

The Effectiveness of the Implementation of the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum in Improving the Numeracy Skills of the Grade 1 Learners in Lagonoy South District, Division of Camarines Sur

Aizel R. Baguio¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	The study examined the implementation of the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum and changes in Grade 1 numeracy in Lagonoy South District, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2024–2025. The study covered 38 Grade 1 teachers and assessment records from 20 public elementary schools. Pretest records included 954 learners and posttest records 930 learners. Implementation activities were rated across capacity building of teachers, provision of support materials, parents' support, and attendance of learners. Weighted means, ranks, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, and a reported paired-sample t-test were used. Overall implementation was rated Much Evident (3.92). Support materials ranked highest (3.96), followed by teacher capacity building (3.93), parents' support (3.90), and learner attendance (3.89). Rank agreement across the three school-size groups was not significant in any domain. The reported mean percentage score increased from 55.34% to 70.17%, a difference of 14.83 percentage points. Full Intervention decreased from 504 learners to 196, while Grade Ready increased from 82 to 279. The reported test yielded $t = 2.94$, $df = 929$, with significance classified at 0.005. These findings indicate a favorable aggregate change alongside widely reported implementation activities. Different assessment totals, undocumented learner matching, and unresolved measurement details constrain the paired-test interpretation and causal attribution. The study supports continued differentiated numeracy assistance, contextualized resources, teacher development, family engagement, and improved learner tracking, with further evaluation needed to establish sustained program effects.
Keywords: Learning Recovery Grade 1 Numeracy Curriculum Implementation Teacher Capacity Building Parental Support Lagonoy South District	

1. Introduction

Foundational numeracy enables young learners to recognize quantities, work with numbers, perform basic operations, and approach mathematical problems with increasing independence. In Grade 1, differences in prior learning can create substantial variation in readiness for classroom instruction. A learning recovery curriculum must therefore do more than repeat a standard sequence of lessons. It must identify learners' starting points, provide instruction that responds to their needs, and assess whether subsequent performance indicates progress. The study examined these concerns through the implementation of the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum in Lagonoy South District, Division of Camarines Sur.

The 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum was described as a contextualized response to foundational learning gaps in Region V. The instructional approach included grouping learners according to assessment results, differentiated lessons, structured and unstructured activities, lesson maps, and materials aligned with learning needs. The program description placed pre-assessment before eight instructional weeks and post-assessment afterward. Thus, the eight-week designation concerns the instructional component within a broader assessment and instruction sequence. The study's practical concern was whether numeracy outcomes improved and how extensively supporting activities were utilized.

Regional evidence provides a basis for examining such interventions locally. Miña and Caballes (2023) investigated the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum for Grade 3 numeracy in Legazpi City. Their evaluation combined assessment results with teacher perspectives and reported a significant pretest–posttest difference. The relevance of that work lies in its attention to both implementation and learner performance. It does not establish that the same outcomes should occur among Grade 1 learners in Lagonoy South District, where the learning stage, participants, and local conditions differ.

Acob et al. (2023) also examined the eight-week curriculum among Key Stage 1 learners in selected schools in the Partido area of Camarines Sur. Their account emphasized variation in learner performance and the role of post-assessment in identifying subsequent instructional needs. This perspective supports interpreting a recovery curriculum as part of an ongoing instructional process. Completion of a time-bound intervention does not mean that every learner has reached the same level or that further support is unnecessary. The study therefore examined the full distribution of intervention categories rather than relying only on a district average.

Family involvement is relevant because numeracy learning extends beyond the classroom. Belarmino and Tamban (2023) investigated a parent-induced learning program for Grade 1 literacy and numeracy, involving training intended to help parents support learning. Their findings make structured parent support a pertinent consideration in early-grade recovery. In the study, parental engagement was measured through teacher-rated activities such as communication, home-learning guidance,

responsiveness, and opportunities for feedback. These ratings provide information about perceived support practices, rather than a direct measure of every household's contribution to numeracy.

1.1 Purpose and research questions

The study sought to determine the effectiveness of implementing the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum in improving Grade 1 numeracy in Lagonoy South District. Six questions guided the investigation: the profile of pretest numeracy scores; the extent of activities in teacher capacity building, support materials, parents' support, and learner attendance; agreement on the rank orders of those activities; the profile of posttest numeracy scores; the significance of pretest–posttest improvement; and practical pointers arising from the findings. The stated hypotheses concerned significant agreement on activity rankings and significant improvement in numeracy. Effectiveness was examined through reported implementation and assessment change. The interpretation of change requires attention to the number of learners assessed at each occasion and to the absence of a documented comparison condition. A higher posttest mean and a more favorable distribution are relevant findings, but they do not isolate curriculum effects from maturation, other instruction, assessment familiarity, or changes in assessment participation. The study is therefore presented as evidence about local implementation and reported outcomes, with conclusions limited to what the available measures establish.

