RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 1069-1076 | Article No. 119
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a119
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Cognitive Activities in Enhancing the Thinking Skills of the Kindergarten Learners in Bula District 1, Division of Camarines Sur

Mary Jane T. Lomeda[1]

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

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
cognitive activities
teacher-rated thinking skills
questionnaire
Kendall concordance
Bula District 1

ABSTRACT

The study examined cognitive activities and teacher-rated thinking skills in Bula District 1, Division of Camarines Sur during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design used a researcher-made questionnaire with 33 kindergarten teachers. Weighted means and ranks described the indicators; Kendall's coefficient of concordance and corresponding chi-square tests assessed agreement at 0.05. The reported indicators of cognitive activity utilization were classified as Very Much Utilized, and those of thinking-skill indicators as Very Much Evident. Significant agreement was reported for all six activity domains. For thinking-skill indicators, significant agreement was reported for all six thinking domains. The findings identify local priorities for professional support and implementation review. They concern perceptions and rankings rather than independently verified improvement or causal effects. Incomplete measurement details and unresolved reporting issues constrain interpretation.

1. Introduction

Kindergarten thinking develops through participation in activities that invite noticing, questioning, trying alternatives, and explaining choices. Teachers can make these processes visible through play, language, drawing, stories, and discussion. The study examined reported use of six cognitive activities and teachers' ratings of six thinking domains. Its enhancement purpose is distinguished from a directly measured gain because the reported findings concern questionnaire ratings and agreement on indicator rankings.

The activity categories were Completing Quizzed and Puzzles, Growing Vocabulary, Counting Specific Letter, Drawing, Reading Books, and Listening to Music. Their labels and detailed statements are retained as reported. Several statements refer to advanced language analysis, written journals, and evidence-based opinions; their actual implementation would need to be examined before concluding that they were developmentally suitable for kindergarten. The study does not supply sample tasks or learner work that resolve this question.

Skene et al. (2022) reviewed guided play in educational contexts and found that its comparison with other approaches depends on the learning outcome considered. Their work makes adult guidance and explicit outcomes relevant to early-childhood instruction. It does not validate the six activity categories used here. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (2020) emphasizes developmentally appropriate practice responsive to children and context, providing a professional benchmark for evaluating how the listed activities might be enacted.

The six thinking domains were critical, analytical, creative, reflective, divergent, and convergent thinking. These groupings include overlapping behaviors, such as questioning, trying strategies, and reviewing a result. A separate label is not proof of a distinct measured dimension. The study's contribution is a local teacher-rated profile and reported concordance, rather than confirmation of six independent cognitive abilities or experimental evidence of improvement.

2. Purpose and research questions

The study addressed the extent of cognitive activity utilization across Completing Quizzed and Puzzles; Growing Vocabulary; Counting Specific Letter; Drawing; Reading Books; Listening to Music; agreement on their indicator rankings; the extent of thinking-skill indicators across Critical; Analytical; Creative; Reflective; Divergent; Convergent; agreement on those rankings; and policy recommendations based on the findings. The reported null hypotheses concerned the absence of significant rank agreement. The title and substantive focus are retained while the interpretation is limited to the analyses actually reported.

Examining extent and agreement together separates the magnitude of a rating from the ordering of its components. Respondents may rate every statement favorably while differing in which they prioritize. Conversely, concordant rankings can coexist with less favorable ratings. The study therefore treats descriptive profiles and inferential comparisons as complementary evidence, without using one as a substitute for the other.

3. Methods

3.1 Design and participants

The study used descriptive-evaluative-correlational methods in Bula District 1, Division of Camarines Sur for School Year 2025–2026. The reported participant group comprised 33 kindergarten teachers. The descriptive component assessed the listed practices and outcomes; the evaluative component concerned their rated extent. The reported inferential component assessed agreement on indicator rankings. No separate participant-level correlation or regression between the two sets of domain scores was presented.

Sampling procedures, the eligible population, recruitment, response rate, exact administration dates, and demographic distribution were not reported. References to respondent groups do not provide a documented allocation of the participant total. No subgroup

counts are inferred. The findings concern the participating group and do not provide a probability-based estimate for a wider population. The respondents were teachers, while the outcome statements describe learners. No directly assessed learner count, baseline scores, individual assessment protocol, or learner matching was reported. The ratings are therefore treated as teachers' perceptions of learner behaviors rather than independent measures of attainment or change. No control condition or intervention assignment was described.

