across three functions: designing developmentally appropriate learning experiences, managing a stimulating literacy environment, and evaluating literacy outcomes through varied assessment (Maulani et al., 2021; Vernon-Feagans et al., 2019). Teaching pedagogy itself is defined broadly as the combination of instructional methods, learning activities, and assessment practices teachers use (University of Minnesota Center for Educational Innovation, 2024), spanning behaviorist, constructivist, liberationist, and social-constructivist approaches that teachers must match to individual students' learning needs (Chaudhary & Singh, 2018; Jing & Bin Abu, 2022). Reading, meanwhile, is considered the most foundational academic language skill: gains are largest in the earliest grades, and learners who fail to master basic reading by Grade 3 face a difficult transition from “learning to read” to “reading to learn” (Sampson & Condy, 2016; Spencer & Wagner, 2018).

A cluster of Philippine and international studies converges on the plausibility of a teaching-pedagogy–literacy link. Locally, Burgos and Garcia (2020) and Dalan et al. (2022) each found teachers' pedagogical approaches significantly and positively associated with students' second-language competencies and learning interest, respectively, while Wuntu et al. (2024) found literature-pedagogy implementation positively linked to student motivation. Studies specifically on Grade 1 reading — Echaure and Torno (2018), Santos and De Vera (2020), and Hubag et al. (2021) — each documented significant pre- to post-intervention gains using targeted reading strategies (competency-based instruction, the Marungko Approach, and the PFRATH parent-facilitated reading project, respectively), reinforcing that structured pedagogical intervention measurably improves early reading outcomes. International studies on early literacy predictors — Jimenez et al. (2024), Birgisdottir et al. (2020), Cardoza (2020), and Postanes et al. (2023) — identified vocabulary, letter knowledge, phonological awareness, self-regulation, and quality early-childhood exposure as consistent predictors of first-grade reading, situating teacher pedagogy as one lever among several environmental and child-level factors.

Collectively, this literature establishes that (a) literacy is multidimensional and developmentally staged, (b) teacher pedagogy is one of several plausible levers for improving it, and (c) prior Philippine studies have tested pedagogy's association with language competence, motivation, and reading gains separately, but not together with a simultaneous assessment of literacy level, pedagogy extent, and reading performance in a single Grade 1 population — the gap this study addressed.



2. Methods

2.1 Research Design

This study used a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design to assess the relationship among teachers' teaching pedagogies, students' level of literacy, and students' reading performance. The descriptive component profiled student- and teacher-respondents and assessed literacy level, pedagogy-use extent, and reading performance; the correlational component tested the relationship between literacy level and student profile variates, between pedagogy-use extent and teacher profile variates, and between reading performance and both literacy level and teaching pedagogy.

2.2 Locale and Participants

The study was conducted across the elementary schools of the District of Catbalogan III, Schools Division of Catbalogan City, Samar, Philippines: Catbalogan III Central Elementary School, Caramayon Elementary School, Libas Elementary School, and Lagundi Elementary School. Using stratified random sampling with Slovin's formula (margin of error = .05) applied to a Grade 1 population of 200, the study sampled 133 student-respondents, proportionately distributed across schools (Table 1). All 10 Grade 1 teachers in the district were included through complete enumeration.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by School

School	Teachers	Student Population (N)	Student Sample (n)
Catbalogan III Central Elementary School	6	178	119
Caramayon Elementary School	0	0	0
Libas Elementary School	1	1	0
Lagundi Elementary School	3	21	14
Total	10	200	133

Response rate: 100.00% for both teacher and student respondents.

2.3 Instruments

Two structured questionnaires (Set 1: teachers; Set 2: students) were used, each with three parts: (I) respondent profile items; (II) a 10-item, five-point Likert scale on attitude toward teaching or schooling; and (III) a pedagogy-use checklist (25 items, teachers) or a literacy-level checklist (20 items, students). Untransmuted first- and second-quarter grade ranges, drawn from students' report cards (School Form 8), served as the reading performance measure.

2.4 Validity and Reliability

Because both instruments were adopted from previously validated sources, they underwent content (face, construct, pragmatic, and convergent-discriminant) validation by an oral examination panel rather than a new pilot reliability test.