2. Methods

2.1 Study approach and setting

The study examined teacher-rated implementation activities together with pretest and posttest numeracy assessment records. Its reported analyses comprised descriptive summaries, tests of agreement on item rankings across school-size groups, and a paired-sample t-test of improvement. A specific formal research-design designation was not stated in the documented account of the study's own procedures. The study is not reclassified here as randomized, quasi-experimental, correlational, or mixed-method on the basis of those analyses alone. No control group, random assignment, or independently analyzed interview dataset was documented. The setting was Lagonoy South District in the Division of Camarines Sur. The district comprised 20 public elementary schools, grouped as one big school, eight medium schools, and 11 small schools. The big school was Lagonoy South Central School. These school-size groups were used to organize both the numeracy profiles and the teacher-rating results. The operational definitions described big schools as having more than thirty teachers, medium schools as having more than ten to twenty-nine teachers, and small schools as having nine or fewer teachers. The boundaries in those definitions were not further resolved.

2.2 Teachers and learner assessment records

The study's stated scope covered 38 Grade 1 teachers during School Year 2024–2025. Their ratings were summarized by big, medium, and small school groups. The distribution of those 38 teachers across the three groups, individual selection criteria, recruitment procedure, and response rate were not specified. The number of schools is therefore distinguished from the number of teacher respondents. The one big school, eight medium schools, and 11 small schools should not be interpreted as corresponding teacher sample counts. Numeracy profiles were reported for 954 learners at pretest and 930 at posttest. The pretest totals were 212 in the big school, 447 in medium schools, and 295 in small schools. Corresponding posttest totals were 209, 437, and 284. These are assessment-record totals, not confirmation that every posttest learner was matched to an identifiable pretest record. The study reported a paired-sample analysis with 929 degrees of freedom, but the procedure for constructing the matched set and handling incomplete records was not documented.

2.2 Curriculum and measures

The curriculum description placed diagnostic assessment in week 1, eight weeks of instruction in weeks 2–9, and post-assessment in week 10. Instruction included ability grouping, unstructured activities in numeracy corners, structured lessons by learning group, and teacher lesson maps. The program account identified number sense and basic operations within its wider numeracy scope. It described the initial assessment as adopted from the Albay Numeracy Assessment Tools and the post-assessment as a standardized tool developed by DepEd Region V. The exact instruments administered to the study cohort, their equivalence, item counts, scoring procedures, and psychometric properties were not specified.

The assessment tables identified the Electronic Numeracy Assessment Tools – Reporting System 2025 of DepEd Region V as the reporting system. Learners were classified into Full Intervention, Moderate Intervention, Light Intervention, and Grade Ready. The district mean percentage score was also reported and assigned an overall intervention category. Numerical thresholds for the four learner categories and the calculation of the district mean percentage score were not stated. The reported classifications are retained without constructing new cutoffs or deriving scores from category frequencies.

Implementation was represented by four sets of ten statements: Capacity Building of Teachers, Provision of Support Materials, Parents' Support, and Attendance of Learners. The tables reported weighted means, interpretations, and ranks for each school-size group and an average column. Their five-point interpretation scale was 4.50–5.00, Very Much Evident; 3.50–4.49, Much Evident; 2.50–3.49, Evident; 1.50–2.49, Fairly Evident; and 1.00–1.49, Not Evident. All tabulated implementation means fell within Much Evident. Instrument development, validation, reliability, and administration procedures were not specified.

The attendance statements require particular care. They addressed perceived attendance consistency, monitoring, expectations, incentives, parental involvement, and the perceived consequences of absenteeism. Their weighted means are survey ratings, not recorded attendance percentages or tests of attendance effects. Similarly, statements referring to improved learner motivation or performance are respondents' ratings of those assertions. They are not separate experimental or correlational estimates of the relationship between a specific implementation activity and numeracy change.

2.4 Analytical procedures

The descriptive analysis used learner counts, reported percentages, weighted means, and ranks. Tables 1 and 8 retain school-level category counts and percentages, including the reported subtotals and totals. The percentages in those profiles use the relevant district

assessment total as their reference rather than each school's enrollment; rounding and reporting inconsistencies have not been silently adjusted. Implementation tables retain the stated group means, average means, and ranks. A common interpretation is given in the notes where every entry was classified Much Evident.

Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W , was reported for each implementation domain, with three school-size groups, ten items, and nine degrees of freedom. The reported chi-square critical values were 16.92 at 0.05, 19.02 at 0.025, 21.67 at 0.01, 23.59 at 0.005, and 27.88 at 0.001. The analysis concerns agreement in the ordering of ten statements across three groups. It does not test whether the groups had equal mean ratings or whether one implementation activity predicted learner improvement. The reported concordance coefficients and test statistics are retained without recalculation.

The reported paired-sample t -test included a mean difference of 14.83, a standard deviation of differences of 154, $t = 2.94$, and $df = 929$. Its significance was classified at 0.005. These figures are reported as tabulated, rather than as independently verified inferential estimates. The documented evidence does not establish the measurement units of the difference scores, the matched learner dataset, the distribution of differences, or the treatment of clustering within schools. Exact p values, confidence intervals, and standardized effect sizes were not reported.

2.5 Ethical and reporting considerations

The study concerns teacher reports and educational assessment records involving children. Information about ethics review or exemption, institutional permission, parent or guardian consent, learner assent where applicable, confidentiality procedures, and access to assessment records was not specified. No such approval or procedure is presumed. The findings are presented at school or group level, without learner names or individual scores. The account also does not assign reasons for the reduction in assessment totals to particular children, because reasons for missing posttest records were not documented.

