

The Strategies in Improving the Literacy Skills of the Grade 3 Learners in the Public Elementary Schools of Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur

Fame G. Norberto¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Grade 3 Literacy Instructional Strategies Phonological Awareness Active Learning Tigaon District Kendall's W	The study examined reported literacy-skill indicators and instructional strategies for Grade 3 learners in the public elementary schools of Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur, during school year 2025–2026. The study reported an overall literacy-skill mean of 4.35 (“Much Evident”), with phonological and phonemic awareness both at 4.41 and cognitive skills lowest at 4.19. Teachers’ six instructional-strategy domains averaged 3.86 (“Much Employed”), led by active learning (3.94) and followed by mnemonic strategies (3.88), while peer teaching was lowest (3.81). The reported Kendall coefficients were .94–.99 across the four literacy domains and .82–.99 across the six strategy domains, representing strong agreement in ranked indicators among the three school-size groups. The findings described reported ratings and rank agreement; no student-level pretest–posttest or causal estimates were available. The study recommended closer diagnosis of cognitive skills, explicit phonological practice and stronger peer-supported literacy activities.

1. Introduction

Foundational literacy encompasses the coordinated development of sound awareness, language knowledge, reading, writing and the cognitive processes that support comprehension. In Grade 3, weaknesses in these areas can affect participation across the curriculum: understanding instructions, organizing a written response and monitoring the meaning of a passage draw on more than word-level decoding. The distinction between individual literacy components matters when translating teacher reports into instructional priorities.

The present study situated the problem in public elementary schools of Tigaon District, Division of Camarines Sur. Its study separated literacy indicators into phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, language development and cognitive skills. It also examined the instructional strategies employed by teachers: visual processing, mnemonic strategies, writing strategies, hands-on learning, peer teaching and active learning. The study reported school-size comparisons for big, medium and small schools.

According to the Institute of Education Sciences foundational-skills practice guide, early-grade instruction benefits from systematic attention to language, sound–letter correspondences, decoding and reading connected text (Foorman et al., 2016/2019). This literature provides an interpretive framework for the sound-awareness domains; it does not independently validate the local survey findings. Writing instruction also requires regular opportunities to generate and organize text, not simply mechanical practice (Graham et al., 2012/2018).

Instructional strategies are not interchangeable. Mnemonics primarily support encoding and recall, hands-on activities provide embodied manipulation, peer teaching relies on explanation and reciprocal feedback, and active learning encourages overt processing. Their usefulness depends on alignment with the targeted skill, quality of implementation and learners’ starting competencies. Hence a high mean for strategy use should be distinguished from a demonstrated gain in literacy performance.

A further issue is the level of aggregation. The study compared item ranks among three school-size groups and reported Kendall’s coefficient of concordance. Agreement among group rankings is a question about consistency of prioritization, not a test of whether a strategy predicts a learner’s score. The analysis below retains this difference because the original study sometimes discussed strong ratings using the language of effectiveness.

The study thus addressed two related descriptive questions: which literacy domains teachers rated as evident, and which instructional approaches teachers reported employing. It also examined rank agreement among the big-, medium- and small-school groups.

2. Methods

The study was reported as an assessment of Grade 3 learners’ literacy skills and teachers’ instructional strategies during school year 2025–2026. The study presented results from three school categories: big, medium and small schools within Tigaon District. The attached title page identified the researcher and dissertation title, but did not contain a sample frame or procedures. The exact numbers of teachers, learners and schools, the survey administration timeline, and inclusion criteria were not documented in the supplied files. Four observed or rated literacy domains were covered: phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, language development and cognitive skills. Six strategy categories were assessed: visual processing, mnemonic strategies, writing strategies, hands-on learning, peer teaching and active learning. Study tables provided indicator means, overall domain means, rank positions and verbal interpretations. The numeric scales visible as “Much Evident” for skills and “Much Employed” for instructional strategies.

