

Ang Pagtanggap Ng Mga Kagamitan Sa Pagbasa Sa Filipino Para Sa Mga Mag-Aaral Sa Baitang 7 Sa Purok Ng Calauag West, Sangay Ng Quezon

Reden D. Austria¹

¹University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026 Keywords: Filipino Reading Learning Materials Grade 7 Material Evaluation Calauag West	This study evaluated teacher acceptance of Department of Education Filipino reading materials for Grade 7 learners in three public secondary schools in Calauag West District, Division of Quezon, during School Year 2024–2025. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design purposively selected Sto. Domingo National High School, Calauag National High School, and Villa San Isidro National High School. A verified teacher-respondent total was not stated in the available results and is not inferred. Weighted means and ranks assessed objectives, content, activities, language level, assessment, and time allocation; Kendall's W and chi-square examined concordance across schools. Overall acceptance was Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap (Moderately Acceptable; $M=4.28$). Objectives ranked first ($M=4.57$, Lubos na Katanggap-tanggap), followed by content and activities (both $M=4.54$), language level ($M=4.39$), assessment ($M=3.89$), and time allocation ($M=3.76$). Concordance was significant for objectives ($W=.87$, $\chi^2=10.40$), activities ($W=.79$, $\chi^2=11.85$), and assessment ($W=.75$, $\chi^2=13.50$), but not for content, language, or time. Challenges were rated $M=4.13$ and proposed solutions $M=4.11$; both rankings showed significant concordance ($W=.82$, $\chi^2=22.40$; $W=.81$, $\chi^2=21.87$). The principal gaps concern higher-order questions, assessment criteria, readable formal language, feasible completion time, use of literacy assessment, and referral to intervention. The results support iterative material review with readability, alignment, usability, accessibility, and classroom evidence; acceptance ratings do not demonstrate improved reading proficiency.

1. Introduction

Reading materials mediate the relationship between curriculum, teacher, text, task, and learner. Their quality depends not only on literary or informational content but also on clarity of purpose, text complexity, vocabulary, activity design, assessment, time demand, cultural relevance, and accessibility.

In Grade 7, learners are expected to engage with longer texts, more formal Filipino, diverse genres, discipline-specific vocabulary, interpretation, evidence, and critical response. Materials must therefore provide appropriate challenge while scaffolding learners whose decoding, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension remains below grade level.

Alignment begins with clear learning objectives and coherent relationships among text, activity, and assessment. Activities should move beyond recall to interpretation, comparison, inference, evaluation, and creation, but higher-order demand must be supported by adequate background knowledge, vocabulary, modeling, and time.

Language quality involves accuracy, structure, grammar, register, and comprehensibility. Formal language can support academic development, yet excessive complexity can turn language demand into an unintended barrier. Readability review should examine sentence structure, vocabulary, cohesion, layout, and opportunities for clarification.

Assessment quality is central because materials communicate what counts as learning. Learners need clear criteria, useful feedback, opportunities to identify strengths and needs, and tasks aligned with objectives. Frequent assessment is valuable when it informs instruction rather than simply adds workload.

Time allocation is an instructional-design property. A well-written text or task may fail when it exceeds the available period, demands too much copying, or provides insufficient time for reading, discussion, and revision. Usability testing in real classes is therefore necessary.

The present study examines teacher acceptance of specific Filipino reading materials—including Patria Amanda, Labaw Donggon, Ang Habilin ng Ina, Nemo, and Batang Papel—across three schools. Acceptance is interpreted as a quality signal, not as direct evidence that the materials improved learner reading.

1.1 Research Purpose and Analytical Focus

The study aimed to assess acceptance of Grade 7 Filipino reading materials in objectives, content, activities, language level, assessment, and time allocation; test concordance in those rankings; identify challenges and solutions; test concordance in challenge and solution rankings; and formulate policy recommendations.

The journal analysis emphasizes how teacher judgments can be combined with learner readability, usability, assessment, and outcome evidence to support iterative material improvement.

