RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 769-774 | Article No. 87
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a87
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Activities in Improving the Literacy Level of the Grade 1 Learners in the Public Elementary Schools in Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur

Rose Ann P. Oliveros[1]

[1]University of Northeastern Philippines · Iriga City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
Grade 1 Literacy
Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment
Phonemic Awareness
Storytelling
School-Based Reading Activities
Tigaon District

ABSTRACT

The study examined Grade 1 literacy classifications and reported use of classroom literacy activities in public elementary schools in Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur, during school year 2025–2026. The reported Beginning-of-School-Year Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (BOSY CRLA) covered 819 learners: 284 low emerging (35%), 234 high emerging (29%), 159 developing (19%), 97 transitioning (12%), and 45 reading at grade level (5%). A reported chi-square test comparing literacy-level distributions among three school-size categories yielded $\chi^2 = 26.40$, df = 8, interpreted as significant at .001. Reported overall use of classroom literacy activities averaged 4.04 (Much Employed). Word and sound play ranked highest (4.43), followed by writing and fine-motor skills (4.33), environmental discussion/reading activities (4.25), and reading and storytelling (3.17). Concordance among three respondent-group rankings was reported as W = 0.98–0.99 across four activity domains. Because the underlying school-type cross-tabulation has internally inconsistent entries and the original methodology chapter was not provided, the reported inferential analysis could not be independently reproduced; in addition, the study includes no documented post-intervention literacy outcomes. Findings characterize baseline literacy needs and respondent-rated activity implementation rather than demonstrated intervention effectiveness.

1. Introduction

Foundational literacy enables children to interpret classroom directions, recognize written words, participate in oral discussion, and develop knowledge across the curriculum. For Grade 1 learners, differences in letter–sound knowledge, phonological awareness, vocabulary, oral-language experience, and familiarity with books can translate into markedly different starting points in formal instruction. An assessment of reading readiness is therefore most useful when it informs appropriately differentiated teaching rather than serving solely as a classification exercise.

The study focused on Grade 1 learners in public elementary schools in Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur. It used Beginning-of-School-Year (BOSY) Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) results as a profile of initial literacy levels, then reported the extent to which instructional activities were employed across schools of different sizes. The available Chapter 4 names four activity domains: reading and storytelling, word and sound play, writing and fine-motor skills, and environmental discussion/reading activities.

The distinction between identifying a literacy difficulty and demonstrating an effective intervention is fundamental. A baseline assessment can identify how many children fall into particular reading classifications. Ratings of instructional practices can describe the apparent frequency or extent of activities in schools. Neither kind of evidence alone shows that the activities caused a transition from one literacy level to another. A properly supported effectiveness claim ordinarily requires subsequent learner assessments, attention to initial differences, and documentation of implementation.

Research syntheses identify phonemic awareness, explicit alphabetic instruction, oral-reading practice, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies as interrelated components of reading acquisition (National Reading Panel, 2000; Castles et al., 2018). The National Early Literacy Panel further documented predictors of later literacy development in the early childhood period (National Institute for Literacy, 2008). These findings provide a useful external context for interpreting the present study's activities, while not independently validating the locally reported classroom ratings.

Word and sound play may foster children's awareness of syllables, rhymes, and individual sounds, whereas storytelling and shared reading support oral language, narrative understanding, print familiarity, and vocabulary. Fine-motor and letter-formation tasks contribute to written expression but should not be mistaken for a comprehensive measure of reading proficiency. Environmental print and discussion can connect oral language to visible words in familiar settings. Their distinct functions make a domain-level analysis more educationally informative than a single overall activity score.

Grouping schools as big, medium, and small offers an opportunity to inspect variation in assessment outcomes and reported teaching practices, but it also requires clear group definitions and accurately tabulated learner counts. The study presents a complete district-level narrative distribution and reports a significant chi-square result, while the corresponding school-level distribution table includes overlapping incompatible entries. The article retains this difference between usable and unresolved data rather than inventing a corrected contingency table.

The current manuscript is explicitly a reconstruction from the sections actually provided: the title and author are supported by the approval and certification document, while the numerical Results and analysis are derived from Chapter 4. Missing Chapters 1–3 and 5 limit the ability to report sampling procedures, questionnaire development, informed consent, data analysis protocol, and the original bibliography. This transparency is integral to using the available materials responsibly.