For descriptive analysis, the manuscript extracted the displayed means for each school-size group and the grand means without recomputing respondent-level statistics. The study presented Kendall's W and associated chi-square tests for ranked indicators across three school groups. These results are transcribed as reported, and the chi-square tail probabilities shown later are independent arithmetic checks using the displayed degrees of freedom, not replacements for unavailable tie-correction or raw-rank analyses.

The available materials did not show whether the domain ratings reflected direct individual pupil assessments, teacher judgments, or a mixed measurement process. Consequently, the wording "reported literacy indicators" is preferred to a claim of independently tested learner achievement. The study did not supply baseline–follow-up comparisons, an experimental counterfactual, reliability coefficients, or ethical review documentation. The report maintained the original group labels and the reported values; no missing denominators, correlations or test statistics were estimated. External literature was used only to frame the educational implications, while the tables themselves were derived from the supplied data.

3. Results

3.1 Profile of reported Grade 3 literacy skills

Table 1. Mean ratings of Grade 3 literacy-skill domains by school category

Domain	Big	Medium	Small	Overall
Phonological awareness	4.43	4.41	4.38	4.41
Phonemic awareness	4.43	4.41	4.39	4.41
Language development	4.40	4.38	4.36	4.38
Cognitive skills	4.21	4.19	4.17	4.19
Overall	4.37	4.35	4.33	4.35

The overall literacy profile was rated 4.35. Phonological awareness and phonemic awareness shared the highest overall rating at 4.41. Language development followed at 4.38, while cognitive skills ranked lowest at 4.19. The difference between the highest and lowest domain means was 0.22 scale point. This comparatively narrow but consistent ordering is meaningful for planning: strong reported sound-awareness indicators should not obscure the relative weakness of attention, reasoning and other cognitive processes. The size-group pattern was consistent. For phonological awareness, the study recorded 4.43 for big schools, 4.41 for medium schools and 4.38 for small schools. Comparable values for phonemic awareness were 4.43, 4.41 and 4.39. Thus the study showed a small numerical gradient favoring big schools; without respondent dispersion or sample counts, neither the precision nor significance of these mean differences can be established.

Cognitive skills were assessed at 4.21 in big schools, 4.19 in medium schools and 4.17 in small schools. Their lower position across all three groups made them a consistent instructional planning concern, regardless of school-size category. A practical follow-up is to use task-level evidence of sustained attention, reasoning and response accuracy rather than infer a general cognitive deficit from one summary score.

Table 2. Reported concordance of literacy-skill indicator rankings

Domain	Kendall W	χ^2	df	χ^2 tail p
Phonological awareness	0.96	28.80	10	0.0013
Phonemic awareness	0.98	29.40	10	0.0011
Language development	0.99	32.67	11	0.0006
Cognitive skills	0.94	25.38	9	0.0026

The study reported concordance coefficients from .94 to .99 for the four literacy domains. At the level of item rank ordering, all three school-size groups therefore tended to prioritize similar indicators. This is not the same question as whether pupils in the schools had equivalent performance distributions, because Kendall's W was calculated from ranked indicators rather than observations on individual pupils.

The rank-agreement calculations should be revisited if study data are supplied. Tied ranks can affect concordance calculations; the tables show rounded W and chi-square values, but do not provide the complete observation-level data, tie adjustments or software output. Accordingly, the original results are retained and used descriptively rather than interpreted as new inferential evidence about individual learners. Reported instructional strategies

Table 3. Mean ratings of literacy instructional strategies

Instructional domain	Big	Medium	Small	Overall
Visual processing	3.86	3.83	3.82	3.84
Mnemonic strategies	3.89	3.87	3.87	3.88
Writing strategies	3.83	3.82	3.81	3.82
Hands-on learning	3.87	3.86	3.85	3.86
Peer teaching	3.83	3.81	3.80	3.81
Active learning	3.94	3.95	3.93	3.94
Overall	3.87	3.86	3.85	3.86

The instructional approaches received an aggregate mean of 3.86, interpreted as "Much Employed." Active learning was highest at 3.94, followed by mnemonic strategies (3.88), hands-on learning (3.86), visual processing (3.84), writing strategies (3.82) and peer teaching (3.81). The domain spread was 0.13 scale point; although all six categories met the same verbal descriptor, there were visible opportunities to rebalance classroom practices.