1.2 Conceptual and Empirical Synthesis

The analysis uses an alignment triangle: objectives define intended learning; texts and activities create opportunities to learn; and assessment elicits evidence. Language level, time, accessibility, and teacher mediation determine whether learners can participate in this triangle.

Acceptance is multidimensional. A high mean can coexist with a serious weakness in a lower-ranked component. Summary ratings should therefore be read with item-level priorities, school context, and learner evidence.

Kendall concordance indicates whether schools similarly ordered material indicators. Agreement can reveal common design priorities; disagreement may reflect differences in learners, schedules, teacher judgment, or implementation conditions.

2. Methodology

A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design was used in three purposively selected public secondary schools in Calauag West District during School Year 2024–2025: Sto. Domingo National High School, Calauag National High School, and Villa San Isidro National High School.

Teacher respondents evaluated reading materials through a five-point scale with Filipino interpretation anchors ranging from *Lubos na Katanggap-tanggap* to *Walang Pagtanggap*. The available results did not state a verified respondent total, and no number is inferred.

Weighted means and ranks summarized six acceptance domains, ten challenges, and ten proposed solutions. Kendall's W and chi-square tested concordance in rankings across the three schools.

The article retains the Filipino construct labels where useful and presents an English scholarly interpretation. The reported tests are treated as concordance analyses, not as evidence of a causal relationship between materials and reading achievement.

Table 1. Research Design, Participants, Measures, and Analysis

Component	Specification
Design and setting	Descriptive-evaluative-correlational study; three Calauag West public secondary schools; SY 2024–2025
Schools	Sto. Domingo NHS, Calauag NHS, and Villa San Isidro NHS
Respondents	Teacher evaluators; verified N not stated in the available results
Domains	Objectives, content, activities, language, assessment, time; challenges and solutions
Analysis	Weighted mean, rank, Kendall's W, and chi-square

2.1 Analytical Rigor and Boundaries

The evaluation covers alignment, language, pedagogy, assessment, and usability rather than relying on a single overall satisfaction score. School-level comparison also identifies whether priorities are shared.

The absence of a verified respondent total, scale reliability, material-version details, independent expert review, learner feedback, readability evidence, classroom observation, and reading outcomes limits inference. Teachers' ratings may reflect both material quality and implementation conditions.

Several source interpretations were inconsistent with their own scale boundaries. The article relies on the reported numeric means and the summary table, and it recommends raw-data and label verification before external submission.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Overall Acceptance of the Reading Materials

Objectives, content, and activities were strongest; assessment and time were the relative gaps.

Table 2. Summary of Teacher Acceptance

Evaluation Domain	Mean	Source Interpretation	Rank
Objectives (Layunin)	4.57	Lubos na Katanggap-tanggap	1
Content (Nilalaman)	4.54	Lubos na Katanggap-tanggap	2.5
Activities (Mga Gawain)	4.54	Lubos na Katanggap-tanggap*	2.5
Language level (Antas ng Wika)	4.39	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap	4
Assessment (Pagtataya)	3.89	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap	5
Time allocation (Takdang Panahon)	3.76	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap	6
Overall	4.28	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap	—

Objectives ranked first, indicating strong perceived clarity, sequencing, curriculum alignment, and specificity. This is an important foundation, but alignment must also be traced through each text, task, and assessment item.

Content and activities shared the next rank. At item level, activities supporting learning received a very high rating, while higher-order questions were lower ($M=3.44$). Material revision should improve cognitive progression: literal comprehension and vocabulary support should lead into inference, evidence-based interpretation, comparison, and evaluation.

Language, assessment, and time were the relative development priorities. These domains interact: complex language and unclear directions increase completion time; weak criteria reduce the usefulness of assessment; and rushed tasks limit discussion and feedback.

3.2 School-Level Acceptance

The three schools reported favorable but nonidentical overall profiles.