3. Results

3.1 Pretest numeracy profile

Table 1 presents the pretest profile for 954 learners. Full Intervention included 504 learners and the reported district percentage was 53%; Moderate Intervention included 239 learners, 25%; Light Intervention included 129 learners, 13%; and Grade Ready included 82 learners, 8%. The reported overall mean percentage score was 55.34%, interpreted as Full Intervention. The profile indicates that most assessment records were in the two more intensive intervention categories before the curriculum implementation.

Table 1. Profile of pretest numeracy scores

School	FI n (%)	MI n (%)	LI n (%)	GR n (%)	Overall n (%)
Big School					
Lagonoy South Central School	113 (12)	77 (8)	13 (1)	9 (1)	212 (22)
Medium Schools					
Burabod Elementary School	27 (3)	14 (1)	8 (1)	4 (0)	53 (6)
Dahat Elementary School	19 (2)	13 (1)	4 (0)	3 (0)	39 (4)
Loho Elementary School	26 (3)	14 (1)	5 (1)	4 (0)	49 (5)
Pinamihagan Elementary School	31 (3)	13 (1)	6 (1)	2 (0)	52 (5)
San Rafael-Agpo Elementary School	35 (4)	16 (2)	12 (1)	7 (1)	70 (7)
San Ramon Elementary School	45 (5)	17 (2)	10 (1)	4 (0)	76 (8)
San Roque Elementary School	25 (3)	12 (1)	9 (1)	2 (0)	48 (5)
San Sebastian Elementary School	37 (4)	13 (1)	6 (1)	4 (0)	60 (6)
Subtotal medium	245 (26)	112 (12)	60 (6)	30 (3)	447 (47)
Small Schools					
Agosais Elementary School	6 (1)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	11 (1)
Amoguis Elementary School	15 (2)	5 (1)	5 (1)	2 (0)	27 (3)
Bolo Elementary School	11 (1)	4 (0)	6 (1)	3 (0)	24 (3)
Binanuan Elementary School	19 (2)	5 (1)	3 (0)	3 (0)	30 (3)
Cabotonan Elementary School	22 (2)	8 (1)	4 (0)	2 (0)	36 (4)
Gubat Elementary School	31 (3)	9 (1)	11 (1)	14 (1)	65 (7)
Himagtocon Elementary School	5 (1)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	10 (1)
Kinahulogan Elementary School	15 (2)	4 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	25 (3)
Manamoc Elementary School	13 (1)	3 (0)	9 (1)	11 (1)	36 (4)
Panagan Elementary School	4 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	12 (1)
Panicuan Elementary School	5 (1)	5 (1)	7 (1)	2 (0)	19 (2)
Subtotal small	146 (15)	50 (5)	56 (6)	43 (5)	295 (31)
TOTAL	504 (53)	239 (25)	129 (13)	82 (8)	954

Medium schools accounted for the largest number of Full Intervention records, 245, followed by small schools with 146 and the big school with 113. These counts reflect unequal school-group totals. They do not show that a greater proportion of learners in a particular school-size group required intervention unless a separate within-group calculation is made. The reported school percentages describe contributions to the district assessment total and should not be read as within-school rates.

The Grade Ready count was relatively small at baseline, but it was not zero. That finding supports differentiated assistance rather than an assumption that every learner began with the same needs. The assessment profile identifies a broad distribution of support

requirements. It does not determine whether the observed difficulties resulted from pandemic disruption, prior instruction, household conditions, assessment conditions, or other factors. Those explanations were not tested by the category counts.

3.2 Capacity building of teachers

Table 2. Implementation activities for capacity building of teachers

Indicator	Big School Wx / Rank	Medium Schools Wx / Rank	Small Schools Wx / Rank	Average Wx / Rank
1. The content covered during the training sessions of the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum was satisfactory.	4.12 / 4.5	3.72 / 9	3.71 / 9	3.85 / 9
2. The training sessions adequately addressed the professional development needs of Grade 1 teachers.	3.97 / 7	4.01 / 3	3.68 / 10	3.89 / 6
3. The sessions effectively enhanced understanding of teaching strategies for numeracy instruction.	4.12 / 4.5	3.85 / 7	3.74 / 8	3.90 / 5
4. The training improved teachers' confidence in implementing the strategies learned in daily teaching practices.	3.88 / 9	3.93 / 5	3.83 / 5.5	3.88 / 7.5
5. The sessions sufficiently prepared teachers to differentiate instruction based on diverse learning needs of Grade 1 learners.	4.05 / 6	4.14 / 1	3.92 / 2	4.04 / 2
6. The training helped equip teachers in managing potential challenges during curriculum implementation.	3.79 / 10	3.77 / 8	3.79 / 7	3.78 / 10
7. The provided teaching resources and materials were frequently utilized during the implementation of the curriculum.	4.24 / 2	3.66 / 10	3.87 / 3	3.92 / 4
8. Practical examples or case studies relevant to the classroom context were included in the training.	4.17 / 3	4.04 / 2	4.08 / 1	4.10 / 1
9. The sessions contributed to the improvement of classroom management skills during curriculum implementation.	3.91 / 8	3.89 / 6	3.83 / 5.5	3.88 / 7.5
10. Improvements in learners' numeracy skills were observed following the curriculum implementation.	4.25 / 1	3.98 / 4	3.86 / 4	4.03 / 3
AVERAGE	4.05	3.90	3.83	3.93

Table 2 shows an overall mean of 3.93, Much Evident. Practical examples or case studies ranked first at 4.10, followed by preparation for differentiated instruction at 4.04 and observed learner improvement at 4.03. Preparation for managing implementation challenges ranked last at 3.78. These results indicate favorable reported training support while identifying practical problem management as a relative area for strengthening. The learner-improvement statement remains a teacher perception and does not replace the separate assessment results. The big school had the highest group mean, 4.05, followed by medium schools at 3.90 and small schools at 3.83. Within small schools, contextual examples ranked first, while professional development needs ranked last. Within medium schools, differentiation ranked first. These descriptive priorities suggest that training content could be adjusted to different contexts. The table does not demonstrate that a particular training component caused improved numeracy, nor does it test whether the group means differed significantly.