Active learning retained the highest mean within each school-size group, at 3.94, 3.95 and 3.93. The consistency suggests that activities requiring learner participation were commonly reported across the district. In contrast, peer teaching received the lowest

mean in each group. This may reflect constraints in structuring cooperative pairs, explicit explanation routines or peer feedback, but the available data do not establish why peer instruction was less frequently reported.

Mnemonic strategies were the second-highest domain (3.88). Their instructional benefit is plausible when learners must retrieve spellings, vocabulary and sound patterns. Nevertheless, memorization supports rather than substitutes for comprehension: an effective sequence should link mnemonic recall to text interpretation, meaningful writing and dialogue.

Writing strategies (3.82) and visual processing (3.84) were among the lower-rated approaches. In Grade 3 these practices are important for making thinking visible through sentence construction, graphic organizers, illustrations and revision. Guided modeling can ensure that they are not limited to copying exercises or passive exposure to visual displays.

Table 4. Reported concordance of strategy-indicator rankings

Strategy	W	χ^2	df	χ^2 tail p
Visual processing	0.82	24.60	10	0.0062
Mnemonic strategies	0.95	25.65	9	0.0023
Writing strategies	0.99	29.70	10	0.0010
Hands-on learning	0.97	26.19	9	0.0019
Peer teaching	0.99	29.70	10	0.0010
Active learning	0.99	29.70	10	0.0010

All six domains displayed strong reported ranking agreement, ranging from $W = .82$ for visual processing to $W = .99$ for writing strategies, peer teaching and active learning. Such common rankings can help district personnel identify practices that teachers collectively perceive as more established and those they may need support to implement.

Agreement did not measure the effectiveness of those practices. In the absence of linked pupil-level reading scores, the coefficient cannot establish that active learning caused the literacy-skill mean of 4.35. A subsequent study should measure instruction frequency and independently assessed learning outcomes for the same pupils and teachers.

Table 5. Examples of item-level teaching and skill indicators

Area	Indicator	Mean
Phonological awareness	Identify several words beginning with the same sound using word cards	4.54
Phonological awareness	Recognize, identify and produce rhyming words	4.26
Phonological awareness	Produce words beginning with specified sounds	4.26
Phonemic awareness	Blend together individual sounds to form words	4.38
Visual processing	Use assistive technology	4.12
Mnemonic strategies	Use the keyword mnemonic method to improve recall	3.51
Writing strategies	Brainstorm topics to write about	3.42
Hands-on learning	Let learners write a creative story, poem or essay	3.44
Peer teaching	Understand when and how to pose thought-provoking questions	3.84

Within phonological awareness, identification using word cards was rated 4.54, whereas rhyme generation and producing words beginning with certain sounds were each rated 4.26. Recognition with prepared cues can be easier to demonstrate in a classroom rating than production without such cues. Teachers should therefore make opportunities for independent generation explicit rather than assume that high recognition scores encompass all aspects of sound manipulation.

The selected strategy indicators likewise showed variations not visible in the broad domain means. Use of assistive technology (4.12) ranked above some generative literacy practices. Brainstorming topics for writing (3.42) and having learners create a story, poem or essay (3.44) were below the “Much Employed” threshold despite the overall writing and hands-on domain classifications. These specific activities may be priorities for lesson planning and coaching.

Because these values arise from item ratings rather than direct evidence of pupils completing the tasks, the findings suggest where to collect better evidence next: written work samples, timed but developmentally appropriate decoding checks, observations of reciprocal explanation and common rubrics for written responses.

3.1 Detailed item-level results

The following condensed tables retain individual indicator wording and the four corresponding means from the original detailed results tables. They provide a more transparent basis for the domain-level results reported above. Each row reproduces an existing study indicator rather than constituting a new sample or an independently measured student outcome.