The study's questions, as represented in the supplied Chapter 4, concerned the district's beginning-of-year reading profile, differences in reading classifications across school-size categories, the reported extent of literacy activities, and agreement among the rankings supplied for those activities. The article presents each question using the reported values and discusses what the findings can and cannot substantiate.

2. Methods

2.1 Setting and reported learners

The Chapter 4 report places the study in the public elementary schools of Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur, for school year 2025–2026. The BOSY CRLA results cover 819 Grade 1 learners. The study organizes schools into large (295 learners), medium (336), and small (188) categories. The study of schools, number and characteristics of teacher respondents rating activities, and the rule used to classify school sizes cannot be recovered from the submitted portions of the thesis.

2.2 Measures and data provenance

Beginning-of-school-year CRLA classifications were reported as Low Emerging Reader, High Emerging Reader, Developing Reader, Transitioning Reader, and Reading at Grade Level. Four instructional-activity domains were represented in detailed item tables. These tables report five-point weighted means with printed interpretations: Very Much Employed (VME) for 4.50–5.00, Much Employed (ME) for 3.50–4.49, Employed (E) for 2.50–3.49, Fairly Employed for 1.50–2.49, and Not-at-All for 1.00–1.49. The study did not provide the original instrument, administration instructions, respondent denominator for the means, or psychometric documentation.

2.3 Statistical procedures as reported

The results file describes descriptive counts, percentages, domain and item weighted means, a Pearson chi-square test of independence across a three-by-five school-type/literacy-level arrangement, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) for item ranks across three respondent groups. Its chi-square table reports 819 cases, eight degrees of freedom, and $\chi^2 = 26.40$. The rank-concordance table contains W values for four activity domains. The statistics are reproduced as reported, not recalculated; the underlying school-type by literacy-level counts are not reliably recoverable from the supplied table, preventing independent confirmation of χ^2. Neither causal comparison nor posttest change analysis is reported.

3. Results

3.1 Grade 1 literacy profile at the beginning of the school year

Table 1. District-level BOSY CRLA profile of Grade 1 learners

BOSY CRLA literacy level	Learners, n	Reported %	Rank
Low Emerging Reader	284	35	1
High Emerging Reader	234	29	2
Developing Reader	159	19	3
Transitioning Reader	97	12	4
Reading at Grade Level	45	5	5
Total	819	100	—

The most immediate concern was the concentration of learners in the two earliest classifications. The low-emerging group comprised 284 learners (35%) and the high-emerging group 234 (29%). Together, they represented 518 of the 819 learners, reported as 64% of the district Grade 1 cohort. Only 45 learners, or 5%, were classified as reading at grade level. The remaining 256 learners fell into developing and transitioning categories. These findings document substantial differentiation needs at the beginning of the academic year.

The baseline profile provides a strong practical justification for systematic and repeated assessment. Children in the low-emerging and high-emerging classifications may need different combinations of oral language, sound discrimination, alphabetic knowledge, and guided text work than children already moving toward grade-level reading. However, the aggregate categories do not reveal the specific skill deficits of individual learners, and the present record does not provide item-level CRLA assessments. Intervention planning should therefore connect each broad classification to more detailed diagnostic evidence available within schools.

3.2 Reported distribution by school-size category and chi-square test

Table 2. Reported school-size totals and comparative chi-square result

Reported measure	Value
Learners in large schools	295
Learners in medium schools	336
Learners in small schools	188
All reported learners	819
Cross-tabulation dimensions	3 school categories × 5 reading categories
Degrees of freedom	8
Reported χ^2	26.40
Decision	Significant at .001

The author reported that the distribution of the five reading categories varied by school-size category, with a χ^2 statistic of 26.40 at df = 8. This statistic was stated to exceed the .001 critical value of 26.12 in the study. Although the reported comparison suggests

an association between school-size category and reading classification, the compromised underlying contingency cells prevent checking whether each cell count, expected frequency, and test assumption was correctly specified.

The district's school-size totals sum to 819, but they do not determine how many learners in each school category belonged to the low-emerging or other reading classifications. Assigning the coherent district-level totals across categories would require assumptions and would change the evidence base. Therefore, no reconstructed school-type prevalence or effect size is presented. The potential differences warrant investigation only after the author supplies the original uncontaminated cross-tabulation or data export.

