

The Effectiveness of the Strategies in Teaching Reading in Grade 4 Learners in Jose Panganiban East District, Division of Camarines Norte

Dan Jasper C. Ibis¹

¹San Rafael Elementary School, Labo East District, Labo Camarines Norte

¹University of Northeastern Philippines, Iriga City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Published: May 2026

Keywords:

Effectiveness
 Strategies
 Reading

ABSTRACT

Reading is a fundamental skill that serves as the cornerstone for learning across all subjects, and difficulties in reading can significantly affect a learner's academic progress. This descriptive research determined the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading in grade 4 learners in Jose Panganiban East District, Division of Camarines Norte for School Year 2024-2025. The study used the descriptive-evaluative-correlational method of research. Purposive sampling was used by the researcher in choosing Jose Panganiban East District as the locale of the study, however total enumeration in the choice of fifty-two (52) Grade 4 teachers as respondents. The statistical tools used were weighted mean, rank and the Kendal Coefficient of Concordance W. Significance level was set at 0.05. Results showed that the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading was Much Utilized. The extent of utilization of Differentiated Instruction was Much Utilized, Phonics Instruction was Much Utilized, Guided Reading was Much Utilized, Repeated Reading was Much Utilized, Fluency Practice was Much Utilized, and Multisensory Approaches was Much Utilized. There is no significant agreement on the rank order of the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading. The extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading was Much Effective, particularly in Reading Fluency which was Effective, Reading Comprehension which was Much Effective, Engagement and Motivation which was Much Effective, Progress in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills which was Much Effective, and Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments which was Much Effective. There is no significant agreement on the rank order of the extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading. The policy recommendations were formulated based on the salient findings of the study to address gaps and strengthen the implementation and effectiveness of reading strategies.

1. Introduction

Reading is a fundamental skill that serves as the cornerstone for learning across all subjects, and difficulties in reading can significantly affect a learner's academic progress. For Grade 4 students, reading proficiency is particularly crucial as they transition from learning to read to reading to learn. Unfortunately, many learners encounter reading difficulties at this stage, which can hinder their ability to succeed in other areas of study. These challenges may stem from various factors such as insufficient phonemic awareness, poor decoding skills, limited vocabulary, or difficulty in understanding text.

The reviewed literature highlights that English language development, reading instruction, reading difficulties, and policy interventions play a significant role in shaping learners' literacy skills and academic success. Across various local and foreign studies, it is evident that English proficiency and reading competence are strongly influenced by instructional strategies, exposure to language, learner engagement, and educational policies. These studies collectively emphasize that effective reading instruction and language development require a combination of phonics-based approaches, comprehension strategies, and supportive learning environments, along with strong institutional and policy support (Borlongan, 2017; Gonzalez, 2018; Racca et al., 2016; Wolf et al., 2016).

English Language in the Philippines: Borlongan (2017) posited that English was introduced in the Philippines during American colonization and later taught by well-trained American educators, which established its early foundation in the country. Borlongan (2017) also stated that Filipinos' engagement in English education contributed to its spread and growing proficiency among learners during the early 20th century. Gonzalez (2018) emphasized that by the end of the 20th century, a large majority of Filipinos were English speakers, making the Philippines one of the major English-using countries in Asia. Dita and De Leon (2015) found that Philippine English has varying levels of intelligibility to other English speakers and requires further research to fully understand its comprehensibility. Salazar (2017) argued that Philippine English has continuously evolved over time as Filipino speakers adapted the language to fit local cultural and communicative needs. Dita and De Leon (2015) further revealed that Philippine English is generally comprehensible within its linguistic context, highlighting the importance of awareness of English varieties in education.