Table 6. Phonological-awareness indicator means

Indicator	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Identify words ending with the same sound.	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.52
Identify the similar sounds at the beginning of a word.	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.29
Identify and segment words in a sentence and into syllables.	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.33
Identify whether or not 2 spoken words begin with the same sound.	4.52	4.51	4.50	4.51
Select from 3 spoken words those that begin with the same sound.	4.35	4.33	4.30	4.33
Identify several words that begin with the same sound as the spoken word.	4.39	4.36	4.32	4.36
Identify several words that begin with the same sound using word cards.	4.57	4.55	4.51	4.54
Identify several words that begin with the same sound using word pictures.	4.56	4.53	4.50	4.53

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Recognize and identify rhyming words and produce rhyming words.	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.26
Blend individual sounds together to make a word (e.g. c a t = cat).	4.54	4.53	4.50	4.52
Produce words that begin with certain sounds.	4.29	4.26	4.24	4.26

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.54 for “Identify several words that begin with the same sound using word cards.” while the lowest was 4.26 for “Recognize and identify rhyming words and produce rhyming words.” These are study-reported item means. Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 7. Phonemic-awareness indicator means

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Blend together individual sounds to make words.	4.42	4.37	4.35	4.38
Break apart each individual sound in a word.	4.31	4.30	4.28	4.30
Tell whether words and sounds are the same or different.	4.43	4.42	4.41	4.42
Identify which word is different.	4.60	4.59	4.56	4.58
Identify different speech sounds.	4.55	4.54	4.52	4.54
Identify whether words rhyme.	4.44	4.43	4.42	4.43
Clap syllables in words.	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.48
Clap words in sentences.	4.27	4.25	4.23	4.25
Identify the first sound in a one- syllable word.	4.45	4.42	4.40	4.42
Segment individual sounds in words.	4.35	4.33	4.31	4.33
Orally blends separate phonemes.	4.42	4.38	4.37	4.39

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.58 for “Identify which word is different.” while the lowest was 4.25 for “Clap words in sentences.” These are study-reported item means. Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 8. Cognitive-skills indicator means

Indicator	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Sustain attention during learning activities appropriate to their age.	4.28	4.25	4.23	4.25
Remember and recall previously learned information when completing learning tasks.	4.19	4.16	4.14	4.16
Understand and follow multi-step instructions accurately.	4.15	4.13	4.12	4.13
Think critically about ideas and respond to questions appropriately.	4.13	4.12	4.11	4.13
Explain their thinking and justify their answers using appropriate reasons.	4.17	4.15	4.13	4.15
Maintain focus on learning tasks despite distractions.	4.14	4.13	4.10	4.12
Recognize patterns, similarities, and differences among letters, words, pictures, or ideas.	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.27
Solve simple problems using logical thinking and reasoning.	4.46	4.43	4.42	4.44
Generate new ideas or make meaningful connections between previously learned concepts.	4.13	4.12	4.10	4.12
Apply appropriate cognitive strategies when faced with new learning situations or problem-solving tasks.	4.16	4.13	4.11	4.13

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.44 for “Solve simple problems using logical thinking and reasoning.” while the lowest was 4.12 for “Maintain focus on learning tasks despite distractions.” The relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 9. Visual-processing instructional activities

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Use assistive technology.	4.12	4.14	4.10	4.12
Provide the option of an oral examination rather than a written examination.	3.48	3.45	3.42	3.45
Use preferential seating to reduce visual distractions.	3.98	3.87	3.90	3.92
Provide a model to which the learners can refer to when completing tasks.	3.75	3.68	3.66	3.69
Use speech-to-text assistance technology.	3.59	3.58	3.56	3.58
Encourage learners to visually demonstrate what they have learned.	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.10
Use concept maps to drive critical thinking.	3.85	3.83	3.81	3.83
Use compelling visual media (including art, physical artifacts, video, video games, film, etc.).	4.14	4.12	4.10	4.12

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Publish and curate learning artifacts that represent different stages of the learning process.	3.33	3.30	3.32	3.32
Encourage learners to visually	3.97	4.00	3.96	3.98
Provide clear and concise verbal instructions for tasks, assignments, or activities.	4.10	4.09	4.07	4.09

