RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 8, Page 91-95 | Article No. 16
DOI: 10.4898/jener.v2i8.a16
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Effectiveness of the Instructional Materials Utilized in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Grade 1 Learners in Lupi Districts 1 And 2, Division of Camarines Sur

Rosalie Ann C. Almario[1]

[1]University of Northeastern Philippines, School of Graduate Studies

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: August 2026

Keywords:
Early Literacy
Instructional Materials
CRLA
Grade 1
Lupi District

ABSTRACT

This study examined the literacy profile of Grade 1 learners, the instructional materials used across five literacy domains, and teachers' assessments of material effectiveness in Lupi Districts 1 and 2, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2023–2024. A descriptive-evaluative-inferential design used total enumeration of 39 Grade 1 teachers—26 from District 1 and 13 from District 2—and Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) classifications for 752 learners. A researcher-made 80-item, five-point questionnaire reported a KR-21 coefficient of .71. Frequencies, percentages, weighted means, ranks, and Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney procedures were used. The CRLA profile comprised 31 Full Refreshers (4%), 183 Moderate Refreshers (24%), 280 Light Refreshers (37%), and 258 Grade Ready learners (34%); percentages total 99% because of rounding. District CRLA profiles were reported as not significantly different ($z=-1.30$, $p=.9680$), although the probability value should be verified. Materials were distributed across listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing, with big books and sight-word materials prominent for reading. Perceived effectiveness was Much Evident in relevance ($M=4.37$), content ($M=4.34$), usefulness ($M=4.33$), and clarity ($M=4.19$), for an overall mean of 4.31. Only usefulness differed significantly between districts ($z=-2.57$, $p<.01$). The findings support assessment-matched material sets, explicit literacy instruction, stronger clarity review, and equitable access. They do not establish causal material effects because learner outcomes were not linked to individual exposure.

1. Introduction

Grade 1 literacy is a developmental system involving oral language, phonological awareness, decoding, word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing, and the interpretation of visual information. Instructional materials can make these processes visible and provide structured opportunities for explanation, practice, feedback, and transfer.

Materials are effective only in relation to a learner need and an instructional routine. A big book can support print concepts, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension when the teacher models and prompts strategically; a worksheet can consolidate a taught skill or become disconnected seatwork. The question is therefore not whether a material exists, but how its content, clarity, relevance, dosage, and use support a defined literacy outcome.

The Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment is used for Key Stage 1 profiling and can guide differentiated support. Assessment categories should function as temporary instructional signals rather than fixed identities. Learners need targeted teaching, repeated progress checks, and timely movement between support levels based on response.

Current Philippine policy places strong emphasis on learning recovery and foundational skills. The ARAL Program Act established a national intervention framework for learners who need support in reading and mathematics, while DepEd continues CRLA administration for Grades 1–3 (Department of Education, 2024; Republic Act No. 12028, 2024).

Evidence on early reading supports explicit and systematic instruction in foundational skills, rich oral language and vocabulary, connected text reading, comprehension, writing, and responsive intervention (Foorman et al., 2016; National Reading Panel, 2000). Multimedia and audio support can extend access, but printed-word processing and teacher-mediated meaning making remain indispensable.

The study's five domains—listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing—capture a broad literacy ecology. Balance matters because language comprehension and expressive language support decoding and reading comprehension, while reading and writing reinforce knowledge of sound, spelling, syntax, and meaning.

This article integrates learner CRLA categories, material-use distributions, perceived effectiveness, and district comparisons. Because the sources are aggregate and teacher-reported, the discussion treats effectiveness as perceived quality and does not attribute learner categories to particular materials.

1.1 Research Purpose and Analytical Focus

The study aimed to describe the CRLA profile of Grade 1 learners; identify instructional materials used for listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing; assess the perceived effectiveness of materials in content, usefulness, clarity, and relevance; and compare district profiles and effectiveness rankings.