2.5 Procedure

Following approval from the Schools Division Superintendent and the district's public school district supervisors and school administrators, the researcher personally administered both questionnaires to achieve 100 percent retrieval, checked them for completeness, and conducted documentary analysis of consolidated school forms at the district office. Data collection ran from August to September 2022.

2.6 Statistical Treatment



Frequency counts and percentages described categorical profile variates. Because most continuous profile and performance variates were not normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk), median and median absolute deviation (MAD) were used for these; mean and standard deviation were used where normality held (e.g., teacher age, years in teaching). Weighted means summarized five-point Likert responses on attitude, literacy level, and pedagogy use. Pearson r or Spearman ρ (depending on normality) quantified linear association between continuous variates, interpreted using standard bands from very weak ($< .20$) to perfect association (1.0); chi-square tested association between nominal variates; and Fisher's t -test evaluated the significance of each correlation coefficient, at $\alpha = .05$, two-tailed.

3. Results

3.1 Profile of Respondents

Table 2 summarizes the student-respondents' profile. Ages ranged 6–7 years ($Mdn = 6$, $MAD = 0$), with slightly more female (54.89%) than male (45.11%) students. Most were of normal nutritional status. Fathers were most often baccalaureate degree holders or college-level, and mothers most often college- or high-school-level; occupationally, fathers were predominantly farmers or fishermen, and mothers predominantly housewives or farmers. Gross monthly family income was low, ranging ₱5,000–₱15,000 ($Mdn = ₱5,000$), with the majority (57.90%) earning only ₱5,000 — below the 2022 poverty threshold. Students nonetheless reported a highly favorable attitude toward schooling (grand $WM = 4.20$, Agree).

Table 2. Profile of Student-Respondents (N = 133)

Variate	Summary
Age and Sex	Ages 6–7 ($Mdn = 6$, $MAD = 0$); 45.11% male, 54.89% female
Nutritional Status	57.89% Normal, 39.10% Wasted, 3.01% Severely Wasted
Parents' Highest Educational Attainment	Father: mostly Baccalaureate Degree Holder (22.56%) or College Level (21.05%); Mother: mostly College Level (22.56%) or High School Level (22.56%)
Parents' Occupation	Father: mostly Farmer (45.11%) or Fisherman (30.08%); Mother: mostly Housewife (42.11%) or Farmer (41.35%)
Gross Monthly Family Income	₱5,000–₱15,000 ($Mdn = ₱5,000$, $MAD = ₱0$); 57.90% earn ₱5,000/month
Attitude toward Schooling	Grand $WM = 4.20$ (Agree — highly favorable)

Table 3 summarizes the teacher-respondents' profile. Ages ranged 25–53 years ($M = 33.50$, $SD = 8.14$). Most teachers were married (70.00%) and had earned units toward a master's degree (80.00%). Gross monthly family income ranged ₱20,000–₱40,000 ($Mdn = ₱24,393.50$), above the 2022 poverty threshold. Most held entry-level Teacher I positions (60.00%), had 1–13 years of teaching experience ($M = 6.60$, $SD = 3.75$), and had received a Very Satisfactory IPCRF rating (70.00%). Teachers reported attending division- and school-level in-service training oftentimes-to-always, but rarely national or international training. Teachers reported a highly favorable attitude toward teaching (grand $WM = 3.95$, Agree).

Table 3. Profile of Teacher-Respondents (N = 10)

Variate	Summary
Age and Sex	Ages 25–53 ($M = 33.50$, $SD = 8.14$); 40.00% male, 60.00% female
Civil Status	70.00% Married, 30.00% Single
Highest Educational Attainment	80.00% Master's units, 20.00% Baccalaureate Degree Holder
Gross Monthly Family Income	₱20,000–₱40,000 ($Mdn = ₱24,393.50$, $MAD = ₱2,632.50$)
Teaching Position	60.00% Teacher I, 30.00% Teacher III, 10.00% Teacher II

Variate	Summary
Number of Years in Teaching	1–13 years (M = 6.60, SD = 3.75)
Latest IPCRF Performance Rating	70.00% Very Satisfactory (4.000), 30.00% Outstanding (5.000)
Relevant In-Service Trainings (WM)	International 1.00 (Never); National 1.60 (Sometimes); Regional 2.20 (Sometimes); Division 3.30 (Oftentimes); District 3.00 (Oftentimes); School 3.50 (Always)
Attitude toward Teaching	Grand WM = 3.95 (Agree — highly favorable)