Table 3. Overall Acceptance by School

School	Overall Mean	Source Interpretation
Sto. Domingo National High School	4.37	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap
Calauag National High School	4.26	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap
Villa San Isidro National High School	4.22	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap
Combined	4.28	Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap

The mean range across schools was .15, with Sto. Domingo highest. These values should not be interpreted as school performance rankings because teachers evaluated shared materials under different learner, schedule, and implementation conditions.

School-level item patterns are more actionable than overall means. Material-review conferences should examine which texts or tasks created difficulty, the learner profiles involved, how much time was available, and what teacher adaptation was required.

3.3 Concordance in Acceptance Rankings

Agreement was significant for objectives, activities, and assessment.

Table 4. Kendall Concordance for Material-Acceptance Domains

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported Decision
Objectives	.87	10.40	Significant
Content	.58	8.70	Not significant
Activities	.79	11.85	Significant
Language level	.77	9.24	Not significant
Assessment	.75	13.50	Significant
Time allocation	.38	3.42	Not significant

Strong concordance for objectives and activities indicates shared ordering of their indicators across schools. Significant assessment concordance is especially useful because teachers consistently recognized which assessment practices were stronger or weaker.

Content, language, and time did not show statistically significant concordance. Learner vocabulary, teacher mediation, schedules, and prior reading proficiency may influence judgments. Material revision should therefore include common quality standards and school-specific usability evidence.

Time had the lowest W, consistent with strong contextual dependence. A task feasible in one schedule or class may be unrealistic in another. Pilot timing should be built into the publication process.

3.4 Challenges in Using the Reading Materials

Teachers identified alignment and teachability as prominent concerns.

Table 5. Highest-Rated Challenges

Challenge	Mean	Rank
Materials are not aligned with the lesson	4.79	1
Learners are difficult to teach with the materials	4.76	2
Assessment results remain low	4.29	3
Learners are insufficiently prepared	4.25	4
Materials do not adequately support learning	4.19	5
Overall challenge profile	4.13	—

The highest challenge was perceived misalignment with the lesson, despite strong acceptance of objectives and content. This apparent tension may arise when a material is sound in general but poorly matched to a particular learner profile, pacing sequence, or daily objective.

Teachability and low assessment results point to an implementation–design interaction. Materials may need stronger scaffolds, teacher guidance, differentiated entry points, vocabulary preparation, and checks for understanding. Learner difficulty should not be attributed to a presumed style; it should be diagnosed in decoding, fluency, vocabulary, knowledge, or comprehension.

The presence of learners with special needs and varying readiness further supports accessibility and intervention planning. Materials should offer readable formatting, clear navigation, alternative response modes, and appropriate supports without lowering the reading construct.

3.5 Proposed Solutions and Concordance

Teachers prioritized ability-matched texts and structured reading routines; both challenge and solution rankings were concordant.

Table 6. Leading Solutions and Concordance Results

Evidence	Mean / W	χ^2	Interpretation
Use texts matched to learner ability	M=4.69	—	Highest-rated solution
Use Read-A-Thon/DEAR and related strategies	M=4.65	—	Second-ranked solution
Provide more frequent assessment	M=4.33	—	Progress-monitoring priority
Use Rapid Literacy Assessment results	M=3.69	—	Lower-ranked data-use practice
Refer nonreaders to intervention	M=3.48	—	Lowest-ranked solution
Challenges	W=.82	22.40	Significant concordance
Solutions	W=.81	21.87	Significant concordance

Ability-matched texts and sustained reading routines were the strongest proposed responses. Matching should preserve dignity and provide access to engaging content while building toward grade-level complexity; learners should not be confined permanently to easier texts.

Assessment use and referral to intervention ranked relatively low. This is a critical implementation gap because learners who cannot yet read require systematic diagnosis and intensive support, not only easier activities. Screening, progress monitoring, intervention dosage, and exit criteria should be standardized.

Strong concordance for both challenges and solutions provides a shared district agenda. Material revision should be paired with a multi-tiered reading-support system so that general classroom resources and targeted intervention are not treated as substitutes.

3.6 Integrated Interpretation of the Findings

The reading materials were generally accepted, especially their objectives, content, and activities. The lower results for language, assessment, and time identify concrete design priorities rather than rejection of the resources.