The journal analysis emphasizes how screening evidence can be converted into matched instructional-material decisions, explicit teaching routines, progress monitoring, and equitable district support.

1.2 Conceptual and Empirical Synthesis

The framework links assessment, instructional target, material affordance, teacher mediation, learner response, and progress monitoring. A material is selected because it supports a specific skill; the teacher models and scaffolds its use; learners practice and produce evidence; and the next decision follows from that evidence.

Effectiveness has four dimensions in the study. Content concerns accuracy and coverage; usefulness concerns practical support for teaching and learning; clarity concerns comprehensibility of language, directions, layout, and task demand; and relevance concerns alignment with learner needs and context.

District comparison can identify different experiences of usefulness or access, but a rank-based difference does not explain its cause. Resource availability, teacher training, class composition, and local adaptation require follow-up evidence.

2. Methodology

A descriptive-evaluative-inferential design was used in Lupi Districts 1 and 2 during School Year 2023–2024. Total enumeration included 39 Grade 1 teachers: 26 (67%) from District 1 and 13 (33%) from District 2.

The learner profile was based on CRLA classifications for 752 Grade 1 learners. A researcher-made 80-item, five-point questionnaire recorded material use and perceived effectiveness. The source reported a KR-21 reliability coefficient of .71; because Likert-type items are polytomous, future reporting should justify the coefficient or use an appropriate internal-consistency estimator.

Frequencies and percentages described learner categories and material use. Weighted means and ranks summarized effectiveness. Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney procedures compared district rankings at the reported significance level.

The article uses the verified counts and summary statistics. It retains p=.9680 exactly as reported for the district learner-profile comparison but identifies it as requiring verification because it is unusual relative to z=−1.30.

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

Component	Specification
Design and locale	Descriptive-evaluative-inferential study; Lupi Districts 1 and 2; SY 2023–2024
Teachers	39 Grade 1 teachers: District 1=26; District 2=13
Learners	CRLA profiles for 752 Grade 1 learners
Instrument	Researcher-made 80-item, five-point questionnaire; source-reported KR-21=.71
Analysis	Frequency, percentage, weighted mean, rank, Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney

2.1 Analytical Rigor and Boundaries

Total enumeration of the identified Grade 1 teacher population strengthens local coverage, while the CRLA profile provides a learner-needs frame for interpreting material use. Separate district reporting supports equity-oriented planning.

The learner and material data were aggregated and were not linked at the individual level. The study also did not report exposure dosage, fidelity, independent material-review scores, pretest-posttest growth, confidence intervals, or effect sizes. Causal material-effect claims are therefore unwarranted.

The source-reported reliability method and the probability value for the CRLA district comparison should be checked against the raw dataset and statistical output. A journal submission should include scale reliability appropriate for polytomous items, valid-response counts, missing-data rules, medians, rank sums, exact p-values, and effect sizes.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 CRLA Profile of Grade 1 Learners

Two thirds of learners were classified in one of the refresher categories.

Table 2. Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment Profile

CRLA Category	Frequency	Reported Percent	Instructional Signal
Full Refresher	31	4%	Intensive foundational support
Moderate Refresher	183	24%	Targeted, frequent support
Light Refresher	280	37%	Focused consolidation
Grade Ready	258	34%	Grade-level extension and monitoring
Total	752	99%*	*Rounding of reported percentages

The largest group was Light Refresher, followed closely by Grade Ready. The profile therefore calls for differentiated instruction rather than a single remedial program. Learners needing light support may respond to short, precise reteaching, whereas Moderate and Full Refreshers require diagnostic depth, smaller groups, greater dosage, and more frequent monitoring.

Grade Ready learners also require purposeful instruction. Extension should deepen vocabulary, comprehension, text discussion, writing, and knowledge building rather than simply increase task volume. Flexible grouping should allow movement as learner evidence changes.