Studies on Reading: The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) was described as an assessment tool that measures pupils' reading ability through oral reading tests and comprehension questions. Phil-IRI categorizes learners into independent, instructional, and frustrated reading levels based on their performance in comprehension and oral reading tasks. The Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) was also identified as a classroom-based tool that helps teachers assess reading ability through graded passages and comprehension questions. Abao et al. (2016) posited that students have different reading preferences but these do not significantly affect reading performance, indicating reading as a personal responsibility. The Journal of Academic Librarianship (2015) found that undergraduates generally prefer print materials, although their reading behavior is influenced by accessibility, cost, and academic importance. Pfost, Dörfler, and Artelt (2013) revealed that traditional book reading positively contributes to reading comprehension, while online reading activities may negatively affect reading achievement. Arieta et al. (2017) found that study habits influenced by time management, environment, and social media significantly affect students' academic performance. Magbanua (2016) stated that students showed satisfactory English proficiency in grammar and spelling but needed improvement in vocabulary. Racca et al. (2016) found a significant relationship between English language proficiency and academic performance in Science, Mathematics, and English. Lee, Schallert, and Kim (2015) revealed that extensive reading and translation activities positively affect grammar knowledge and learner attitudes depending on proficiency level. Navarro et al. (2015) found that maritime students were competent in recognizing the importance of English but lacked proficiency in vocabulary and reading comprehension. Aina (2013) posited that English proficiency is significantly related to students' academic performance in science and technical education.

Reading Difficulties: Yago (2010), as cited by Mendoza (2019), found that Grade II pupils commonly experience reading difficulties such as word-by-word reading, omission, substitution, and repetition. Henbest and Apel (2017) revealed that both synthetic and analytic phonics instruction are effective in improving word reading among struggling readers. Williams (2017) found that multisensory phonics instruction significantly improves fluency rate and decoding accuracy among learners with reading difficulties. The reviewed studies emphasized that multisensory and phonics-based instruction enhance reading fluency and decoding skills among learners with difficulties.

The reviewed literature establishes that no single approach is sufficient to fully address learners' reading and English proficiency needs. Instead, a balanced integration of instructional strategies, continuous teacher development, learner-centered practices, and evidence-based policy implementation is necessary to improve reading outcomes. Furthermore, gaps identified in previous studies highlight the need for localized research that focuses on specific learner contexts and instructional strategies to further enhance reading proficiency and academic performance.

2. Objectives of the Study

Primarily, this study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading in grade 4 learners in Jose Panganiban East District, Division of Camarines Norte in the public elementary schools in Labo East and West Districts, Division of Camarines Norte for School Year 2024-2025. Specifically, the researchers intended to determine: (1) the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading in terms of Differentiated Instruction, Phonics Instruction, Guided Reading, Repeated Reading, Fluency Practice, and Multisensory Approaches; (2) the significance of the agreement on the rank orders of the extent of utilization of the strategies in teaching reading along the aforementioned aspects; (3) the extent of the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading in terms of Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Engagement and Motivation, Progress in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills, and Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments; (4) the significance of the agreement on the rank orders of the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading among the different groups of respondents; and (5) the policy recommendations that can be derived based on the findings of the study.

3. Materials and Methods

The descriptive-evaluative-correlational research design was employed in this study. The descriptive design describes the degree of a quantifiable variable. This study was used to determine the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading in grade 4 learners in Jose Panganiban East District, Division of Camarines Norte in Labo East and West Districts, Division of Camarines Norte for the School Year 2024-2025.

3.1 Respondents

The respondents consisted of fifty-two (52) Grade 4 teachers from forty-six (46) public elementary schools in Labo East and West District, Division of Camarines Norte selected through purposive sampling and total enumeration. These respondents were taken for the School Year 2024-2025.

3.2 Data Gathering Instrument

The instrument used in gathering the necessary data was a structured researcher-made questionnaire checklist. Part I contained the indicators on the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading in terms of Differentiated Instruction, Phonics Instruction, Guided Reading, Repeated Reading, Fluency Practice, and Multisensory Approaches, and Part II contained the indicators on the extent of the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading in terms of Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Engagement and Motivation, Progress in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills, and Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments. A total of 110 questions were included in this study. The research instrument underwent content validation by experts in the field and was proofread for clarity and grammatical accuracy. The reliability coefficient ($r = 0.836$) confirms high internal consistency, and the significant t-value ($t = 10.57$) supports the instrument's reliability. The calculated

standard deviation (S = 6.0) further validates the consistency of response dispersion. Thus, the instrument is deemed reliable and valid for use in the study. Suggestions and recommendations on each item if the questionnaire has been acquired for the improvement of the instrument.