3.2 Level of Literacy and Its Correlates

Table 4 summarizes students' self-appraised literacy level across 20 indicators. Ten indicators — largely concerning general literacy importance and teacher support — were rated High (WM 3.68–4.03); eight indicators concerning specific reading and writing skills and school-wide reading/writing programs were rated Moderate (WM 2.53–2.84); and two indicators, both concerning school-wide reading and writing programs specifically, were rated Low (WM = 2.44). The grand weighted mean of 3.26 places students' overall literacy level at Moderate, indicating students perceived themselves as able to read only with difficulty.

Table 4. Level of Literacy of Student-Respondents (Summary of 20 Indicators)

Band	n Indicators	WM Range	Representative Indicators
High	10	3.68–4.03	“My grades have improved based on literacy strategies my teacher employs” (4.03)
Moderate	8	2.53–2.84	“I am confident in my ability to gauge my reading comprehension” (2.73)
Low	2	2.44	“My school emphasizes a school-wide reading/writing program” (2.44 each)

Grand Weighted Mean = 3.26 (Moderate). Scale: 4.50–5.00 Very High; 3.50–4.49 High; 2.50–3.49 Moderate; 1.50–2.49 Low; 1.00–1.49 Very Low.

Table 5 presents the relationship between students' literacy level and their profile variates. Of the six variates tested, only gross monthly family income showed a significant, though weak, positive relationship with literacy level ($\rho = .248$, $F(133) = 2.930$, $p = .004$); age, sex, nutritional status, parents' educational attainment, parents' occupation, and attitude toward schooling showed no significant relationship.

Table 5. Relationship between Level of Literacy and Student Profile Variates

Variate	Association	Degree	Fisher's t / χ^2	p	Decision
Age	$\rho = .134$	Very Weak	1.548	.124	Not Significant
Sex	$\chi^2 = .676$ (df=3)	—	—	.879	Not Significant

Variate	Association	Degree	Fisher's t / χ^2	p	Decision
Nutritional Status	$\rho = -.040$	Very Weak	0.458	.644	Not Significant
Parents' Educational Attainment	$\rho = -.048$	Very Weak	0.550	.584	Not Significant
Parents' Occupation	$\chi^2 = 12.280$ (df=15)	—	—	.658	Not Significant
Gross Monthly Family Income	$\rho = .248$	Weak	2.930	.004	Significant
<i>Attitude toward Schooling</i>	$\rho = .087$	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>1.000</i>	<i>.318</i>	<i>Not Significant</i>

Fisher's t-critical = ± 1.978 , $df = 133$. $\alpha = .05$.

3.3 Extent of Teaching Pedagogy Use and Its Correlates

Table 6 summarizes the extent to which teachers reported using different pedagogies in teaching literacy across 25 indicators. Twenty-three indicators were rated Oftentimes (WM 3.50–3.90), with “I assess measurement results with an explanatory language instead of a judgmental approach” rated highest; two indicators — “I act with the knowledge that each student has a capacity” and “I provide measurement results without delay” — were rated Sometimes (WM = 3.30). The grand weighted mean of 3.67 indicates teachers oftentimes used varied pedagogies, reflecting active effort in literacy instruction.

Table 6. Extent of Teaching Pedagogy Use by Teacher-Respondents (Summary of 25 Indicators)

Band	n Indicators	WM Range
Oftentimes	23	3.50–3.90
Sometimes	2	3.30

Grand Weighted Mean = 3.67 (Oftentimes). Scale: 4.50–5.00 Always; 3.50–4.49 Oftentimes; 2.50–3.49 Sometimes; 1.50–2.49 Rarely; 1.00–1.49 Never.

Table 7 presents the relationship between teachers' extent of pedagogy use and their profile variates. Teaching position showed a significant, strong, inverse relationship ($r = -.681$, $F(8) = 2.630$, $p = .030$): teachers in the entry-level Teacher I position used pedagogies more frequently than those in higher Teacher II or III positions. Attitude toward teaching showed a significant, strong, positive relationship ($\rho = .671$, $F(8) = 2.560$, $p = .021$): teachers with more favorable attitudes toward teaching used pedagogies more frequently. Age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, gross monthly family income, years in teaching, IPCRF rating, and in-service trainings showed no significant relationship.