3.2 Instrument and operational definitions

The main instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire covering 12 domains. The reconstructed findings below preserve the listed indicator statements, mean values, and interpretation labels. Numerical rankings, overall means, and group-specific values have not been invented where they were not reported. The categories describe the study's operational measure rather than a standardized diagnostic or performance scale.

The complete response anchors, interpretation intervals, instrument-validation process, pilot sample, and reliability coefficients were not supplied. A favorable verbal classification is retained without reconstructing a five-point response scale from the observed means. The number of statements in a summary does not by itself establish the number administered. Any incomplete or repeated entries remain visible rather than being repaired through assumption.

3.3 Procedures and ethical reporting

Questionnaire distribution, administration mode, retrieval, missing-response handling, individual consent, confidentiality safeguards, ethics approval, and data-retention procedures were not specified. These steps are not presumed to have occurred. The study is reported through aggregate findings without adding personal information. Missing documentation is identified separately for author review before further inferential interpretation.

No new fieldwork or reconstruction of individual responses was undertaken. The reporting process preserves aggregate values and distinguishes them from proposed actions. Consequently, the manuscript cannot add standard errors, confidence intervals, missing-data estimates, or participant characteristics that were not provided. The limitations of the available evidence are part of the interpretation of the study, not evidence that an unreported procedure was performed incorrectly.

3.4 Statistical analysis

Weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W, and corresponding chi-square tests were identified as analytical tools. Significance was set at 0.05. The test tables retain reported W values, chi-square values, probability inequalities, and decisions. Probability inequalities are not exact p values. No unreported probability or corrected calculation has been substituted.

Kendall concordance concerns similarity in the ordering of statements across ranking groups. It does not estimate an association between a practice score and an outcome score, and it does not establish a causal effect. A nonsignificant result means that the reported procedure did not establish significant agreement; it is not proof of no agreement, equivalent groups, or low skill. These distinctions are maintained throughout the results.

The full ranking matrices, degrees of freedom, treatment of ties, and unrounded calculations were not supplied. Three groups are mentioned in some research questions or result summaries, but group composition and counts are insufficiently documented. The inferential results are reproduced as reported and should be verified against the complete statistical output before further inferential interpretation.

The Reading Books summary joins two statements before a single 4.74 and uses a period rather than a semicolon at another boundary. Combined wording is retained without assigning an invented separate score. Several probability thresholds and the Divergent W–chi-square pair require verification; none has been silently corrected.

4. Results

4.1 Completing Quizzed and Puzzles

Table 1. Completing Quizzed and Puzzles

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher monitors learners' responses to quizzes and puzzles to identify cognitive strengths and areas for improvement	4.64
the teacher designs differentiated quiz formats to accommodate varying levels of cognitive readiness among learners	4.62
the teacher uses visual and tactile puzzle materials to support multi-sensory learning experiences	4.62
the teacher provides immediate feedback during quiz and puzzle activities to reinforce correct reasoning and guide corrections	4.62
the teacher aligns puzzle content with thematic units or subject matter to ensure contextual relevance	4.61
the teacher evaluates the effectiveness of quizzes and puzzles in promoting higher-order thinking skills through reflective assessment	4.61
the teacher facilitates guided puzzle-solving sessions to enhance learners' logical reasoning and pattern recognition	4.61
the teacher encourages collaborative puzzle activities to foster peer interaction and shared problem-solving	4.59
the teacher integrates age-appropriate quizzes and puzzles into daily lesson routines to reinforce key concepts	4.55

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 1 presents completing quizzed and puzzles indicators. The displayed means range from 4.55 to 4.64. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Monitoring responses was rated above daily integration. This distinguishes attending to learners' performance from the regular scheduling of an activity. The findings support considering what information a puzzle reveals and how teachers respond to it. No task examples or cognitive-load evidence establish that the listed quizzes were developmentally appropriate for every child.