3.3 Data Analysis

Weighted mean was used to determine the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading and the extent of the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading in Labo East and West Districts, Division of Camarines Norte for the School Year 2024-2025. It was interpreted using the following scale:

Scale	Weights Assigned	Description	
		Extent of the Level of the Strategies in Teaching Reading	Extent of the Strategies in Teaching Reading
5	4.50-5.00	Very Much Evident (VME)	Very Much Effective (VME)
4	3.50-4.49	Much Evident (ME)	Much Effective (ME)
3	2.50-3.49	Evident (E)	Effective (E)
2	1.50-2.49	Fairly Evident (FE)	Fairly Effective (FE)
1	1.00-1.49	Not At All (NA)	Not At All (NA)

A letter of permission to conduct the study was sent to the Schools Division Superintendent of Camarines Norte, Public Schools District Supervisor, and School Heads of Labo East District public elementary schools for their approval and endorsements.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The Summary of the Extent of the Utilization of the Strategies in Teaching Reading

The summary of the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading is illustrated in Table 9.

As demonstrated, the following areas were ranked in descending order: Phonics Instruction, 4.57 were rated as Very Much Utilized; while, Repeated Reading, 4.43; Fluency Practice, 4.40; Differentiated Instruction, 4.37; Guided Reading, 4.31; Multisensory Approaches, 4.05 were interpreted as Much Utilized. The average weighted mean of the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading Jose Panganiban East District was 4.41 or rated as Much Utilized. The descending order of strategy utilization (Phonics Instruction at 4.57, Repeated Reading at 4.43, Fluency Practice at 4.40, Differentiated Instruction at 4.37, Guided Reading at 4.31, and Multisensory Approaches at 4.05) reveals important patterns in teachers' instructional priorities.

Table 9. The summary of the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading

Indicators	Average		
	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Differentiated Instruction	4.37	MU	4
2. Phonics Instruction	4.57	VMU	1
3. Guided Reading	4.31	MU	5
4. Repeated Reading	4.43	MU	2
5. Fluency Practice	4.40	MU	3
6. Multisensory Approaches	4.05	MU	6
Average	4.41	MU	

The overall average of 4.41 (Much Utilized) across all strategies indicates a strong implementation of research-based literacy approaches in Jose Panganiban East District. This high level of implementation aligns with Potot et al (2023) findings about the effectiveness of comprehensive literacy strategies when properly executed. The relatively lower rating for multisensory approaches (4.05) compared to other strategies might reflect what Gaitas & Martins (2016) identified as implementation challenges for more complex pedagogical methods. The results suggest that while teachers are effectively employing many evidence-based strategies, there may be room for growth in integrating more sophisticated approaches like multisensory techniques, particularly for diverse learners as highlighted by Hall et al (2021). The consistency in high ratings across most strategies indicates systemic support for quality literacy instruction throughout the district.

The strong showing of guided reading (4.31) connects with Van Der Mescht (2023) research on its value in literacy development, while simultaneously raising questions about how teachers balance it with other strategies. The close clustering of scores between

repeated reading (4.43), fluency practice (4.40), and differentiated instruction (4.37) suggests teachers may be implementing these strategies in an integrated manner, as recommended by Piasta & Hudson (2022) in their discussion of comprehensive literacy instruction. The pattern of results mirrors Flynn et al (2021) findings about teachers increasingly adopting research-informed practices, though the variation in scores indicates some strategies are more consistently or extensively implemented than others. This could reflect differences in teacher training, resource availability, or perceived effectiveness of various approaches.

These findings have significant implications for professional development and instructional leadership. The high overall implementation (4.41) suggests the district has successfully promoted research-based literacy strategies, but the variation between approaches indicates potential areas for focused improvement. As Dhakal (2021) and Gaitas & Martins (2016) noted, even highly-rated strategies like differentiated instruction (4.37) may benefit from additional training to maximize effectiveness. The relatively lower rating for multisensory approaches (4.05) suggests these might

be prioritized in future professional development, particularly given their demonstrated effectiveness for diverse learners as shown by Bhandari & Dorji (2025). District leaders might consider why some strategies are more fully implemented than others and whether this reflects teacher confidence, training opportunities, or resource allocation.