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.12 for “Use compelling visual media (including art, physical artifacts, video, video games, film, etc.),” while the lowest was 3.32 for “Publish and curate learning artifacts that represent different stages of the learning process.” Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 10. Writing-strategy instructional activities

Indicator	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Brainstorm topics to write about.	3.42	3.45	3.40	3.42
Orally sentences and then let learners write them down.	3.37	3.32	3.31	3.33
Stretch out sounds in words for spelling.	4.14	4.12	4.13	4.13
Create a plan for writing.	3.83	3.76	3.73	3.77
Work one-on-one or with small groups to identify strengths and weaknesses of writing.	3.66	3.65	3.64	3.65
Think-aloud or write-aloud approaches, have learners help during the modeling process.	4.15	4.17	4.14	4.15
Introduce the lessons/topic by modeling how to begin writing.	4.12	4.13	4.11	4.12
Demonstrate the conventions of writing: capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and print directionality.	4.18	4.15	4.19	4.17
Compose the text, using input from the learners.	3.64	3.63	3.60	3.62
Record class ideas in a format that all	3.74	3.72	3.71	3.72
Generate ideas for the writing and plan	3.89	3.90	3.93	3.91

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.17 for “Demonstrate the conventions of writing: capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and print directionality.” while the lowest was 3.33 for “Orally sentences and then let learners write them down.” These are study-reported item means. Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 11. Hands-on learning activities

Indicator	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Let the learners write a creative story, poem, or essay.	3.48	3.45	3.40	3.44
Use art to facilitate their learning, such as drawing a map, or writing a skit to describe a historical even.	4.09	4.05	4.07	4.07
Let learners partake in activities rather than passively reading a book or attending a lecture.	3.65	3.68	3.64	3.66
Employ movement game to review letter names and sounds.	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.14
Use blocks to retell the beginning, middle, and ending of a story.	3.71	3.68	3.66	3.68
Let learners manipulate objects to develop a deeper understanding of how things work.	3.45	3.47	3.44	3.45
Employ songs, jingles, and raps.	4.15	4.16	4.14	4.15
Prove learners with hands-on experience in designing, creating and constructing their own ideas.	3.74	3.71	3.72	3.72
Conduct field trip for learners’ field experience.	4.13	4.11	4.14	4.13
Use role play/simulation drama.	4.17	4.15	4.16	4.16

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.16 for “Use role play/simulation drama,” while the lowest was 3.44 for “Let the learners write a creative story, poem, or essay.” These are study-reported item means. Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 12. Peer-teaching activities

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Understand when and how to pose thought-provoking questions.	3.84	3.86	3.81	3.84
Ask learners to think of meaningful compliments they have received.	4.18	4.15	4.17	4.17
Demonstrate how to reach proper solutions.	4.15	4.13	4.16	4.15
Praise for when a tutee makes progress.	4.25	4.24	4.22	4.24
Feedback for when a tutee makes a mistake.	4.21	4.22	4.24	4.22
Guide questions for when a tutee is close to reaching an answer.	4.11	4.08	4.06	4.08
Probe questions for when a tutee is trying to explain his or her thoughts.	3.68	3.65	3.63	3.65

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Allow learners to take turns teaching.	3.35	3.32	3.31	3.32
Select learners who want to, and can, tutor.	3.36	3.33	3.30	3.33
Introduce peer editing exercises to	3.27	3.26	3.22	3.25
Devote a short lesson to the process	3.74	3.68	3.70	3.71

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.24 for “Praise for when a tutee makes progress,” while the lowest was 3.25 for “Introduce peer editing exercises to.” These are study-reported item means. Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