4.2 Growing Vocabulary

Table 2. Growing Vocabulary

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher provides explicit instruction on word meanings, affixes, synonyms, antonyms, and etymology to support morphological awareness	4.75
The teacher integrates vocabulary instruction into reading and writing tasks to reinforce word usage in authentic academic contexts	4.74
The teacher facilitates interactive vocabulary-building exercises such as word mapping, semantic clustering, and concept association to deepen learners' understanding	4.70
The teacher introduces new vocabulary terms through contextualized examples drawn from lesson content, thematic units, or real-life scenarios	4.66
The teacher encourages learners to use newly acquired vocabulary in oral discussions, reflective journals, and collaborative activities to promote active retention	4.66
The teacher utilizes visual aids, graphic organizers, and multimedia tools to support multimodal vocabulary acquisition	4.64
The teacher differentiates vocabulary instruction to accommodate varying language proficiency levels and learning needs across the classroom	4.58
the teacher monitors learners' vocabulary growth through formative assessments, vocabulary journals, and performance-based tasks	4.54

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 2 presents growing vocabulary indicators. The displayed means range from 4.54 to 4.75. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Explicit word instruction was rated above monitoring vocabulary growth. The indicators include advanced language terms and written routines, so their kindergarten adaptation requires clarification. A favorable mean does not establish that children performed etymological analysis or kept independent journals. The table preserves the wording without certifying age suitability.

4.3 Counting Specific Letter

Table 3. Counting Specific Letter

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher integrates letter-counting tasks into vocabulary instruction to reinforce phonemic awareness and spelling accuracy	4.93
The teacher designs formative assessments that require learners to identify and tally specific letters within target vocabulary words	4.91
The teacher facilitates performance-based tasks where learners apply letter-counting strategies to decode unfamiliar words	4.91
The teacher uses vocabulary journals to document learners' letter-counting exercises, reflections, and observed patterns	4.90
The teacher monitors learners' progress in letter recognition and frequency analysis through structured observation and feedback	4.88
The teacher differentiates letter-counting activities based on learners' reading levels and language proficiency	4.84
the teacher aligns letter-counting strategies with Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) and integrates them into daily literacy routines	4.83

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 3 presents counting specific letter indicators. The displayed means range from 4.83 to 4.93. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Letter counting was linked in the statements to spelling, decoding, and phonemic awareness. Counting visible letters and manipulating spoken sounds are conceptually distinct. Their relationship cannot be assumed from a favorable rating. The actual task prompts and examples are needed to determine whether the activity elicited counting, print recognition, sound analysis, or a combination.

4.4 Drawing

Table 4. Drawing

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher provides constructive feedback on learner drawings, focusing on clarity, relevance to the learning objective, and integration with literacy outcomes	4.79
The teacher encourages collaborative drawing projects, fostering peer interaction, shared meaning-making, and collective interpretation of MELC-aligned themes	4.78
The teacher models drawing techniques that support narrative construction, helping learners organize ideas sequentially and connect illustrations to written text	4.77
The teacher documents and displays student drawings as evidence of learning, using visual outputs to track progress, celebrate creativity, and reinforce MELC mastery	4.75

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher aligns drawing prompts with daily literacy routines, embedding visual expression into reading, writing, and speaking activities to enhance engagement and retention	4.75
The teacher uses drawing as a formative assessment tool, enabling learners to express their grasp of content through visual storytelling or concept mapping	4.73
The teacher facilitates guided drawing exercises that support phonemic awareness, allowing learners to associate sounds with symbols, letters, or thematic illustrations	4.70
The teacher scaffolds drawing tasks to accommodate diverse learning styles and developmental levels, ensuring inclusivity and differentiated instruction	4.70
the teacher integrates drawing activities to reinforce comprehension of MELCs, using visual representation to deepen understanding of key concepts and vocabulary	4.68

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 4 presents drawing indicators. The displayed means range from 4.68 to 4.79. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Feedback and collaborative visual work were comparatively prominent, while broad integration with learning competencies was lower. Drawing can make understanding visible, but interpretation depends on the task and the language children use around their work. The study did not score drawings independently or show that a particular visual task improved a thinking domain.