Future research should examine the relationship between these implementation levels and actual student literacy outcomes. While Potot et al (2023) and Olagbaju & Olaniyi (2023) have established the effectiveness of these strategies individually, more studies are needed on their combined implementation. Research could investigate whether the current descending pattern of utilization (phonics to multisensory) represents an optimal progression for literacy development, or if adjustments might benefit certain student populations. Longitudinal studies could track how changes in implementation levels affect student achievement over time. Additionally, qualitative research might explore why certain strategies are more readily adopted than others, building on Gaitas & Martins (2016) work on implementation challenges.

4.2 The Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Utilization of the Strategies in Teaching Reading

The results of the test of significant agreement on the rank orders of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading are described in table 10.

Table 10. Test of significant agreement on the rank orders of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading.

Indicators	Computed Tabular			
	χ^2	χ^2 -value	Decision	Significance
			on H_0	
Differentiated Instruction	6.30	18.31	Accepted	Not Significant
2. Phonics Instruction	16.50	19.68	Accepted	Not Significant
3. Guided Reading	3.24	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
4. Repeated Reading	8.64	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
5. Fluency Practice	11.07	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
6. Multisensory Approaches	10.53	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
Average	9.38	17.612		

The summation of squared deviation from the mean for Differentiated Instruction, 205; Phonics Instruction, 637; Guided Reading, 91.5; Repeated Reading, 236; Fluency Practice, 306; and Multisensory Approaches, 286.

It could be discerned from the table that the Coefficient of Concordance W and the computed chi-square on the strategies utilized by the teachers were: Differentiated Instruction, 0.21 and 6.30(p>0.05); Phonics Instruction, 0.50 and 16.50(p>0.05); Guided Reading, 0.12 and 3.24(p>0.05); Repeated Reading, 0.32 and 8.64(p>0.05); Fluency Practice, 0.41 and 11.07(p>0.05) and lastly, Multisensory Approaches, 0.39 and 10.53.

The data show that the computed chi-square, all indicators failed to exceed the tabular chi-square value at the level of significance of 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted on the strategies utilized by the teachers along Differentiated Instruction, Phonics Instruction, Guided Reading, Repeated Reading, and Fluency Practice. Therefore, there is no significant agreement on the strategies utilized by the teachers among the different types of schools in Jose Panganiban East District. The acceptance of the null hypothesis, indicating no significant agreement on literacy strategy utilization across different school types in Jose Panganiban East District, presents a complex picture of instructional variation. This finding contrasts with Chandra & Chand (2024) who demonstrated how coordinated approaches to reading instruction can lead to measurable improvements in student outcomes. The lack of consensus suggests that while individual teachers may be implementing effective strategies as shown by the high weighted means (4.31-4.57), there is no systematic, school-wide or district-wide pattern in how these approaches are adopted. This variation could reflect differences in school resources, leadership priorities, or teacher training opportunities across institutions, highlighting potential inequities in professional development access. The results imply that without greater alignment, students may receive substantially different literacy instruction depending on which school they attend. The findings particularly challenge assumptions about strategy implementation for foundational skills like phonics and repeated reading, which Faulhaber (2016) showed to be most effective when consistently applied. While previous data showed high utilization rates for these strategies individually, the chi-square results reveal this implementation isn't standardized across schools. This disconnect suggests that teachers may be adapting strategies based on local contexts rather than following evidence-based protocols, potentially diluting their effectiveness. Wei (2017) theories about translanguaging and contextual adaptation might help explain why teachers in different school environments modify core strategies, though this flexibility could come at the cost of implementation fidelity. The results raise important questions about how to balance evidence-based practice standardization with

necessary contextual adaptations in diverse educational settings. The lack of significant agreement across schools becomes particularly noteworthy when considering multimodal approaches to literacy. Smith (2018) research emphasizes how consistent, well-designed multimodal instruction can enhance student composition skills, yet the current results show no coordinated approach to implementing such strategies across school types. This suggests that while individual teachers may be effectively using differentiated or multisensory approaches, there's no shared pedagogical framework uniting schools within the district. The variation could stem from differences in student populations, available resources, or interpretation of curriculum standards across institutions. This finding aligns partially with Chandra & Chand (2024) observation that teacher practice often varies even within the same school, though the current study extends this variability to the inter-school level.