3.3 Extent of reported classroom literacy activities

Table 3. Overall reported extent of literacy activities across school-size groups

Domain	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Reading and storytelling	3.19	3.18	3.15	3.17	4
Word and sound play	4.45	4.43	4.41	4.43	1
Writing and fine-motor skills	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.33	2
Environmental discussion and reading	4.27	4.25	4.22	4.25	3
Overall	4.05	4.03	4.03	4.04	—

The overall weighted mean of 4.04 was interpreted by the study as "Much Employed." Word and sound play received the highest rating (4.43), followed by writing and fine-motor activities (4.33), environmental discussion/reading activities (4.25), and reading and storytelling (3.17). The 1.26-point spread between the highest and lowest activity domains is notably wider than the differences among school-size categories within any given domain.

The descriptive sequence suggests that respondents perceived phonological activities as relatively established, whereas extended storytelling and narrative-response activities were reported less frequently or extensively. This comparison should not be interpreted as a contest between methods; effective Grade 1 literacy instruction draws on multiple components, which may have different functions for different learners.

3.4 Reading and storytelling

Table 4. Reported activity indicators: reading and storytelling

Original activity indicator	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Fill a box with random objects, then pull them out one by one to weave a spontaneous story	3.15	3.14	3.12	3.14	6.5
Create characters from paper bags or socks to act out familiar or new stories	3.13	3.12	3.10	3.12	8
Draw key scenes from a story or create a comic version of a tale	3.09	3.07	3.05	3.07	9
Act out characters or scenes from a book without speaking	3.08	3.06	3.05	3.06	10
Start a story with one sentence, and each person adds the next sentence	3.06	3.04	3.02	3.04	11
Ask children to imagine and tell a different way the story could have ended	3.35	3.33	3.31	3.33	3.5
Encourage adding sound effects while narrating a story	3.17	3.14	3.13	3.15	5
Encourage children to act out scenes or characters from a story, which helps with comprehension and creative expression	3.38	3.36	3.35	3.36	2
Use scripts of stories for oral expression without the need for memorization or elaborate props, sparking imagination and building language skills	3.34	3.33	3.32	3.33	3.5
Use varied pitch, volume, and character voices, along with facial expressions and gestures, to make stories more engaging and dramatic	3.40	3.38	3.36	3.38	1
Use mind maps or story webs to visually outline the key events, characters, and plot points of a story, aiding memory and comprehension	3.02	3.00	2.89	2.97	12
Encourage children to write shopping lists, menus, or trip journals with family photos, linking writing to real-life purposes	3.15	3.14	3.12	3.14	6.5

Reading and storytelling activities were rated Employed (overall 3.17), below the other three domains. The strongest listed item concerned expressive use of pitch, volume, character voices, facial expressions, and gestures (3.38), followed by encouraging children to act out scenes or characters (3.36). In contrast, using mind maps or story webs to visualize stories received 2.97, showing that different forms of narrative engagement were not equally emphasized.

The item pattern suggests a classroom preference for performative storytelling techniques over structured visual reconstruction of narratives. Expressive oral reading can make a text accessible and memorable; story mapping, however, can help children revisit sequence, causal links, characters, and main ideas. The dataset does not show why story webs were less common; potential explanations such as material availability, teacher familiarity, instructional time, or pupil readiness were not measured. These should remain questions for observation rather than explanations presented as findings.

3.5 Word and sound play

Table 5. Reported activity indicators: word and sound play

Original activity indicator	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Find objects around the house that begin with a target sound (e.g., /m/ for 'moon')	4.29	4.27	4.25	4.27	9
Clap or tap out the number of sounds (phonemes) in a word (e.g., "dog" has three: /d/-/o/-/g/)	4.63	4.61	4.59	4.61	1
Say a word very slowly, stretching out each sound, and have the child guess the word (e.g., /m/-/o/-/p/)	4.54	4.53	4.51	4.53	5.5
Say a word and ask for a rhyming word (e.g., "cat" rhymes with "hat") or sing nursery rhymes	4.59	4.58	4.56	4.58	2

Original activity indicator	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Focus on sets of rhyming words (e.g., "-at": cat, hat, mat)	4.57	4.55	4.53	4.55	3
Start with a word like "car," change the first sound to make a new word, like "bar," then "far."	4.38	4.36	4.35	4.36	7
Count syllables in words like "ban-an-a."	4.55	4.52	4.51	4.53	5.5
Sing nursery rhymes or create new songs focusing on specific sounds or word patterns	4.56	4.54	4.52	4.54	4
Stretch a slinky out for each sound in a word, then bring it back together	4.31	4.29	4.26	4.29	8
Practice repeating phrases like "Silly Sally sells seashells."	4.27	4.25	4.23	4.25	10
Use letter cards to build and change words (e.g., change 'hat' to 'cat' to 'mat')	4.23	4.21	4.20	4.21	11

Word and sound play had the strongest overall rating, 4.43 (Much Employed). Clapping or tapping the number of sounds in words was the highest-scoring listed item (4.61). Producing rhyming words scored 4.58; focusing on sets of rhyming words scored 4.55. Activities involving sound stretching and syllable counting scored 4.53, whereas letter cards for word changes received 4.21.