4.5 Reading Books

Table 5. Reading Books

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher facilitates guided reading sessions that promote inferential thinking, contextual analysis, and comprehension of MELC-aligned texts	4.76
The teacher encourages reflective journaling after reading, allowing learners to synthesize ideas, express interpretations, and connect texts to personal experiences	4.75
The teacher aligns reading selections with cross-curricular goals, reinforcing content knowledge in science, social studies, or values education through literary texts. The teacher scaffolds reading tasks to accommodate varying proficiency levels, ensuring differentiated instruction and equitable access to cognitive engagement	4.74
The teacher documents reading progress through portfolios or rubrics, tracking comprehension growth, critical responses, and mastery of literacy competencies	4.74
The teacher models metacognitive strategies such as predicting, questioning, and summarizing to help learners monitor their understanding while reading	4.73
The teacher integrates vocabulary-building exercises drawn from book content, enhancing lexical awareness and semantic precision	4.72
the teacher uses reading books as a springboard for discussion, prompting learners to analyze themes, evaluate character decisions, and articulate evidence-based opinions	4.71

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred. Combined statement wording before one mean is retained because separate scores were not supplied.

Table 5 presents reading books indicators. The displayed means range from 4.71 to 4.76. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The reported list connects guided reading, reflection, scaffolding, and discussion. Two statements are joined before one mean, making their separate scores unclear. The combined wording is retained to avoid assigning an invented value. Kindergarten implementation would require appropriate oral and shared-reading adaptations rather than assuming independent written reflection from the statement alone.

4.6 Listening to Music

Table 6. Listening to Music

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher facilitates guided music listening sessions that prompt learners to analyze lyrics, identify themes, and interpret emotional tone in relation to curricular content	5.00
The teacher uses music as a springboard for discussion, prompting learners to evaluate artistic choices, critique social messages, and articulate evidence-based opinions	5.00
The teacher aligns musical selections with cross-curricular goals, using songs to reinforce concepts in literature, history, values education, or social studies	4.98
The teacher encourages reflective journaling after music listening, allowing learners to synthesize ideas, express personal interpretations, and connect musical themes to lived experiences	4.98
The teacher scaffolds music-based activities to accommodate diverse learning styles and auditory sensitivities, ensuring inclusive and differentiated instruction	4.97

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher documents learner responses to music through portfolios, rubrics, or creative outputs, tracking growth in interpretive thinking, emotional literacy, and thematic comprehension	4.97
the teacher models analytical strategies such as identifying figurative language, historical references, and cultural symbolism embedded in song lyrics	4.87

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 6 presents listening to music indicators. The displayed means range from 4.87 to 5.00. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Analysis of lyrics and discussion were strongly endorsed. The references to social messages, historical context, and figurative language require review against the actual age-appropriate prompts. These may have been teacher-mediated, but that procedure was not reported. High ratings do not establish advanced independent analysis by kindergarten learners.

Table 7. Reported concordance for cognitive activity utilization

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Completing Quizzed and Puzzles	0.81	19.44	$p<0.025$	Rejected
Growing Vocabulary	0.89	18.69	$p<0.005$	Rejected
Counting Specific Letter	0.91	16.38	$p<0.0025$	Rejected
Drawing	0.95	22.80	$p<0.005$	Rejected
Reading Books	0.73	15.33	$P<0.05$	Rejected
Listening to Music	0.86	15.48	$p<0.025$	Rejected

Note. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 7 reports significant agreement for all six activity domains. No domain was reported as nonsignificant. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

4.7 Critical

Table 8. Critical

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner reflects on what worked or did not work after completing an activity	4.84
The learner asks questions to understand how things work or why things happen	4.83
The learner uses trial and error to test ideas and adjust their approach	4.82
The learner connects new information to something they already know	4.80
The learner makes choices based on comparing options (e.g., selecting the bigger block to build a taller tower)	4.80
The learner explains their thinking when solving a problem or completing a task	4.80
The learner identifies when something does not make sense and seeks clarification	4.80
The learner notices patterns or differences in objects, sounds, or behaviors	4.79
the learner listens to others' ideas and responds with their own thoughts	4.79

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 8 presents critical indicators. The displayed means range from 4.79 to 4.84. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Reflection after activity was comparatively prominent, while responding to others and noticing patterns were lower. The statements span questioning, trial and error, and explanation. These processes can overlap with other thinking domains. The ratings do not establish a distinct critical-thinking factor or show how individual children changed over time.