Table 13. Active-learning activities

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Provide learners with informal opportunities for feedback on how well they understood the material.	4.15	4.19	4.17	4.17
Explore some specific active learning techniques for engaging learners in the learning process.	4.12	4.14	4.13	4.13
Use reciprocal questioning to encourage an open dialogue in which learners take on the role of the teacher.	3.95	3.91	3.90	3.92
Let learners create their own questions about a topic, reading section, or lesson.	3.48	3.47	3.44	3.46
Involve learners in the learning process to help build their comprehension of course material.	3.73	3.77	3.75	3.75
Encourage learners to develop active listening skills by quizzing one another, sharing their thoughts, and taking notes.	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.27
Guide learners learn and apply different questioning strategies.	3.78	3.81	3.76	3.78
Strengthen learners’ connection with course material in a creative and engaging way.	4.19	4.20	4.18	4.19
Encourage learners to discuss or rework their notes in pairs to clarify key points covered, raise questions, and solve problems posed.	4.13	4.11	4.10	4.11
Ask learners to write down what they find to be	3.83	3.85	3.82	3.83
Ask one or more learners to take the opposing	3.73	3.69	3.71	3.71

Within this detailed indicator set, the highest displayed overall mean was 4.27 for “Encourage learners to develop active listening skills by quizzing one another, sharing their thoughts, and taking notes,” while the lowest was 3.46 for “Let learners create their own questions about a topic, reading section, or lesson.” These are study-reported item means. Their relative positions identify topics for observation and instructional planning, not statistically established improvements in learner achievement.

The distribution across the big/large, medium and small school categories should be checked against local teaching conditions and response counts. Similar means across categories indicate a broadly shared reported pattern; even when visible differences occur, the available aggregate tables do not provide the respondent-level variability needed for independent tests of differences among school types.

3.2 Additional tabulated indicators for validation

The indicators allow readers to evaluate whether the relative domain priorities were driven by consistently similar items or by a small subset of highly rated practices. They were not created from hypothetical or reconstructed participant records.

Table 14. Language-development indicator means

Original item	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Talk with the children about the story line.	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.52
Understand both verbal and non-verbal forms of communication.	4.56	4.54	4.52	4.54
Use words and gestures to express his thoughts and feelings.	4.36	4.34	4.33	4.34
Share ideas and experiences.	4.40	4.38	4.36	4.38
Provide an ongoing commentary on activities	4.30	4.29	4.26	4.28
Recognize spoken words represented in written language by specific sequences of letters.	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.23
Follow words from left to right, top to bottom, and page-by-page.	4.23	4.21	4.20	4.21
Understand that words are separated by spaces in print.	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.32
Recognize and name some upper /lowercase letters of the alphabet, especially those in their name.	4.40	4.38	4.35	4.38
Recognize that letters are grouped to form words.	4.35	4.34	4.32	4.34
Recognize simple words in print and understand their meaning.	4.46	4.43	4.41	4.43
Name some letters of the alphabet.	4.63	4.62	4.59	4.61

This item-level table gave the highest overall rating to “Name some letters of the alphabet.” (4.61), while “Follow words from left to right, top to bottom, and page-by-page.” received the lowest (4.21). The contrast refines the broader domain finding: a favorable overall score may coexist with specific instructional practices that are less well established or more demanding. The researcher should examine these indicators through actual classroom artifacts and a documented scoring procedure.

Differences among school-size groups are best interpreted as descriptive patterns, because this table supplies aggregate means rather than the respondent-level scores and variances required to estimate confidence intervals or test group effects. For subsequent evaluation, teachers could link the most relevant indicators to short performance tasks, collect repeated examples of pupil work, and track the quality of implementation over time.

Table 15. Mnemonic-strategy indicator means

Indicators	Big / large	Medium	Small	Overall
Use the keyword mnemonic method to improve learning and recall.	3.52	3.51	3.50	3.51
Organize information into more easily learned groups, phrases, words or numbers.	3.67	3.63	3.62	3.64
Use a simple formula of a letter to represent each word or phrase that needs to be remembered.	4.15	4.13	4.11	4.13
Rearrange words or substitute a different word with the same meaning to make them rhyme.	4.13	4.15	4.10	4.13
Create a link between the mnemonic and the new information.	3.72	3.68	3.67	3.69
Use a rhyming pattern of words to make memorization easier and more fun.	4.14	4.12	4.13	4.13
Teach challenging new vocabulary words.	4.15	4.14	4.16	4.15
Let learners' connect the new information with something that is already familiar to them.	3.84	3.81	3.82	3.82
Make a memorable connection with each new piece of information the learners need to memorize.	3.77	3.75	3.73	3.75
Generate a sentence that helps learners	3.84	3.81	3.84	3.83