The prominence of clapping, rhyming, and other oral activities indicates reported attention to sound awareness. Such activities can be developmentally suitable for early learners, but they do not automatically demonstrate progress in decoding or orthographic learning. The National Reading Panel (2000) distinguished phonemic awareness—the manipulation of spoken phonemes—from phonics, which links phonemes with graphemes. Teaching plans should therefore specify when sound-play activities introduce, reinforce, or complement explicit letter–sound teaching.

3.6 Writing and fine-motor skills

Table 6. Reported activity indicators: writing and fine-motor skills

Original activity indicator	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Pick up small items (beans, pom-poms) to strengthen finger muscles and coordination	4.18	4.16	4.14	4.16	6
Write letters and shapes in sand, salt, or shaving cream	4.45	4.43	4.41	4.43	5
Trace lines, curves, and shapes on paper or with fingers	4.57	4.55	4.53	4.55	2
Draw or paint on easels or walls to promote better wrist control	4.13	4.11	4.10	4.11	9
Use sidewalk chalk or chalk on a chalkboard for large-scale writing	4.55	4.54	4.52	4.54	3.5
Let children write letters and shapes in engaging ways	4.56	4.53	4.52	4.54	3.5
Start with tracing simple lines, curves, and shapes using fingers, crayons, or markers	4.63	4.61	4.60	4.61	1
Drawing or painting on a vertical surface like an easel or a piece of paper taped to the wall strengthens shoulder muscles, which provides stability for hand movements	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.15	7
Peeling and placing small stickers or using stamps requires careful finger movements and pressure control	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.13	8
Stringing beads onto yarn or using lacing cards to thread string through holes helps improve the pincer grasp and coordination	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.10	10

Writing and fine-motor skills averaged 4.33 (Much Employed). The highest rated item involved moving from simple line, curve, and shape tracing toward letter formation (4.61). Tracing lines and shapes using paper templates scored 4.55, while use of sidewalk chalk or a chalkboard and writing letters in tactile media each scored 4.54. Bead-stringing received 4.10.

The highest-scoring activities are aligned with recognizable classroom writing-preparation routines and increasing familiarity with letter forms. Fine-motor tasks may support physical control needed for writing, but they should be integrated with literacy content: children also need to learn what letters represent, how words carry meaning, and why writing is communicative. A later evaluation could distinguish improvements in handwriting mechanics from changes in letter knowledge, spelling, and writing expression.

3.7 Environmental discussion and reading

Table 7. Reported activity indicators: environmental discussion and reading

Original activity indicator	Large	Medium	Small	Overall	Rank
Point out words on signs, walls, and products, identifying letters and sounds	4.58	4.55	4.53	4.55	2
Create word walls, alphabet posters, and displays of learners' work like labeled drawings	4.61	4.58	4.56	4.58	1
Provide writing tools (crayons, pencils) in all areas, not just a writing center, for spontaneous writing	4.21	4.19	4.17	4.19	5
Make vocabulary rings with words relevant to current topics (e.g., weather words)	4.15	4.13	4.11	4.13	10.5
Talk about daily routines, feelings, and what you see, emphasizing sounds and words	4.19	4.17	4.15	4.17	6.5
Read aloud, then discuss the story, ask questions, and predict outcomes	4.29	4.28	4.26	4.28	4
Act out characters or plot points from books to deepen understanding	4.18	4.16	4.14	4.16	8
Ask open-ended questions to encourage deep thinking and language	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.15	9
Sing songs, do sound games, or find rhyming words (cat, mat)	4.35	4.33	4.30	4.33	3
Create shopping lists, to-do lists, or paint self-portraits and write descriptions	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.13	10.5
Practice forming letters in tactile surfaces	4.12	4.11	4.07	4.10	12
Use physical gestures to learn syllables in words	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.17	6.5

Environmental discussion/reading activities averaged 4.25 (Much Employed). Creating word walls and alphabet displays was strongest (4.58); pointing out words in signs, walls, and products followed (4.55). Sound games and songs scored 4.33, and read-aloud discussion scored 4.28. Tactile letter-formation practice rated 4.10.