Table 7. Relationship between Extent of Pedagogy Use and Teacher Profile Variates

Variate	Association	Degree	Fisher's t / χ^2	p	Decision
Age	$r = .132$	Very Weak	0.377	.716	Not Significant
Sex	$\chi^2 = 4.048$ (df=2)	—	—	.132	Not Significant
Civil Status	$\chi^2 = 3.197$ (df=2)	—	—	.202	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	$\rho = -.371$	Weak	1.130	.291	Not Significant
Gross Monthly Family Income	$\rho = .176$	Very Weak	0.506	.627	Not Significant
Teaching Position	$r = -.681$	Strong	2.630	.030	Significant
Number of Years in Teaching	$r = .345$	Weak	1.040	.329	Not Significant
Latest IPCRF Rating	$r = .122$	Very Weak	0.348	.738	Not Significant
Relevant In-Service Trainings	$\rho = .227$	Weak	0.659	.527	Not Significant
Attitude toward Teaching	$\rho = .671$	Strong	2.560	.021	Significant

Fisher's t -critical = ± 2.306 , $df = 8$. $\alpha = .05$.

3.4 Reading Performance and Its Correlates

Table 8 shows students' reading performance based on untransmuted grades for the first and second quarters of SY 2022–2023. Grades ranged 79–92 (Mdn = 82, MAD = 2), well above the DepEd passing grade of 75, indicating exemplary reading performance overall.

Table 8. Reading Performance of Student-Respondents (N = 133)

Statistic	Value
Grade Range	79–92
Median	82
MAD	2 points

Table 9 presents the relationship between students' reading performance and both their level of literacy and their teachers' teaching pedagogy. Both relationships were significant and positive: reading performance rose with literacy level ($\rho = .261$, $F(133) = 3.095$, $p = .000$) and with more frequent teacher use of varied pedagogies ($\rho = .235$, $F(133) = 2.767$, $p = .010$).



Table 9. Relationship between Reading Performance and Level of Literacy / Teaching Pedagogies

Variate	Association	Degree	Fisher's t	p	Decision
Level of Literacy	$\rho = .261$	Weak	3.095	.000	Significant
Teachers' Teaching Pedagogies	$\rho = .235$	Weak	2.767	.010	Significant

Fisher's t-critical = ± 1.978 , *df* = 133. $\alpha = .05$



4. Discussion

The student-respondents' profile — age-appropriate for Grade 1, with a majority having normal nutritional status, functionally literate parents, but low family income — describes a population with adequate foundational conditions for learning but constrained material resources. That gross monthly family income was the only student-profile variate significantly related to literacy level (Table 5) is consistent with prior findings that household income shapes access to learning resources and print-rich environments (Vasquez et al., 2019; Bao et al., 2020): higher-income families could likely provide reading materials and support that lower-income families could not, plausibly explaining why literacy did not vary significantly with age, sex, nutritional status, or parents' education or occupation in this sample.

Students' Moderate overall literacy level (grand WM = 3.26) is consistent with Chall's placement of Grade 1 learners at the Initial Reading and Decoding stage (Stage 1), where sound-symbol correspondence is still forming rather than mastered (Hudson et al., 2020; Parlindungan, 2019). Notably, the lowest-rated indicators concerned school-wide reading and writing programs specifically, rather than general literacy confidence — suggesting a gap not in students' foundational orientation toward literacy, but in structured, program-level reading support at the school level. This is consistent with the World Bank's and De la Fuente's (2024) national findings that even reportedly high aggregate literacy rates can mask children's actual struggles with simple text.