3.3 Provision of support materials

Table 3. Implementation activities for provision of support materials

Indicator	Big School Wx / Rank	Medium Schools Wx / Rank	Small Schools Wx / Rank	Average Wx / Rank
1. The provided worksheets and activity sheets were appropriate for reinforcing the curriculum content among Grade 1 learners.	3.89 / 9.5	3.84 / 8	3.92 / 7	3.88 / 10
2. Digital resources made available during the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum were accessible and user-friendly.	4.03 / 4.5	3.92 / 5	4.06 / 3	4.00 / 3.5
3. The supplementary materials (e.g., flashcards, manipulatives) enhanced learner engagement with the curriculum content.	4.06 / 2.5	3.76 / 10	3.99 / 4	3.94 / 6
4. A variety of high-quality resources were provided to support the implementation of the curriculum.	3.98 / 7	4.01 / 2	4.12 / 2	4.04 / 1
5. Supplementary materials were frequently integrated into teaching practices during curriculum implementation.	4.03 / 4.5	3.88 / 7	4.18 / 1	4.03 / 2
6. Specific resources or materials were identified as particularly effective in supporting learners' understanding.	4.19 / 1	3.95 / 4	3.87 / 9	4.00 / 3.5
7. The availability of support materials significantly influenced the teachers' ability to implement the curriculum effectively.	3.94 / 8	3.89 / 6	3.91 / 8	3.91 / 8
8. The provided materials catered to the diverse learning styles and abilities of Grade 1 learners.	3.89 / 9.5	4.15 / 1	3.63 / 10	3.89 / 9

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Big School Wx / Rank	Medium Schools Wx / Rank	Small Schools Wx / Rank	Average Wx / Rank
9. The provision of support materials positively influenced learner motivation and engagement.	4.06 / 2.5	3.98 / 3	3.94 / 6	3.99 / 5
10. The support materials were aligned with the learning objectives and expected outcomes specified in the curriculum.	3.99 / 6	3.83 / 9	3.97 / 5	3.93 / 7
AVERAGE	4.01	3.92	3.96	3.96

Table 3 reports an overall mean of 3.96, the highest of the four implementation domains. Variety of high-quality resources ranked first at 4.04, and frequent integration of supplementary materials ranked second at 4.03. Digital accessibility and identification of particularly effective resources shared rank 3.5 at 4.00. Appropriateness of worksheets and activity sheets ranked last at 3.88. The ratings indicate reported material availability and use, while leaving open questions about the quality of particular tasks and their fit to individual learners.

The big school mean was 4.01, the small-school mean 3.96, and the medium-school mean 3.92. Small schools rated integration of supplementary materials highest at 4.18 but accommodation of diverse learning styles and abilities lowest at 3.63. That contrast identifies a distinction between frequent material use and perceived suitability for varied needs. The statement wording includes claims of influence and effectiveness, but its ratings should be interpreted as judgments expressed by respondents rather than independent effect estimates.

3.4 Parents support

Table 4. Implementation activities for parents support

Indicator	Big School Wx / Rank	Medium Schools Wx / Rank	Small Schools Wx / Rank	Average Wx / Rank
1. There was full participation among parents and guardians during the orientation on the implementation of the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum.	4.18 / 1	3.92 / 6	3.55 / 9	3.88 / 7.5
2. Parents and guardians were properly informed about the goals and expectations of the curriculum implemented for Grade 1 learners.	4.12 / 4	3.88 / 9	3.68 / 4	3.89 / 6
3. Regular communication was maintained between teachers and parents/guardians regarding their involvement in supporting their child's learning throughout the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum.	4.05 / 8	4.08 / 1	3.64 / 6	3.92 / 3
4. Teachers provided parents and guardians with resources or guidelines to assist their child's learning at home.	4.09 / 6	3.97 / 3	3.51 / 10	3.86 / 9
5. Parents and guardians were responsive to school communications concerning their child's progress during the curriculum implementation.	4.17 / 2	3.95 / 4	3.62 / 7	3.91 / 4
6. Barriers faced by parents or guardians in supporting their child's home learning during curriculum implementation were addressed as needed.	4.03 / 9	4.01 / 2	3.77 / 2	3.94 / 1.5
7. Parental involvement had a notable impact on the academic motivation and performance of Grade 1 learners.	4.11 / 5	3.91 / 7	3.79 / 1	3.94 / 1.5
8. Parent-teacher meetings or conferences effectively addressed learner progress and strategies for improvement during the implementation period.	3.98 / 10	3.93 / 5	3.74 / 3	3.88 / 7.5
9. The school actively encouraged, recognized, and facilitated parental participation in activities related to the curriculum.	4.15 / 3	3.89 / 8	3.66 / 5	3.90 / 5
10. Parents and guardians were given opportunities to express concerns or provide feedback regarding the curriculum and their child's learning experience.	4.07 / 7	3.87 / 10	3.58 / 8	3.84 / 10
AVERAGE	4.10	3.94	3.65	3.90

Table 4 shows an overall parent-support mean of 3.90, Much Evident. Addressing barriers to home learning and perceived parental influence on motivation and performance shared the highest mean, 3.94, and rank 1.5. Opportunities to express concerns or feedback ranked last at 3.84, followed by resources or guidance for home learning at 3.86. The overall pattern suggests that communication and participation were reported, while opportunities for families to receive usable guidance and contribute feedback remained relative priorities.