The pattern indicates a relatively strong use of visible print in the instructional environment. This may help children notice print conventions and make links between familiar language and written labels, but the presence of a word wall alone does not verify that learners can read or use the displayed words. Classroom-level assessment should examine whether teachers repeatedly model words, engage learners in meaningful use, and connect print to sound, vocabulary, and comprehension. The study reports the availability or use of activities as rated by respondents, not their observed instructional fidelity.

3.8 Agreement in the ranked use of literacy activities

Table 8. Reported Kendall concordance statistics for the four literacy-activity domains

Domain	Ranked items	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Printed significance
Reading and storytelling	12	0.98	32.34	11	0.001
Word and sound play	11	0.99	29.70	10	0.001
Writing and fine-motor skills	10	0.99	26.73	9	0.005
Environmental discussion and reading	12	0.99	32.67	11	0.001

The concordance results, reported as W = 0.98–0.99, signify extremely similar rankings of individual activities across the three school-size respondent groupings. This is consistent with the visibly similar descriptive means in the activity tables. The corresponding chi-square approximations were reported significant for all four domains. These statistics address agreement in how practices were ranked; they do not compare literacy improvement between pupils whose teachers used different activities.

The nearly perfect concordance values should be verified against the original individual rankings and treatment of ties before journal submission. Even with perfectly valid computation, agreement only means that groups tended to rank the same items similarly. The study does not provide matched classroom implementation and learner-outcome data, so the rank findings cannot justify claims that particular activities were most effective at moving learners to grade-level reading.

4. Discussion

4.1 District baseline and instructional differentiation

The reported BOSY profile presents a district-wide educational challenge: the majority of the documented Grade 1 learners began the year in low- or high-emerging reading categories. The practical significance lies in the need for systematic assessment and responsive teaching rather than in any single percentage considered in isolation. A teacher designing a first-quarter lesson must accommodate learners who differ in alphabetic knowledge, vocabulary, sound awareness, oral language, and print familiarity. An aggregate classification cannot substitute for an individual learner's assessment record.

Evidence syntheses offer guidance for this differentiation. The National Reading Panel (2000) identified phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as distinct but connected components of reading instruction. Castles et al. (2018) traced the progression from novice reading through automatic recognition and comprehension, explaining why accurate word reading and broader language comprehension both matter. The study's broad domains overlap with parts of this evidence base, but their local implementation should be evaluated using actual pupil work and reading assessments.

The reported profile also requires caution in interpretation. A BOSY assessment provides a snapshot at entry. Learners may develop rapidly with routine instruction, additional intervention, attendance improvements, or familiarization with school. Without a corresponding end-of-year or other follow-up assessment, the chapter cannot distinguish temporary starting-point differences from sustained difficulties. Future reporting should include matched learner records over time and clear definitions of the reading-level thresholds used by the district.

4.2 Balancing phonological awareness with language-rich activities

Word and sound play was the highest-rated domain in the study. Clapping and rhyming tasks can help teachers elicit children's attention to the structure of spoken words, which can be useful when developmentally matched to instruction. However, high respondent ratings cannot reveal how a teacher responds when a child cannot blend sounds, identify the initial phoneme, or connect sounds to letters. Teachers need an instructional sequence that moves beyond enjoyment or participation to increasingly accurate sound–symbol mapping and reading of meaningful words.

Reading and storytelling received the lowest rating. This finding does not imply that narrative activities are less educationally valuable than sound games. Oral stories, shared reading, and discussion expose children to vocabulary, syntax, narrative sequence, and inference. These experiences complement decoding-oriented instruction, particularly for learners who may be learning to recognize letters but still need richer oral-language opportunities. A balanced schedule would provide explicit early-word instruction along with purposeful listening, conversation, and supported encounters with texts.

The contrast between expressive story performance and low-rated story-mapping activities suggests a possible opportunity to connect engagement with comprehension. After an oral story, learners can place picture cards in sequence, retell events, identify characters' motives, or draw and label key ideas. Whether these approaches are suitable for any particular group must be evaluated against children's needs and instructional time; their adoption is an implication to investigate, not an effect demonstrated by the study.

4.3 Writing and environmental print as complementary supports

Writing and fine-motor activities were reported as much employed, particularly tracing and letter-formation routines. This pattern is consistent with the expectations of early handwriting instruction but should be connected to symbol knowledge and meaning. Repeated tracing can enhance letter formation only to the extent that children receive feedback about the form and identity of letters and use them in meaningful written or reading tasks. It is analytically important to separate motor control from spelling and actual writing development.