Teachers' Oftentimes-level pedagogy use (grand WM = 3.67) reflects active, if not maximal, instructional effort. That teaching position and attitude toward teaching — but not years of experience, training, or performance rating — significantly predicted the use of pedagogy (Table 7) is a notable finding. The inverse relationship with teaching position (entry-level Teacher I teachers used pedagogies more than higher-ranked teachers) may reflect newer teachers' closer contact with pre-service pedagogical training, or greater motivation to demonstrate instructional versatility early in their careers; more senior teachers may rely more on routinized practice. This pattern echoes van Manen's emphasis on pedagogy as a living, everyday relational practice rather than a credential-driven one (Gupta, 2021), and is broadly consistent with Burgos and Garcia (2020) and Dalan et al. (2022), who likewise found pedagogical attitude and practice, not tenure, associated with better instructional and student outcomes.

Students' exemplary reading performance (Mdn = 82, well above the DepEd passing grade of 75) alongside significant positive relationships with both literacy level and teacher pedagogy use (Table 9) supports this study's central premise: teaching pedagogy is measurably associated with reading outcomes, net of the fact that literacy level itself was only Moderate. This pattern is consistent with Santos and De Vera (2020) and Hubag et al. (2021), who documented reading gains tied to specific pedagogical interventions (the Marungko Approach and the PFRATH parent-facilitation project, respectively), and with Postanes et al. (2023), who linked strong early literacy and reading outcomes to supportive instructional and home environments together. Taken together, these results are consistent with a Vygotskian account in which teachers, as more knowledgeable others, scaffold literacy development within students' zone of proximal development — and where doing so more consistently (i.e., a higher extent of pedagogy use) is associated with stronger reading performance.

4.1 Proposed Intervention Program

Based on these findings — particularly the significant relationship between reading performance and both literacy level and teacher pedagogy, and the specific gap identified in school-wide reading program support — this study proposes Project Let'S READ Lit (Letters and Sounds: Reading Enhancement Activities for Development of Literacy). The program targets phonological awareness, specifically letter-sound recognition and association, through weekly reading enhancement sessions integrated into English and Filipino instruction. It is structured in three phases: a Pre-Implementation Phase (finalizing findings-based activities with school administrators and the district coordinator), an Implementation Phase (one quarter of weekly sessions co-facilitated by Grade 1 teachers and tutors, monitored by school principals and the district coordinator), and a Post-Implementation Phase (assessment using DepEd-mandated tools such as the CRLA or Phil-IRI). Estimated implementation cost is ₱30,000, to be shared between the proponent (pre-implementation materials) and school/district local funds (implementation and post-implementation activities).



5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Student-respondents were of age-appropriate, healthy, functionally-literate-parented backgrounds but low household income, and held a highly favorable attitude toward schooling. Teacher-respondents were relatively young, predominantly female, married, holding graduate-level units, adequately compensated, and largely at entry-level teaching positions with a highly favorable attitude toward teaching. Students' overall literacy level was Moderate, significantly related only to household income among the profile variates tested. Teachers used varied literacy pedagogies Oftentimes, with this extent of use significantly related to teaching position (inversely) and attitude toward teaching (positively), but not to age, sex, civil status, education, income, experience, performance rating, or training. Students' reading performance was exemplary relative to the DepEd passing standard and was significantly, positively related to both their level of literacy and their teachers' extent of pedagogy use — supporting this study's central premise that teaching pedagogy is a meaningful correlate of Grade 1 reading outcomes.

5.2 Recommendations

1. Implement a structured reading enhancement intervention, such as the proposed Project Let'S READ Lit, to address the specific literacy gaps identified — particularly the low-rated school-wide reading and writing program indicators — given that reading performance is significantly related to literacy level.
2. Encourage teachers to continue and expand their use of varied teaching pedagogies in literacy instruction, applying them contingently based on individual student needs, given the significant relationship between pedagogy use and reading performance.
3. Support family income-generating opportunities or resource-provision programs for students' households, given that gross monthly family income was the only significant correlate of students' literacy level.
4. Sustain and reinforce the favorable attitudes toward teaching already shown by entry-level teachers, including through continued access to relevant learning resources, given the significant relationship between attitude toward teaching and pedagogy use.
5. Replicate this study in other districts or divisions to validate its findings across different populations.
6. Conduct a follow-up study after implementing the proposed intervention program to evaluate its effectiveness.