4.8 Analytical

Table 9. Analytical

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner asks questions to clarify, investigate, or challenge what is observed or heard	4.78
The learner notices patterns, similarities, or differences in objects, sounds, or behaviors	4.75
The learner identifies problems and explores multiple possible solutions	4.72
The learner predicts outcomes based on patterns or previous results	4.72
The learner connects new information to prior experiences or knowledge	4.71
The learner explains their thinking or decision-making process using observable evidence	4.70
The learner listens to others' ideas and responds with their own thoughts or counterpoints	4.70

Indicator	Weighted mean
the learner reflects on what worked, what did not, and why after completing a task	4.68

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 9 presents analytical indicators. The displayed means range from 4.68 to 4.78. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Questioning was rated above explaining what worked and why after a task. Investigation and retrospective explanation are complementary demands. The profile supports discussing how teachers prompt evidence and reasons, but no direct child-assessment protocol establishes the quality of those explanations. The findings remain perceived classroom behaviors.

4.9 Creative

Table 10. Creative

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner tries new ways of doing things, even if they are unsure of the outcome	4.80
The learner explores different materials, colors, or sounds to express ideas or feelings	4.79
The learner uses imagination to create stories, drawings, or pretend play scenarios	4.78
The learner combines objects or ideas in unusual ways to make something new	4.76
The learner enjoys making choices and expressing preferences in creative tasks	4.73
The learner shares their creations with others and talks about what they made	4.72
the learner reflects on their work by saying what they liked, what was hard, or what they might do differently next time	4.71

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 10 presents creative indicators. The displayed means range from 4.71 to 4.80. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Trying new approaches was rated above reflection on the resulting work. Exploration and evaluation represent different parts of a creative process. The findings suggest considering both without treating one as proof of the other. No originality rubric, work-sample comparison, or baseline established an increase in children's creativity.

4.10 Reflective

Table 11. Reflective

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner expresses what they enjoyed or found meaningful	4.66
The learner evaluates the effectiveness of their approach or decisions	4.63
The learner suggests what they might do differently next time	4.61
The learner describes their emotional response to the task	4.61
The learner seeks clarification or feedback to improve understanding	4.61
The learner uses reflective vocabulary and sentence structures	4.60
The learner sets personal goals based on their reflection	4.59
the learner identifies what was challenging or confusing	4.55

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 11 presents reflective indicators. The displayed means range from 4.55 to 4.66. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Expressing enjoyment was rated above identifying confusion or difficulty. Reporting a preference is not the same as explaining a learning obstacle. Age-appropriate dialogue could help make the latter visible, but the study did not evaluate a reflective-coaching intervention. The favorable classification should not obscure differences in what the statements require.

4.11 Divergent

Table 12. Divergent

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner explores alternative perspectives or interpretations of a concept	4.80
The learner offers original or unexpected responses that differ from peers	4.79
The learner generates multiple ideas or solutions in response to a single prompt or problem	4.78
The learner asks "what if" questions to expand thinking beyond the obvious	4.77
The learner adapts known strategies in novel ways to solve problems	4.76
The learner engages in brainstorming without fear of making mistakes	4.76
The learner revises or reimagines ideas based on feedback or new insights	4.76
the learner combines unrelated elements to create new ideas or products	4.75

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 12 presents divergent indicators. The displayed means range from 4.75 to 4.80. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Considering alternative perspectives was rated above combining unrelated elements. The profile covers multiple ideas, adaptation, and revision, but those behaviors are not necessarily independent. The reported test pair requires numerical clarification before drawing stronger agreement conclusions. The descriptive findings provide no count or originality assessment of children's generated ideas.

4.12 Convergent

Table 13. Convergent

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner organizes information systematically to support conclusions	4.82
The learner follows multi-step processes with precision and consistency	4.81
The learner eliminates irrelevant or incorrect options through logical analysis	4.81
The learner identifies the most appropriate solution among several options	4.80
The learner applies known facts, rules, or procedures to solve problems accurately	4.79
The learner justifies answers using evidence or prior learning	4.78
the learner maintains focus on task objectives and avoids unnecessary elaboration	4.64

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 13 presents convergent indicators. The displayed means range from 4.64 to 4.82. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Organizing information and following procedures were rated above maintaining concise focus on the task objective. Accuracy and relevance can be complementary, but they require different evidence. The study did not administer a problem-solving test. Its favorable ratings cannot establish mastery of multi-step reasoning or the absence of distracting elaboration.