The percentages sum to 99 because of rounding, while the frequencies sum correctly to 752. Reporting both prevents a rounding artifact from being mistaken for missing learner data.

3.2 District Comparison of CRLA Profiles

The source reported no significant district difference.

Table 3. Reported District Comparison of Learner Profiles

Comparison	z	Reported p	Decision	Reporting Note
Lupi District 1 vs. District 2	−1.30	.9680	Not significant	Verify p against output

The source retained the null decision, indicating no statistically established difference in district profile ordering. A common district intervention framework is therefore reasonable, with school-level differentiation based on local learner counts.

The reported p=.9680 is unusually large for z=−1.30 under common two-sided normal approximations. It is preserved rather than silently corrected, but the raw statistical output should be verified before publication. Effect size and confidence intervals should accompany the corrected result.

3.3 Instructional Materials Used across Literacy Domains

Material use was distributed across oral language, print, writing, and viewing.

Table 4. Most Frequently Reported Materials by Literacy Domain

Domain	Leading Materials	Reported Shares
Listening	Songs/rhymes; storytelling CDs; worksheets	31%; 25%; 24%
Speaking	Flashcards; show-and-tell; phonics manipulatives	25%; 25%; 22%
Reading	Big books; sight words; picture/leveled books	29%; 29%; 25% each
Writing	Word banks; tracing; strips/graphic organizers	24%; 22%; 19%
Viewing	Educational videos; image flashcards; posters	23%; 22%; 21%

The distribution shows a multimodal resource base. Songs, rhymes, storytelling, and show-and-tell can develop phonological awareness, vocabulary, syntax, and oral confidence when paired with explicit prompts and feedback. They should connect to print and meaning rather than remain stand-alone entertainment.

Big books and sight-word resources were prominent for reading. Big books can support shared reading, print concepts, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension; sight-word instruction should emphasize mapping sounds and spellings and repeated use in connected text rather than visual memorization alone.

Writing materials emphasized word banks and transcription support. These are useful scaffolds, but learners also need opportunities to encode sounds, compose meaningful messages, receive feedback, and gradually reduce prompts. Viewing materials should be followed by oral or written interpretation so that media exposure produces language and comprehension evidence.

3.4 Perceived Effectiveness of Instructional Materials

All four quality domains were rated Much Evident; clarity was the relative gap.

Table 5. Perceived Effectiveness of Literacy Materials

Quality Domain	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Relevance	4.37	Much Evident	1
Content	4.34	Much Evident	2
Usefulness	4.33	Much Evident	3
Clarity	4.19	Much Evident	4
Overall	4.31	Much Evident	—

Relevance ranked first, suggesting that teachers saw materials as connected to learner needs and classroom context. Relevance should be reviewed at the level of vocabulary, examples, cultural representation, developmental demand, and alignment with assessed skills.

Content and usefulness were similarly favorable. A material is useful when it reduces teacher preparation burden without reducing instructional responsiveness, supports clear modeling and practice, and can be adapted for learner levels. Reusability, cost, storage, and accessibility also affect practical usefulness.

Clarity was lowest despite a favorable mean. For beginning readers, small ambiguities in directions, print size, visual layout, vocabulary, or task sequence can create a barrier unrelated to the intended skill. A plain-language and usability review with teachers and learners is therefore a high-leverage quality-improvement step.

3.5 District Differences in Perceived Effectiveness

Only usefulness showed a significant district difference.

Table 6. Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney Results for Material Effectiveness

Quality Domain	z	Reported Probability	Decision
Content	−1.10	p>.05	Not significant
Usefulness	−2.57	p<.01	Significant
Clarity	−.23	p>.05	Not significant
Relevance	−1.64	p=.05050	Not significant at .05

Usefulness was the only domain with a statistically significant district difference, indicating that teachers' rank distributions differed in their practical assessment of the materials. The result warrants follow-up on availability, quantity, adaptability, training, class size, storage, and time required for preparation and use.