References

1. Banez, R. M., & Urayan, M. T. M. (2019). Unpacking pupils' reading ability: Examining the effect of Marungko Approach-based intervention program for non-reader pupils. *International Journal of Recent Innovations in Academic Research*, 3(2), 60–66. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363212882>
2. Bao, X., Qu, H., Zhang, R., & Hogan, T. P. (2020). Modeling reading ability gain in kindergarten children during COVID-19 school closures. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(17), 6371, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176371>
3. Beck, C. (2024). Theory of cognitive development by Jean Piaget. <https://itcollege.ac.in/itdc/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Dr-C.Beck-5.pdf>
4. Birgisdottir, F., Gestsdottir, S., & Geldhof, G. J. (2020). Early predictors of first and fourth grade reading and math: The role of self-regulation and early literacy skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 53, 507–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2020.05.001>
5. Burgos, M. V., & Garcia, R. B. (2020). Language teaching method, pedagogies, attitudes and competencies toward English as a second language among senior high schools: Basis for intervention program. *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Social Sciences*, 5(1), 6–14. <https://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/APJARSS-2020.002.pdf>
6. Capricho, M. G., Escartin, M., & Baticuang, A. (2024). Strategies in teaching reading among Grade One learners amidst COVID-19 pandemic. *World Journal on Education and Humanities Research*, 4(2), 19–29.
7. Cardoza, J. (2020). Factors that affect language and literacy development in international school contexts [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/9642>
8. Chaudhary, A., & Singh, R. (2018). Research as a pedagogical tool in higher education programmes. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330103113>
9. Dalan, J. D. S. L., Chavez, M. K. E., & Paler, G. S. (2022). Teachers' pedagogical approach and students' learning interest in English. *Institutional Multidisciplinary Research and Development Journal*, 4, 1–7.
10. Department of Education (DepEd). (2017). DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2017: Operational guidelines on the implementation of School-Based Feeding Program for School Years 2017–2022. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DO_s2017_039.pdf
11. De la Fuente, J. K. (2024). Reading performance declining in the Philippines. <https://www.teacherph.com/reading-performance-declining-philippines/>
12. Echaure, J. S., & Torno, V. D. (2018). Developing the reading literacy among Grade 1 learners in the Philippines. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(4), 19–26.
13. Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/practiceGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf
14. Friesen, N., & Su, H. (2023). What is pedagogy? Discovering the hidden pedagogical dimension. *Educational Theory*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357575615>
15. Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). How can students improve their reading comprehension skill? *Journal of Studies in Education*, 6(2), 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v6i2.9201>



-
16. Gill, K. (2024). Piaget's stages of cognitive development. <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/325030>
 17. Gupta, G. (2021). Pedagogy in theory and practice. *LEARNing Landscapes*, 14(1), 143–151. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1305048.pdf>
 18. Haren, R. V. (2010). Engaging learner diversity through learning by design. *e-Learning and Digital Media*, 7(3), 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.2304/elea.2010.7.3.258>
 19. Herrera, S., Phillips, B. M., Yi-Chieh, N., Dombek, J. L., & Hernandez, J. A. (2021). Effectiveness of early literacy instruction: Summary of 20 years of research. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED613947.pdf>
 20. Hubag, D. M., Elona, E. F., & Felisilda, M. J. M. (2021). Effectiveness of Project PFRATH on reading performance of Grade One pupils in Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education. *Sapienza: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(3), 106–112. <https://doi.org/10.51798/sijis.v2i3.125>
 21. Hudson, A., Koh, P. W., Moore, K. A., & Binks-Cantrell, E. (2020). Fluency interventions for elementary students with reading difficulties: A synthesis of research from 2000–2019. *Education Sciences*, 10(52), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10030052>
 22. IGI Global. (2024). What is literacy instruction. <https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/assitive-technology-interventions-and-equity-within-literacy-instruction/52879>
 23. Jimenez, M. V., Yumus, M., Schiele, T., Mues, A., & Niklas, F. (2024). Preschool emergent literacy skills as predictors of reading and spelling in Grade 2 and the role of migration background in Germany. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 244(105927), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2024.105927>
 24. Jing, N., & Bin Abu, B. (2022). Research on the design of pedagogy curriculum teaching plan based on nonlinear analysis. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(8), 3614–3622.
 25. Kendra, C. (2024). What is sociocultural theory? Recognizing the role that society and socialization play in learning. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-sociocultural-theory-2795088>
 26. Lee, J. (2016). Attitude toward school does not predict academic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 52, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.09.009>
 27. Lu, B. J. (2024). Literacy important for PH development. In *Fresh Viewpoints: A New Perspective*. Philippine News Agency. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/opinion/pieces/962-literacy-important-for-ph-development>
 28. Luciano, R. G., Viudez, G., & Roquel, S. M. (2020). Reading performance of elementary pupils in the Philippines as influenced by CIP processes: An assessment. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(02), 3059–3063.
 29. Maulani, S., Musthafa, B., Damaianti, V. S., Agustin, M., & Puspita, R. D. (2021). Applying social cognitive based literacy learning model to improve students' reading and reasoning skill in Indonesian elementary school. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 18(09), 1205–1224.
 30. McLeod, S. (2024). Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/vygotsky.html>
 31. Meacham, S. (2023). Foundations of early literacy. In N. Gurjar, S. Meacham, & C. Beecher (Eds.), *Methods of teaching early literacy*. Iowa State University Digital Press. <https://iastate.pressbooks.pub/teachingearlyliteracy/chapter/chapter-2-foundations-of-early-literacy/>
-