Teachers agreed on the ordering of objectives, activities, assessment practices, challenges, and solutions. This agreement supports common district review criteria and implementation tools.

The most consequential gap is the weak position of systematic assessment use and referral for nonreaders. High-quality classroom materials cannot replace intensive intervention for learners with substantial foundational needs.

A stronger material system would combine expert review, teacher usability testing, learner readability and accessibility feedback, timed classroom pilots, assessment alignment, and repeated reading-outcome evidence.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

Overall teacher acceptance was Katamtamang Katanggap-tanggap (M=4.28). Objectives ranked highest, while time allocation ranked lowest. Concordance was significant for objectives, activities, and assessment, but not for content, language, or time.

Challenges and solutions were both rated highly and showed significant concordance across schools. Misalignment, teachability, and low assessment results were major concerns; ability-matched texts and sustained reading routines were leading solutions.

Acceptance ratings provide a material-quality and implementation baseline but do not demonstrate improved Grade 7 reading proficiency.

4.2 Study Limitations

The cross-sectional design describes conditions during the stated school year and cannot establish temporal or causal effects. Ratings of effectiveness, competence, or implementation are therefore interpreted as respondent perceptions rather than independently verified improvements in learner performance.

The principal measures were researcher-made, self-report scales. Social desirability, recall, common-method variance, and differences in interpretation of the response anchors may have influenced the estimates. Classroom observation, document review, learning-resource audits, and learner-level outcome data were not incorporated into the principal analyses.

Kendall's W evaluates concordance in the ordering of indicators. It does not test a respondent-level causal relationship between program implementation and competence, nor does it show that a higher-rated practice produced a learner outcome. A verified respondent total, scale reliability, exact material versions, learner readability and usability data, implementation observations, and reading-outcome measures were not stated in the available results.

4.3 Implications for Practice and Policy

Institute a material-review rubric covering alignment, accuracy, text complexity, vocabulary, language, activities, assessment, accessibility, and realistic time.

Conduct classroom usability pilots and record actual reading, discussion, completion, and feedback time before wide distribution. Strengthen higher-order questions with sufficient background knowledge, vocabulary support, modeling, and evidence prompts. Use literacy assessment data to match text and instruction, monitor progress, and trigger intensive intervention for learners who need it. Gather learner feedback and reading-performance evidence alongside teacher acceptance before judging material effectiveness.

5. Policy and Implementation Priorities

Table 7. Filipino Reading-Material Quality and Intervention Framework

Priority Area	Recommended Direction	Expected Evidence
Alignment	Map objectives, text, activities, and assessment item by item.	Alignment matrix; reviewer agreement
Language/readability	Review vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, register, layout, and scaffolds.	Readability/usability evidence; revision log
Activity quality	Build progression from supported comprehension to inference and evaluation.	Cognitive-demand map; learner response
Assessment	Provide clear criteria, feedback, progress checks, and data-use guidance.	Rubric; feedback sample; progress record
Time/usability	Pilot materials in real schedules and revise workload and directions.	Observed completion-time distribution
Intervention	Use assessment thresholds, targeted dosage, monitoring, and referral pathways.	Intervention roster; growth and exit evidence

6. Directions for Future Research

Link material acceptance with objective reading outcomes, learner engagement, completion time, and implementation fidelity.

Conduct cognitive interviews and readability studies with Grade 7 learners across proficiency levels.

Experimentally compare revised activities, assessment supports, language scaffolds, and time structures.

Examine the effectiveness and equity of ability-matched texts, sustained silent reading routines, and intensive intervention pathways.

References

- [1] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- [2] Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/>
- [3] Department of Education. (2022). *Basic Education Development Plan 2030*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- [4] Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- [5] Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J., Jr. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [6] Department of Education. (2024). *MATATAG Curriculum: Filipino Baitang 7*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/matatagcurriculumk147/>
- [7] Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). *Text complexity: Raising rigor in reading*. International Reading Association.
- [8] National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- [9] RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. RAND.
- [10] Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.