The group means were 4.10 in the big school, 3.94 in medium schools, and 3.65 in small schools. Small schools rated provision of home-learning guidance lowest at 3.51 and parental orientation at 3.55, both still within Much Evident. These findings support attention to the accessibility and usefulness of engagement activities. They do not establish that parents in smaller schools were less committed or that household characteristics caused the differences. Parents themselves were not documented as survey respondents.

3.5 Attendance of learners

Table 5. Implementation activities for attendance of learners

Indicator	Big School Wx / Rank	Medium Schools Wx / Rank	Small Schools Wx / Rank	Average Wx / Rank
1. The average daily attendance rate of Grade 1 learners was consistently high during the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum.	4.08 / 3	3.88 / 6	3.97 / 1	3.98 / 2
2. Teachers actively monitored and addressed issues related to learner absenteeism during the curriculum implementation.	4.05 / 5	3.75 / 9	3.85 / 4	3.88 / 6
3. Learner attendance had a significant impact on their academic progress and performance in numeracy.	3.91 / 8	3.92 / 5	3.82 / 5	3.88 / 6
4. Specific strategies were implemented to promote regular attendance among Grade 1 learners during the program.	3.76 / 10	4.02 / 2	3.77 / 6	3.85 / 8
5. Learner absenteeism negatively affected their ability to fully engage in curriculum activities and lessons.	4.12 / 1	3.84 / 7	3.67 / 9	3.88 / 6
6. Observable trends or patterns in attendance were associated with specific activities or subject areas within the curriculum.	3.89 / 9	3.96 / 4	3.91 / 2	3.92 / 4
7. The school clearly communicated attendance expectations and policies to Grade 1 learners and their families during the implementation period.	3.95 / 7	3.73 / 10	3.58 / 10	3.75 / 10
8. Incentives or recognition were provided to encourage consistent attendance among Grade 1 learners.	4.07 / 4	4.15 / 1	3.69 / 8	3.97 / 3
9. The school demonstrated understanding and support for learners facing challenges in maintaining regular attendance.	3.98 / 6	3.78 / 8	3.74 / 7	3.83 / 9
10. Parents and guardians played a significant role in monitoring and promoting their children's attendance during the implementation of the curriculum.	4.11 / 2	3.99 / 3	3.86 / 3	3.99 / 1
AVERAGE	3.99	3.90	3.79	3.89

Table 5 gives an overall mean of 3.89, Much Evident. Parental monitoring and promotion of attendance ranked first at 3.99, perceived high daily attendance ranked second at 3.98, and incentives or recognition ranked third at 3.97. Communication of attendance expectations ranked last at 3.75. Understanding and support for learners facing attendance challenges ranked ninth at 3.83. The result distinguishes favorable perceptions of participation from comparatively lower ratings of some measures intended to sustain it. Group means were 3.99 for the big school, 3.90 for medium schools, and 3.79 for small schools. The positively and negatively worded statements require interpretation at item level. For example, agreement that absenteeism negatively affected engagement describes a perceived problem, not the successful delivery of an attendance support activity. The combined domain mean is retained as reported, but it should not be converted into an attendance rate or a causal estimate linking attendance to assessment improvement.

3.6 Summary of implementation activities

Table 6. Summary of the extent of implementation activities

Domain	Big School Wx / Rank	Medium Schools Wx / Rank	Small Schools Wx / Rank	Average Wx / Rank
Capacity Building of Teachers	4.05 / 2	3.90 / 3.5	3.83 / 2	3.93 / 2
Provision of Support Materials	4.01 / 3	3.92 / 2	3.96 / 1	3.96 / 1
Parents' Support	4.10 / 1	3.94 / 1	3.65 / 4	3.90 / 3
Attendance of Learners	3.99 / 4	3.90 / 3.5	3.79 / 3	3.89 / 4
AVERAGE	4.04	3.92	3.81	3.92

Table 6 summarizes a favorable implementation profile across all four domains, with an overall mean of 3.92. Support materials ranked first, followed by capacity building, parents' support, and attendance. The big school had the highest overall group mean, 4.04, while the small-school group had 3.81. These summaries indicate the reported extent of activities. They do not establish that the highest-rated domain was the strongest determinant of numeracy improvement or that the lowest-rated group achieved the weakest learner outcomes.