-
32. Methner, G. (2013). Perceptions of administrative support and follower readiness in middle school teachers [Doctoral dissertation]. Bowling Green State University. https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/leadership_diss/74
 33. Ministry of Human Resource Department of India. (2020). Guidelines for innovative pedagogical approaches & evaluation reforms. https://www.ugc.gov.in/pdfnews/7900069_Guidelines-PEA.pdf
 34. Nava, F. J. G., Pado, F. E., & Diaz, L. A. (2017). The Philippine informal reading inventory 2016: Pupils' performance in Filipino and English across mother tongues [Conference presentation]. National Conference on Research in Teacher Education.
 35. Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2018). Reading performance (PISA). <https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/reading-performance-pisa.html>
 36. Parlindungan, F. (2019). Understanding children development from literacy perspective: Critique of competing theories [Conference presentation]. 1st International Conference on Public Health, Universitas Teuku Umar.
 37. Postanes, J. V. G., Bringas, R. R., Deanon, B. M. B., Mangubat, R., Opingo, K. M., & Pantaleon, A. (2023). Assessing early language & literacy development of the Grade 1 pupils. *World Journal on Education and Humanities Research*, 3(4), 89–105.
 38. Sampson, C., & Condy, J. (2016). One teacher's experiences of teaching reading in an urban multi-grade foundation phase class. *Perspectives in Education*, 34(2), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v34i2.7>
 39. Santos, C. M., & De Vera, G. M. (2020). Reading performance of Grade 1 learners using Marungko Approach. *ASEAN Journal of Basic and Higher Education*, 2(1), 42–84.
 40. Spencer, M., & Wagner, R. K. (2018). The comprehension problems of children with poor reading comprehension despite adequate decoding: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(3), 366–400. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317749187>
 41. Tang, Y., & Hu, J. (2022). The impact of teacher attitude and teaching approaches on student demotivation: Disappointment as a mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(985859), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.985859>
 42. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2017). Literacy rates continue to rise from one generation to the next. https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs45-literacy-rates-continue-rise-generation-to-next-en-2017_0.pdf
 43. University of Minnesota Center for Educational Innovation. (2024). Pedagogy — Diversifying your teaching methods, learning activities, and assignments. <https://cei.umn.edu/teaching-resources/inclusive-teaching-predominantly-white-institution/pedagogy-diversifying-your-teaching-methods-learning-activities-and-assignments>
 44. Vasquez, V. M., Janks, H., & Comber, B. (2019). Critical literacy as a way of being and doing. *Language Arts*, 96(5), 300–311.
 45. Vernon-Feagans, L., Mokrova, L. L., Carr, R. C., Garrett-Peters, P. T., & Burchinal, M. R. (2019). Cumulative years of classroom quality from kindergarten to third grade: Prediction to children's third grade literacy skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 47, 531–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.08.003>



-
46. Wuntu, C. N., Tatipang, D. P., & Ali, M. (2024). Literature pedagogy for English development: Investigating preferences, motivation, and best practices toward the implementation. *Teaching English Language*, 18(2), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2024.456555.1608>