4.3 The Summary of the The Extent of Effectiveness of the Strategies in Teaching Reading

The summary of the extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading is presented in Table 16.

Table 16. The Summary of the The Extent of Effectiveness of the Strategies in Teaching Reading

Indicators	Average		
	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Reading Fluency	4.34	ME	2
2. Reading Comprehension	4.34	ME	2
3. Engagement and Motivation	4.34	ME	2
4. Progress in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills	4.33	ME	4
5. Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments	4.17	ME	5
Average	4.34	ME	

As revealed, among the five areas, Reading Fluency ranked first with 4.34 mean and rated as Much Effective. This was followed by: Reading Comprehension, 4.34; Engagement and Motivation, 4.34; Progress in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills, 4.33; Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments, 4.17 were also rated as Much Effective.

The average weighted mean of the extent of extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading among the different types of schools in Jose Panganiban East District was 4.34 or Much Effective. The remarkably consistent high effectiveness ratings across all five areas (Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Engagement and Motivation, Phonemic Awareness/Phonics, and Academic Performance) with means ranging from 4.17 to 4.34 suggest a comprehensive, well-balanced approach to reading instruction in Jose Panganiban East District.

This pattern aligns with Spichtig et al (2016) findings about the interconnected nature of reading skills, where fluency, comprehension and motivation mutually reinforce each other. The top ranking of Reading Fluency at 4.34 particularly supports Kuhn (2020) research on the pivotal role of fluency as the bridge between decoding and comprehension. The minimal variation between areas (only 0.17 difference between highest and lowest) indicates teachers are not favoring one aspect of reading development over others, but rather implementing an integrated instructional model that addresses all critical components simultaneously, as advocated by Piasta & Hudson (2022) in their work on comprehensive reading instruction.

The equal 4.34 ratings for Reading Comprehension, Engagement/Motivation, and Reading Fluency demonstrate teachers' exceptional ability to balance skill development with affective factors. This triangulation of high scores echoes Haerazi et al (2019) findings about the powerful combination of contextual teaching and motivation strategies. The near-identical scores suggest teachers understand, as Wulandari et al (2025) observed, that effective comprehension instruction requires both cognitive strategies and engaged participation. The slightly lower (though still strong) 4.33 for Phonemic Awareness/Phonics and 4.17 for Academic Performance might reflect, as Adao et al (2023) noted, the greater challenges of assessing foundational skills and translating all competencies into test performance. However, the overall high effectiveness across domains supports Dhakal (2021) argument that differentiated instruction can successfully address multiple reading components simultaneously.

The district-wide average of 4.34 ("Much Effective") is particularly noteworthy given the diversity of school types included. This suggests successful knowledge-sharing and consistent professional development across institutions, addressing the variability concerns raised by Gaitas & Martins (2016). The results demonstrate that, contrary to Chandra & Chand (2024) findings about implementation challenges, teachers across different school contexts can achieve uniformly high effectiveness when supported with appropriate training and resources. The strong performance in Engagement/Motivation (4.34) specifically supports Alcayde & Basilan (2024) findings about the importance of teacher enthusiasm and creative approaches. Similarly, the phonemic awareness/phonics results (4.33) validate Maizarah & Purwanti (2023) emphasis on systematic early reading instruction, while the comprehension scores (4.34) confirm Nurdianingsih (2021) findings about effective strategy instruction.

4.4 The Test of Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Effectiveness of the Strategies in Teaching Reading

The results of the test of significant agreement on the rank orders of the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading are described in Table 17.

Table 17. The results of the test of significant agreement on the rank orders of the effectiveness of the strategies in teaching

Indicators	Computed Tabular			
	χ^2	χ^2 -value	Decision on H_0	Significance
1. Reading Fluency	6.51	15.51	Accepted	Not Significant
2. Reading Comprehension	15.00	18.31	Accepted	Not Significant
3. Engagement and Motivation	7.27	16.92	Accepted	Not Significant
4. Progress in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills	24.09	19.68	Rejected	0.025
5. Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments	14.40	18.31	Accepted	Not Significant
Average	13.454	17.746		

It could be discerned from the table that the Coefficient of Concordance W and the computed chi-square on the effectiveness of the strategies utilized by the teachers were: Reading Fluency, 0.23 and 6.51($p>0.05$); Reading Comprehension, 0.50 and 15.00($p>0.05$); Engagement and Motivation, 0.27 and 7.27($p>0.05$); Phonics Skills, 0.73 and 24.09($p<0.025$); and lastly, Academic

Performance in Reading-Related Assessments, 0.48 and 14.40($p>0.05$).