3.7 Agreement on implementation rankings

Table 7. Kendall concordance on implementation activity rankings

Domain	ΣD^2	W	χ^2	H ₁ decision	Significance
Capacity Building of Teachers	372.5	0.38	10.26	Rejected	Not Significant
Provision of Support Materials	216	0.22	5.94	Rejected	Not Significant
Parents' Support	120.5	0.12	3.24	Rejected	Not Significant
Attendance of Learners	266.5	0.27	7.29	Rejected	Not Significant

Table 7 reports no significant agreement for any implementation domain. Capacity building had the highest W, 0.38, followed by attendance at 0.27, support materials at 0.22, and parents' support at 0.12. The respective chi-square statistics were 10.26, 7.29, 5.94, and 3.24,

all below the reported 0.05 critical value of 16.92. The alternative hypothesis of significant rank agreement was rejected in each domain. The nonsignificant results do not negate the Much Evident mean ratings. A high mean describes reported extent, while concordance concerns similarity in the ordering of statements across groups. Groups can rate activities favorably while prioritizing their components differently. The results therefore support examining local priorities within an overall favorable profile. They do not establish that school size caused those priorities or that a nonsignificant result proves complete disagreement.

3.8 Posttest numeracy profile

Table 8 reports posttest records for 930 learners. Full Intervention included 196 learners, or the reported 21%; Moderate Intervention included 176, 19%; Light Intervention included 279, 30%; and Grade Ready included 279, 30%. The overall mean percentage score was 70.17%, interpreted as Moderate Intervention. The posttest distribution was more favorable than the baseline distribution, but substantial needs remained across the intervention categories.

Table 8. Profile of posttest numeracy scores

School	FI n (%)	MI n (%)	LI n (%)	GR n (%)	Overall n (%)
Big School					
Lagonoy South Central School	24 (3)	54 (6)	68 (7)	63 (7)	209 (22)
Medium Schools					
Burabod Elementary School	14 (1)	8 (1)	19 (2)	12 (1)	53 (6)
Dahat Elementary School	9 (1)	9 (1)	10 (1)	9 (1)	37 (4)
Loho Elementary School	11 (1)	8 (1)	16 (2)	13 (1)	48 (5)
Pinamihagan Elementary School	14 (1)	12 (1)	12 (1)	12 (1)	50 (5)
San Rafael-Agpo Elementary School	14 (1)	10 (1)	19 (2)	27 (3)	70 (8)
San Ramon Elementary School	13 (1)	9 (1)	24 (3)	26 (3)	72 (8)
San Roque Elementary School	14 (1)	10 (1)	15 (2)	8 (1)	47 (5)
San Sebastian Elementary School	12 (1)	9 (1)	16 (2)	23 (2)	60 (6)
Subtotal medium	101 (11)	75 (8)	131 (14)	130 (14)	437 (47)
Small Schools					
Agosais Elementary School	3 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	11 (1)
Amoguis Elementary School	6 (1)	4 (0)	12 (1)	4 (0)	26 (3)
Bolo Elementary School	5 (1)	2 (0)	10 (1)	6 (1)	23 (2)
Binanuahan Elementary School	10 (1)	5 (1)	6 (1)	8 (1)	29 (3)
Cabotonan Elementary School	12 (1)	6 (1)	6 (1)	10 (1)	34 (4)
Gubat Elementary School	13 (1)	7 (1)	19 (2)	25 (3)	64 (7)
Himagtocon Elementary School	3 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	10 (1)
Kinahulogan Elementary School	6 (1)	5 (1)	6 (1)	7 (1)	24 (3)
Manamoc Elementary School	7 (1)	5 (1)	9 (1)	13 (1)	34 (4)
Panagan Elementary School	3 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	11 (1)
Panicuan Elementary School	3 (0)	5 (1)	5 (1)	5 (1)	18 (2)
Subtotal small	71 (7)	47 (5)	80 (8)	86 (9)	284 (31)
TOTAL	196 (21)	176 (19)	279 (30)	279 (30)	930

Medium schools contributed 130 Grade Ready records, small schools 86, and the big school 63. The big school's Full Intervention count was 24 at posttest compared with 113 at pretest. The corresponding medium- and small-school subtotals were 101 and 71 at posttest, compared with 245 and 146 at pretest. These are aggregate comparisons. The tables do not identify which learners moved between categories, and differences in record totals prevent treating every category-count change as an observed individual transition.

The assessment totals decreased in each school-size group. The study reported a district reduction of 24 records between assessment occasions. Transfers, absence, or recording difficulties were discussed as possible explanations, but no documented breakdown was provided. Those possibilities are therefore not reported as observed causes. The assessment profiles support continued assistance for learners who remained in intervention categories and a clearer account of participation in future evaluations.

3.9 Reported improvement from pretest to posttest

Table 9. Reported numeracy changes and paired sample test

Indicator	Pretest	Posttest	Reported interpretation
Full Intervention	52.83% (504 learners)	21.08% (196 learners)	31.75% decrease on learners needing full intervention
Moderate Intervention	25.05% (239 learners)	18.92% (176 learners)	6.13% decrease on learners needing moderate intervention
Light Intervention	13.52% (129 learners)	30.00% (279 learners)	16.48% of learners need light intervention
Grade Ready	8.60% (82 learners)	30.00% (279 learners)	21.4% of learners are grade ready