Relevance was close to the .05 threshold but did not meet it as reported. Threshold proximity should not be described as a trend without a pre-specified rule and effect-size context. Content and clarity showed no statistically established district differences.

A significant rank difference does not identify which district had better materials or why. District medians, rank sums, effect size, and qualitative evidence are needed for an actionable interpretation.

3.6 Integrated Interpretation of the Findings

The learner profile establishes a clear differentiation need: 65% of the reported sample occupied refresher categories, while 34% were Grade Ready. Materials should therefore be organized as matched support sets rather than distributed uniformly.

Teachers used resources across listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing and rated them favorably. The strongest perception was relevance; the clearest quality-development area was clarity.

Only usefulness differed significantly between districts, suggesting that practical implementation conditions—not necessarily content quality—may vary. Resource and training audits should precede procurement decisions.

The defensible improvement pathway is assessment to target to material to explicit routine to learner evidence. The study cannot show that more material use caused a stronger CRLA category, but it provides a useful map for testing that pathway.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

The CRLA profile comprised 4% Full Refresher, 24% Moderate Refresher, 37% Light Refresher, and 34% Grade Ready learners. Differentiated support is required.

The source reported no district difference in CRLA profile, although the p-value paired with z=−1.30 should be verified.

Teachers reported a broad range of materials across five literacy domains. Perceived effectiveness was Much Evident overall (M=4.31), with relevance highest and clarity lowest.

Usefulness was the only effectiveness domain with a significant district difference. The evidence supports material-quality and access improvement but does not establish causal effects on learner literacy.

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.

CRLA categories, material use, and teacher effectiveness ratings were aggregated and not linked learner by learner. The reported KR-21 method for a Likert-type instrument and the p-value for the learner-profile comparison require verification.

4.3 Implications for Practice and Policy

Create differentiated material sets aligned with Full, Moderate, Light Refresher, and Grade Ready instructional targets and exit criteria.

Strengthen explicit instruction in oral language, phonological awareness, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, spelling, and composition.

Run clarity and usability reviews covering directions, vocabulary, print, layout, visual density, accessibility, and task sequence.

Audit the district difference in usefulness through teacher interviews, access and quantity records, training history, and observation of actual use.

Use brief progress monitoring to determine whether a material-supported routine is producing learner growth and when support should change.

5. Policy and Implementation Priorities

Table 7. Assessment-Matched Early Literacy Materials Framework

Priority Area	Recommended Direction	Expected Evidence
Learner profiling	Verify CRLA records and translate categories into specific skill targets.	Skill profile; group plan; review date
Material mapping	Link every material to an explicit literacy objective, routine, and learner level.	Resource map; annotated lesson
Clarity review	Apply plain-language, readability, layout, accessibility, and usability checks.	Review rubric; learner/teacher feedback
Differentiation	Provide tiered dosage, group size, scaffolds, and exit criteria.	Intervention log; progress evidence
Equity	Monitor quantity, functionality, access, and school-based alternatives.	Access audit; gap and allocation report
Evaluation	Link material exposure and fidelity with repeated learner outcomes.	Matched dataset; growth and effect estimates

6. Directions for Future Research

Link individual learner CRLA subskills and growth with documented material exposure, dosage, and implementation fidelity.
Conduct experimental or well-matched quasi-experimental studies of specific material-supported literacy routines.
Validate the effectiveness instrument with appropriate polytomous reliability, factor analysis, and measurement-invariance testing.
Investigate the district usefulness difference through mixed methods and include material cost, preparation time, durability, adaptability, and learner accessibility.

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). President Marcos signs ARAL Law to accelerate learning recovery. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/10/18/president-marcos-signs-aral-law-to-accelerate-learning-recovery/
[7] Foorman, B. R., 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. Institute of Education Sciences.
[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] Republic Act No. 12028. (2024). Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning Program Act. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
[10] Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), Handbook of early literacy research (pp. 97–110). Guilford Press.