Table 14. Reported concordance for thinking-skill indicators

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Critical	0.81	19.44	p<0.025	Rejected
Analytical	0.93	19.53	p<0.005	Rejected
Creative	1	18	p<0.01	Rejected
Reflective	0.90	21.60	p<0.005	Rejected
Divergent	0.66	16.64	p<0.025	Rejected
Convergent	0.98	17.64	p<0.01	Rejected

Note. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 14 reports significant agreement for all six thinking domains. No domain was reported as nonsignificant. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

5. Discussion

5.1 Meaning of the descriptive profile

The study reported favorable ratings across cognitive activity utilization and thinking-skill indicators. The detailed tables nevertheless distinguish specific practices and behaviors rather than establishing a uniformly successful process. The most useful application is to examine what the relatively lower statements require in everyday practice. A high category rating does not establish that every participant had the same experience or that all implementation conditions were equally supportive.

The within-domain patterns are exploratory and descriptive. The displayed precision allows exact transcription but should not be confused with evidence that small mean differences are practically important. Without response distributions and variability estimates, it is not possible to determine whether a narrow range reflects genuinely similar experience, restricted response options, or a tendency to endorse favorable statements. The interpretation therefore remains tied to the content and type of measurement.

Skene et al. (2022) make it useful to specify which outcome adult guidance during play is intended to support. NAEYC (2020) adds a developmental benchmark for reviewing the task itself. The advanced language in several indicators should therefore be checked against actual kindergarten practice. Favorable ratings cannot resolve developmental fit without examples of prompts, scaffolding, and learner responses.

5.2 Agreement and the research questions

The reported agreement results address a narrower question than the title's practical purpose. For cognitive activity utilization, significant agreement was reported for all six activity domains. For thinking-skill indicators, it was reported for all six thinking

domains. These findings describe the ordering of indicators under the reported procedure. They do not establish which practice explains individual differences in outcomes, nor do they demonstrate that changing one domain would improve another.

Nonsignificant domains should not automatically become deficit labels. They may reflect differences in relative emphasis even when ratings are uniformly high. Similarly, significant domains are not necessarily the strongest priorities for intervention. Priority setting should consider the importance of the behavior, actual implementation conditions, and the evidence needed to understand a problem. The test classification alone does not supply those judgments.

5.3 Implications for practice and policy

The study proposed activity frameworks, teacher development, collaborative planning, reflective dialogue, observation tools, and monitoring of implementation. These proposals need developmental review and evaluation in kindergarten classrooms before broad mandates. The study did not implement or test the proposed policy package.

A defensible next step is to review the findings with relevant stakeholders and compare the questionnaire statements with actual examples of practice. Such review can clarify what respondents understood, identify usable resources, and distinguish shared priorities from context-specific needs. This would extend the study rather than represent data already collected. Proposed actions should have explicit objectives and indicators before their effectiveness is evaluated.

Implementation should also include attention to access, workload, and the quality of support. Standardizing a form or activity does not by itself establish that participants can use it meaningfully. The findings provide a basis for discussing those conditions, but not for prescribing an identical response to every school or stakeholder group. The study did not compare alternative policy packages or estimate their costs and benefits.

6. Conclusion

The study reported favorable extent ratings for cognitive activity utilization and thinking-skill indicators among 33 kindergarten teachers in Bula District 1, Division of Camarines Sur. Significant agreement was reported for all six activity domains in the first set and all six thinking domains in the second. These conclusions concern reported extent and rank concordance.

The findings support consideration of the proposed professional and implementation priorities. They do not establish causal effectiveness, individual mastery, or verified improvement. Completing the missing methodological details and resolving the identified reporting issues are necessary before stronger explanatory claims. The title and study purpose are retained without expanding the evidence beyond the reported design.

References

[1] National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2020). Developmentally appropriate practice [Position statement]. https://www.naeyc.org/resources/position-statements/dap/contents

[2] Skene, K., O'Farrelly, C. M., Byrne, E. M., Kirby, N., Stevens, E. C., & Ramchandani, P. G. (2022). Can guidance during play enhance children's learning and development in educational contexts? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Child Development, 93(4), 1162–1180. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13730