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Pretest	Posttest	Reported interpretation
Overall (Mean Percentage Score – MPS)	55.34% (954 learners)	70.17% (930 learners)	14.83% increase on overall performance
Skill Level (based on Overall MPS)	Full Intervention	Moderate Intervention	
Mean Difference (d)	14.83		
Standard Deviation of Differences	154		
Computed t-value	2.94		
Degree of Freedom	929		
Tabular t-value at 0.05	1.96		
Tabular t-value at 0.025	2.24		
Tabular t-value at 0.01	2.58		
Tabular t-value at 0.005	2.81		
Tabular t-value at 0.001	3.30		
Decision on the Alternative Hypothesis (H_1)	Accepted		
Significance of Improvement	0.005		

Table 9 reports an increase in overall mean percentage score from 55.34% to 70.17%, a difference of 14.83 percentage points. The Full Intervention share decreased from 52.83% to 21.08%, and Grade Ready increased from 8.60% to 30.00%. Moderate Intervention decreased from 25.05% to 18.92%, while Light Intervention increased from 13.52% to 30.00%. The category percentages in this comparison are retained separately from the whole-number percentages in Tables 1 and 8.

The reported t-value, 2.94, exceeded the reported critical value of 2.81 at the 0.005 level and remained below 3.30 at 0.001. The study consequently accepted the alternative hypothesis of significant improvement. This is the reported inferential conclusion. Its independent verification is constrained by the unreported matched dataset and the unclear units of the stated standard deviation of differences, 154. The result should therefore be interpreted alongside the documented aggregate improvement and the limitations of the analysis.

4. Discussion

4.1 Baseline needs and differentiated recovery

Acob et al. (2023) emphasized the use of assessment results to determine further instructional responses within the eight-week curriculum. The study's baseline and posttest distributions similarly support treating assessment as a guide to continuing assistance. A favorable district mean should not conceal learners who remain in intensive intervention categories. The practical implication is to retain assessment-informed planning after the instructional period rather than regard program completion as equivalent to uniform mastery.

4.2 Teacher learning and instructional resources

The teacher capacity-building ratings identify contextual examples and differentiation as relatively strong aspects of training, while preparation for implementation challenges was lower. This pattern supports professional learning that links concepts with classroom decisions. Teachers may need opportunities to discuss how to respond when learners progress at different rates, when materials are unsuitable, or when attendance interrupts instruction. These are implications of the item content and relative ratings; the study did not evaluate a new coaching intervention or document the frequency of such challenges.

Domanico and Embile (2025) identified teacher preparation, knowledge, and available resources among the facilitating and hindering conditions of Grade 1 curriculum implementation. The comparison is pertinent because the study likewise measured training and material provision as separate domains. However, favorable mean ratings in both domains do not demonstrate that training and resources interacted statistically or produced the observed assessment change. The study did not link individual teacher ratings to the outcomes of their specific learners.

The support-material results distinguish availability from suitability. The highest-rated average item concerned resource variety, whereas worksheet appropriateness ranked lowest. Within small schools, frequent use of supplementary materials coexisted with a lower rating for meeting diverse learning needs. The implication is to review what learners are asked to do with resources and whether tasks address identified skills. Merely increasing the quantity of materials would not necessarily resolve the concerns expressed by those relative item ratings.

Aguhayon et al. (2023) provide evidence for differentiated mathematics instruction in an older learner population. Their findings support discussing differentiation as a purposeful instructional response, while the developmental difference limits direct transfer to Grade 1. In the study, differentiated support should be interpreted through early numeracy tasks and diagnostic needs rather than through an assumption that strategies effective with adolescents will work unchanged with beginning learners. The ratings indicate perceived preparation for differentiation, not observed fidelity or verified skill-specific effects.

4.3 Family engagement and attendance support

The parent-support domain was favorable overall but showed differences across school-size groups. Small schools had lower ratings for home-learning guidance and orientation than the big school. These findings do not warrant blaming families for learner performance. Teacher reports may reflect the accessibility of communication, the availability of guidance, or differences in school routines, none of which were independently assessed. A practical response would be to examine what parents receive, whether they can use it, and whether opportunities for feedback are meaningful.

Belarmino and Tamban (2023) examined structured support for parents of Grade 1 learners. Their investigation is relevant to the study's emphasis on orientation and home-learning guidance. The comparison supports treating parent engagement as something

schools can assist through clear instructions and communication. It does not establish that parental involvement explains the numeracy gains observed in Lagonoy South District, because the study did not measure or test that relationship directly.

Attendance is similarly important to implementation but was measured through perceptions. The rating for consistently high daily attendance cannot be read as a percentage of days attended, and the item concerning attendance's significant impact is not a statistical significance test. The negatively worded absenteeism item also differs from positively framed support practices. For program monitoring, these distinctions matter: attendance records, reasons for absence, outreach activities, and perceived consequences each provide different evidence.

4.4 Implementation extent and variation in priorities

Table 6 indicates that all four implementation domains were rated Much Evident, while Table 7 reports no significant agreement in item rankings. These results are compatible because they measure different features of the responses. Groups may report extensive use of activities while differing in which activities they regard as most evident. The appropriate implication is to investigate local priorities within a common recovery framework, rather than classify implementation as uniformly successful or unsuccessful on the basis of one statistic.

4.5 Numeracy change and the limits of effectiveness claims

Miña and Caballes (2023) reported improvement following the same named recovery curriculum in a different grade and division. Their findings offer a regional comparison for the direction of change observed here. The study does not provide a harmonized effect size or a common assessment scale for comparing magnitudes across the two settings. It would consequently be inappropriate to conclude that the curriculum was more effective in one district or grade on the basis of their reported t-values or category percentages.