The data show that the computed chi-square, only one indicator exceeds the tabular chi-square value at the level of significance of 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted on the extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading along Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Engagement and Motivation, and Academic Performance in Reading-Related Assessments while rejected on Phonics Skills. Therefore, there is no significant agreement on the extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading among the aforementioned aspects. The chi-square results revealing no significant agreement on strategy effectiveness across most reading domains (except phonics skills) present a complex picture of instructional variation in Jose Panganiban East District.

This finding partially aligns with Okkinga et al (2018) meta-analysis showing varied effectiveness of reading interventions across different classroom contexts, though contrasts with their conclusion about certain universally effective strategies. The sole significant agreement on phonics instruction effectiveness supports Dwiningtiyas et al (2020) findings about the relative consistency of phonics implementation compared to other reading strategies. This pattern suggests that while teachers may share common, research-backed approaches to foundational skills like phonics (as evidenced by the rejected null hypothesis for this domain), their instructional effectiveness becomes more variable when addressing higher-order reading skills. The results imply that standardized professional development may have successfully created consensus around phonics instruction but hasn't achieved similar uniformity in other reading components.

The lack of significant agreement on reading fluency effectiveness contrasts with Louw & Mofolo-Mbokane (2019) findings about consistent strategy use for basic skill development. This discrepancy might reflect greater diversity in student fluency needs across classrooms or varying teacher interpretations of fluency instruction. Similarly, the non-significant results for comprehension align with Dlodla et al (2024) observations about the contextual nature of effective comprehension strategy instruction, where teacher adaptability leads to more variable implementation. The acceptance of the null hypothesis for engagement/motivation strategies particularly resonates with Mphahlele & Nel (2019) research showing how technology integration creates new variability in motivational approaches. These results collectively suggest that as reading instruction moves beyond foundational phonics into more complex domains, teacher strategy effectiveness becomes increasingly influenced by classroom-specific factors and individual teaching styles.

The rejected null hypothesis for phonics skills alone carries important implications for reading instruction. This finding supports Okkinga et al (2018) conclusion that systematic phonics tends to show more consistent effectiveness across implementations compared to other reading strategies. The strong agreement on phonics effectiveness may reflect its more concrete, sequential nature compared to the fluid, adaptive teaching required for comprehension or engagement. However, the lack of consensus on other components raises concerns identified by Dwiningtiyas et al (2020) about uneven strategy implementation compromising reading development continuity. This pattern suggests that while the district has successfully standardized phonics instruction, other critical reading components may require more coordinated approaches to ensure all students receive consistently effective instruction across all skill domains.

These results have significant implications for professional development and instructional leadership. The variability in effectiveness across most reading domains suggests a need for more structured collaborative planning, as recommended by Dlodla et al (2024). The consistent phonics

results indicate that focused training can produce agreement, implying similar approaches might benefit other reading components. School leaders might consider establishing professional learning communities to analyze and align comprehension and fluency strategies, addressing the variability noted in the chi-square results. The findings also support Mphahlele & Nel (2019) argument for carefully implemented technology frameworks that reduce variability in engagement strategies. While respecting teacher autonomy, the district could develop shared effectiveness criteria for all reading components beyond phonics, creating more uniformity in instructional quality.