Environmental discussion/reading activities were also common, with word walls and exposure to written labels receiving high ratings. Visible print can enrich the classroom, especially when words are revisited during sound work, oral discussion, sentence construction,

and story reading. Passive display is not identical to literacy instruction: learners benefit when a teacher guides attention and checks understanding. Subsequent research could use observation protocols to quantify how often learners actively interact with environmental print.

The four domains could be incorporated into an integrated cycle in which the teacher introduces sounds and letters, reads or tells a short story containing target words, invites children to discuss vocabulary, and provides an age-appropriate writing or letter-forming task. Such a cycle would be a proposed instructional application of existing evidence. The present study does not test this cycle and should not cite its local ratings as proof that the sequence raises reading performance.

4.4 Interpreting the reported statistical differences responsibly

The study identified a significant association between school size and reading-level classifications. Given the data corruption in the corresponding cell counts, this result must remain provisional for dissemination purposes. It would be inappropriate to produce school-type-specific risk estimates, odds ratios, or adjusted models from the district marginals. Before submission, the original CRLA spreadsheet should be retrieved and checked for duplicate learners, classification definitions, and all cell totals. The chi-square test can then be reproduced and expected cell frequencies examined.

The concordance results are likewise descriptive of ranking agreement. Values close to one indicate near-identical orders of activities across school-size respondent groups. They do not identify an optimum intervention or prove that practices were delivered equally well. Further, the underlying number of raters, rating procedure, and treatment of ties were not available in the provided chapters. These omissions should be addressed through the original methodology chapter and survey documentation.

Several inconsistencies in the study appear to be editing artifacts, especially the combined labels and numerals in the school-level CRLA table. The article has not invented missing cells or silently chosen between incompatible alternatives. This deliberate restraint is essential: an apparently complete table created from assumptions would be less defensible than a documented limitation that the author can resolve with the original records.

4.5 Implications for instructional leadership and school improvement

At the district level, a defensible response begins with an early-year screening-to-instruction pathway. Schools can identify individual priority skills from CRLA results, set short-term learning objectives, provide explicit teaching in small groups as needed, and review progress at defined intervals. This work requires adequate reading materials, structured coaching, and collaboration among classroom teachers, reading coordinators, school heads, and families. The study's baseline indicates a need for such planning, but the design does not evaluate the results of any particular intervention.

A useful school monitoring framework could record the number of learners by initial classification, the type and duration of intervention, the frequency of assessment, and progress in specific skills. Observations should capture the quality of phonological activities, explicit alphabetic instruction, comprehension questions, feedback, and accommodations. This would turn the current descriptive categories into a foundation for a later implementation or effectiveness study without treating high self-reported utilization as sufficient evidence of impact.

Family involvement should be framed around feasible, developmentally appropriate activities, including conversation about stories, oral language games, and supported shared reading where materials are available. At the same time, differences in home resources should not be used to explain school-level patterns without actual supporting data. The contribution of leadership is to organize equitable access to materials and timely intervention rather than assume similar conditions across the district.

5. Conclusion

The study documented a beginning-of-school-year literacy profile in which 64% of 819 Grade 1 learners were reported in the two earliest reading classifications and only 5% were at grade level. Reported use of literacy activities was generally high, with word and sound play most prominent and reading and storytelling least prominent. School-size respondent groups assigned highly concordant ranks to activity indicators.

These findings justify attention to differentiated foundational-literacy instruction and balanced implementation of phonological, narrative, writing, and environmental-print activities. They do not demonstrate an activity-induced improvement in pupil reading because follow-up outcome measures were not available. The reported association between school-size category and reading level must also be reviewed against an uncorrupted contingency table.

For journal submission, the author should supply missing methodology and bibliography chapters, confirm the detailed CRLA counts, and verify the chi-square and concordance calculations. A subsequent study with matched learner assessments and documented classroom implementation would support stronger conclusions about what works for Grade 1 readers in Tigaon District.

References

[1] Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 19(1), 5–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271

[2] National Institute for Literacy. (2008). Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel. National Institute for Literacy. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED504224

[3] National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/report

[4] Oliveros, R. A. P. (2026). The activities in improving the literacy level of the Grade 1 learners in the public elementary schools in Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur [Unpublished master's thesis; preliminary pages and Chapter 4 provided, University of Northeastern Philippines].