A paired analysis requires scores from the same learners at both occasions. The reported df of 929 is compatible with an analysis of 930 pairs, but the posttest total alone does not establish that those pairs were constructed correctly. Moreover, the district pretest mean is reported for 954 learners, while the posttest mean is reported for 930. The mean of paired differences cannot be independently confirmed by subtracting means that may describe different assessment sets. This distinction is central to evaluating the reported t-test.

The standard deviation of differences of 154 also requires a documented measurement scale. Its meaning cannot be assumed to be percentage points simply because the overall performance summaries are mean percentage scores. The study did not supply individual difference scores or another unit definition that would resolve the issue. The manuscript therefore retains the reported test while limiting its interpretation. No replacement standard deviation, p value, or effect size has been introduced.

Even a verified paired difference would demonstrate change over time rather than isolate the curriculum as its sole cause. No comparison group or randomized assignment was documented. Other instruction, maturation, differences in test administration, or repeated assessment could contribute to change. The study's conclusion of improvement is supported descriptively by its reported profiles, but a strong causal claim of program effectiveness exceeds the documented design and available analytical detail.

4.6 Practical implications and pointers

The study generated practical pointers for school leaders, teachers, district coordinators, parents, and education officials. These included continuing short-term recovery assistance aligned with developmental readiness; strengthening teacher professional learning; using differentiated instruction; ensuring timely and adequate materials; supporting home learning; monitoring attendance and motivation; establishing feedback mechanisms; contextualizing activities; tracking assessment records; studying long-term retention; and involving community partners. Consideration of wider implementation was also recommended. These are proposed responses to the findings, not interventions whose effects were separately tested.

4.7 Limitations and further investigation

Several limitations qualify the findings. The study's methodological documentation did not specify its formal design, teacher sampling procedure, instrument validation or reliability, exact assessment dates, category thresholds, or test equivalence. Individual records and linked learner transitions were not provided. These omissions limit reproducibility and prevent independent confirmation of the paired analysis. They do not justify filling procedural gaps with standard practices that may not have been used.

There are additional reporting limitations in the assessment profiles. Some reported percentages differ from conventional rounding, and assessment populations differ between occasions. Means cannot be reconstructed from category counts alone. The study also reports no confidence intervals, standardized effect sizes, independent observations of teaching, or long-term follow-up. Its outcomes are limited to the reported assessment period and measures.

Further investigation should document the administered assessments, verify linked records, explain missing outcomes, and establish the reliability and validity of implementation measures. A comparison design or repeated follow-up could help distinguish program-related change from other influences and examine retention. Linking classroom implementation with learner outcomes would permit direct analysis of the relationships suggested by the study's practical pointers. Such work should retain careful ethical safeguards for children's educational information.

5. Conclusion

The study reported that implementation activities for the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum were Much Evident among Grade 1 teachers in Lagonoy South District during School Year 2024–2025. Provision of support materials was the highest-rated domain, followed by teacher capacity building, parents' support, and learner attendance. No significant agreement on item rankings was reported across big, medium, and small school groups in any domain, indicating that favorable implementation ratings did not entail a common ordering of activities.

Numeracy profiles showed a favorable aggregate shift: the reported mean percentage score increased from 55.34% to 70.17%, Full Intervention decreased from 504 to 196 learners, and Grade Ready increased from 82 to 279. The reported paired test classified improvement as significant at 0.005, with $t = 2.94$ and $df = 929$. Different assessment totals, incomplete information about matching,

and unresolved measurement details limit independent verification and causal attribution. The findings support continued targeted assistance and stronger monitoring rather than a claim that every learner achieved recovery.

Teacher development, contextualized resources, family guidance, attendance support, and accurate learner tracking remain practical priorities. The study's pointers offer directions for strengthening those activities. Further evaluation should establish the integrity of matched assessment data, document implementation, and examine whether gains are sustained before making stronger claims about curriculum effectiveness or wider scalability.

References

- [1] Acob, J. L., Brigue, N. A., Carable, V. P., Dela Vega, D. E., Jallores, E. R., & Parola, M. A. (2023). Eight week curriculum for Key Stage 1 learners; its impact on the improvement of their academic performance. *International Education Trend Issue*, 1(2), 114–119. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ieti.v1i2.192>
- [2] Aguhayon, H. G., Tingson, R. D., & Pentang, J. T. (2023). Addressing students learning gaps in mathematics through differentiated instruction. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(1), 69–87. <https://doi.org/10.53378/352967>
- [3] Belarmino, M. J. T., & Tamban, V. E. (2023). Enhancing numeracy and literacy skills of Grade I pupils through a parent-induced learning program: Ilaw sa Lilim for para teachers coping with bereavement. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 5(1), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v5i1.1143>
- [4] Domanico, J. D., & Embile, R. F. (2025). The effectiveness of the 8-Week Learning Recovery Curriculum in improving the numeracy skills of Grade 1 learners. *Pantao (The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 4(3), 4952–4961. <https://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0403460>
- [5] Miña, C. M., & Caballes, D. G. (2023). Evaluation of the implementation of the 8-week learning recovery curriculum in numeracy of grade 3 learners of Legazpi city. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 17(3), 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.3.0355>