5. The Policy Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, several key policy recommendations are proposed which are as follows:

- The Curriculum Implementation Division and Reading Supervisors should develop standardized phonics protocols to sustain consistent foundational reading instruction.
- Division Reading Coordinators and School Heads should create a fluency instruction framework with benchmarks to reduce variability across schools.
- Master Teachers and Information and Communications Technology Coordinators should establish shared digital banks of evidence-based comprehension strategies.
- The Learning Resource Management Development System Team and Instructional Coaches should develop motivation toolkits with differentiated activities for learner engagement.
- School Heads and Grade-Level Chairpersons should ensure professional learning communities analyze reading data monthly to address gaps in effectiveness.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn: the extent of the utilization of the strategies in teaching reading is Much Utilized; there is no significant agreement on the rank order of the strategies utilized by the teachers; the extent of effectiveness of the strategies utilized by the teachers in teaching learners with reading difficulties is Much Effective; there is no significant agreement on the rank order of the extent of effectiveness of the strategies in teaching reading; and policy recommendations were formulated based on the findings of the study.

Pursuant to the conclusions stated above, the following recommendations were given: the school heads should ensure continuous professional development programs for teachers to maintain the high level of utilization of strategies in addressing reading difficulties; the curriculum supervisors should conduct regular monitoring and evaluation to standardize the implementation of various reading intervention strategies across schools; the school heads should support the sustained application of effective reading strategies by providing necessary instructional resources and reading materials; the school division officials should integrate the formulated policy recommendations into the district reading improvement plan to address reading difficulties more systematically; and the policy recommendations formulated should be adopted.

For future research, the following were suggested: conduct similar studies involving a larger number of schools to validate the level of utilization of teachers' strategies in addressing reading difficulties; explore the underlying factors affecting the lack of significant agreement in the rank order of the strategies utilized by teachers; investigate the long-term effects of teachers' strategies on learners with reading difficulties to determine their sustained effectiveness; conduct comparative studies between different districts or divisions to determine if the ranking of strategy effectiveness varies across diverse school settings; and examine additional variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of interventions for reading difficulties.

References

- [1] Amedahe, F. K. (2012). *Educational research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc. Anderson, L. W. *The effective teacher*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- [2] Aquino, G. V. (2007). *Essentials of research and thesis writing*. Quezon City: Alemars-Phoenix Publishing House Inc.
- [3] Arends, R. I. (2001). *Learning to teach*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Company.
- [4] Ariola, M. M. (2007). *Principles and methods of research* (1st ed.). Manila: Rex Book Store. Calderon, J. F., et al. (1993). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. Mandaluyong City: Cacho Publishing.
- [5] Publishing.
- [6] Consuelo, S. G., et al. (2003). *Research methods* (Revised ed.). Manila: Rex Bookstore Inc. Downie, N. M., et al. (1984). *Basic statistical methods* (5th ed.). Mandaluyong City: Cacho
- [7] Hermanos, Inc.
- [8] Evangelista, R. D. (1998). *The making of a professional teacher*. Manila: GIC Enterprises & Co., Inc.
- [9] Gonzales, E. C., et al. (1993). *Measurement and evaluation*. Manila: National Bookstore Inc. Gregorio, H. C. (1960). *Principles and methods of teaching* (Revised ed.). Quezon City: RP Garcia
- [10] Publishing Company.
- [11] Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- [12] Lardizabal, A. S. (2004). *Foundations of education*. Quezon City: Rex Printing Company, Inc. Oriondo, L. L., et al. (1984). *Evaluating educational outcomes*. Manila: Rex Bookstore Inc.
- [13] Salkind, N. J. (2004). *Statistics for people who hate statistics* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [14] Siegel, S., et al. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [15] Abrasaldo, N. (2024). *Difficulties of teachers in teaching reading to Grade 1 learners*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bicol State College of Applied Sciences and Technology.
- [16] Alcayde, K. P., & Basilan, M. L. J. C. (2024). *Teachers' perceptions of the challenges and strategies in supporting students with reading difficulties*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Mindoro.
- [17] Bhandari, M., & Dorji, K. (2025). *Enhancing alphabet learning of pre-primary students through multisensory approach*. Unpublished Dissertation, Royal University of Bhutan.
- [18] Chandra, S. P., & Chand, S. P. (2024). *Reading with understanding in a lower primary classroom*.
- [19] Unpublished Thesis, Fiji National University.
- [20] Dwiningtiyas, G. N., Sofyan, D., & Puspita, H. (2020). *Teachers' strategies in teaching reading comprehension*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Universitas Negeri Malang.

- [21] Faulhaber, J. M. (2016). *Effects of repeated readings on fluency and comprehension*. Unpublished Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- [22] Haerazi, H., Prayati, Z., & Vikasari, R. M. (2019). *Contextual teaching and learning approach to improve reading comprehension*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Mataram University.
- [23] Irawati, R., Hadi, S., & Houtman, H. (2025). *Teacher strategies in overcoming early reading difficulties*. Unpublished Dissertation, Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- [24] Islam, M. H., Badruttamam, C. A., & Azizah, Z. (2024). *Teacher strategies in overcoming reading difficulties*. Unpublished Thesis, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama.
- [25] Nurdianingsih, F. (2021). *Teachers' strategies in teaching reading comprehension*. Unpublished Thesis, Institut Pendidikan Indonesia.
- [26] Potot, A., et al. (2023). *Differentiated instruction as a strategy in improving reading comprehension*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Visayas State University.
- [27] Rogerson, J. (2018). *Differentiated reading instruction: Strategies to reach all students*.
- [28] Unpublished Thesis, Bridgewater State University.
- [29] Sagala, D. I. S., & Kusumawati, T. I. (2024). *Teachers' strategies in overcoming reading difficulties*. Unpublished Thesis, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- [30] Tolete, R., & Mingo, L. (2025). *Differentiated instruction in teaching reading*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Philippine Normal University.
- [31] Wulandari, D., et al. (2025). *Teachers' strategies in teaching reading comprehension*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri.
- [32] Xu, S. (2012). *Strategies for differentiated instruction for English learners*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Illinois.
- [33] Yaqin, N. M. Z. N., & Ulfah, N. F. A. (2024). *Teacher strategies to help students with early reading difficulties*. Unpublished Thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.
- [34] Adao, L., et al. (2023). Teachers' challenges, capabilities, and needs in teaching learners with reading difficulties. *Journal of Science and Education*, 3(3), 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.56003/jse.v3i3.173>
- [35] Dhakal, B. R. (2021). Differentiated reading instruction: Teacher beliefs and strategies. *Journal of NELTA*, 26(1–2), 56–69.
- [36] Dlodla, S., et al. (2024). Teaching strategies in reading comprehension. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(6), 6717–6729.
- [37] Fletcher, J. M., et al. (2020). Role of phonics instruction in reading. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(3), 1249–1274.
- [38] Flynn, N., et al. (2021). Training teachers for phonics and early reading. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 44(2), 301–318.
- [39] Gaitas, S., & Martins, M. A. (2016). Difficulty in implementing differentiated instruction. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(5), 544–556.
- [40] Hall, C., et al. (2021). Reading intervention programs for students with dyslexia. *Exceptionality*, 30(2), 109–125.
- [41] Joshi, R. M., et al. (2002). Multisensory approach in teaching reading. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 52(1), 229–242.
- [42] Kuhn, M. R. (2020). Fluency instruction approaches. *Education Sciences*, 10(5), 145.
- [43] Lee, J., & Yoon, S. Y. (2015). Repeated reading and fluency. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2), 213–224.
- [44] Mastropieri, M. A., et al. (1999). Strategies to increase reading fluency. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 34(5), 278–283.
- [45] Nichols, W. D., et al. (2008). Reading fluency development. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48(1), 1–13.
- [46] Okkinga, M., et al. (2016). Reciprocal teaching and reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 41(1), 20–41.
- [47] Olagbaju, O. O., & Olaniyi, O. O. (2023). Differentiated phonics instruction. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 44(2), 20–30.
- [48] Piasta, S. B., & Hudson, A. K. (2022). Phonics and phonological awareness. *The Reading Teacher*, 76(2), 201–210.
- [49] Puzio, K., et al. (2020). Differentiated literacy instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(4), 459–498.
- [50] Van der Mescht, C. R. (2023). Phonics in guided reading. *Reading & Writing*, 14(1). Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*.
- [51] Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001*. Republic Act No. 4670. (1966). *Magna Carta for Public School Teachers*.
- [52] Department of Education. *Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA)*. Department of Education. *Education for All (EFA)*.
- [53] Department of Education. (2023). *MATATAG Agenda*.
- [54] Department of Education. *School-Based Management (SBM) Framework*. United Nations. *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)*.