This item-level table gave the highest overall rating to “Teach challenging new vocabulary words.” (4.15), while “Use the keyword mnemonic method to improve learning and recall.” received the lowest (3.51). The contrast refines the broader domain finding: a favorable overall score may coexist with specific instructional practices that are less well established or more demanding. The researcher should examine these indicators through actual classroom artifacts and a documented scoring procedure.

Differences among school-size groups are best interpreted as descriptive patterns, because this table supplies aggregate means rather than the respondent-level scores and variances required to estimate confidence intervals or test group effects. For subsequent evaluation, teachers could link the most relevant indicators to short performance tasks, collect repeated examples of pupil work, and track the quality of implementation over time.

4. Discussion

The study presented two complementary descriptive profiles: literacy indicators were generally rated as evident, while a varied set of instructional strategies was reported as employed. The contrast between a skills mean of 4.35 and strategies mean of 3.86 is not a statistical discrepancy, because the two scales used different question content and verbal anchors. Comparisons should instead be confined to each set of domains and the specific educational processes they represent.

The low relative position of cognitive skills requires a more targeted response than generic additional reading lessons. Teachers might ask pupils to explain the sequence of ideas in a passage, make an inference using textual evidence, compare two claims or monitor whether an answer fits a question. Such tasks can be embedded in language lessons while maintaining phonological and word-recognition work when indicated by assessment.

Phonological and phonemic awareness mean values were identical at the domain level, but the item evidence differentiated cue-supported identification from independent production. The foundational reading guide recommends an explicit, cumulative approach that gives repeated opportunities to practice and apply key sound and print skills (Foorman et al., 2016/2019). In Tigaon, such instruction would be most defensible when based on assessed learner errors rather than school-type labels alone.

Active learning emerged as the most frequently reported strategy, yet its instructional meaning remains broad. It could encompass speaking, manipulating materials, responding to prompts or creating a written product. The next step is to specify intended learning behavior for each lesson and use quick checks of understanding to determine whether participation was productive.

Peer teaching received the lowest mean. Reciprocal activities can be difficult to organize if reading skills are uneven across a class. A feasible improvement is to teach roles explicitly: one learner reads or presents a response, another asks for evidence or checks a procedure, and both provide structured feedback before roles reverse. This should be observed and refined instead of assumed effective solely because it is collaborative.

Writing appeared in both the skill-development context and the instructional-strategy context. The IES writing practice guide emphasizes planned time, explicit writing processes and fundamental fluency skills (Graham et al., 2012/2018). A school-based cycle might begin with oral rehearsal and brainstorming, proceed to a short paragraph, and end with feedback on clarity and revision. Such a sequence addresses the low-rated generative indicators without displacing reading instruction.

The school-size pattern was modest and directionally similar across several means. Because counts and dispersion were unavailable, these data cannot establish a robust big-versus-small school difference. Implementation decisions should focus on actual assessed need, available teaching resources and opportunities for professional learning, not infer from the mean ranking that smaller schools underperformed. Finally, the very high W values invite scrutiny of the ranking procedure. Strong concordance may reflect shared instructional expectations or homogeneous responses. It could also be inflated or altered by tie handling when ratings are close. Independent computation from original rankings and explicit documentation of the number of judges and items would strengthen a journal submission.

4.1 Practical directions arising from the findings

Table 16. Evidence-to-action priorities for school-level validation

Observed pattern	Proposed response	Verification metric
Cognitive skills lowest (4.19)	Use structured inference and attention-to-text activities	Common rubric on pupil work
Independent phonological production relatively low (4.26)	Teach and check unprompted sound production	Individual oral response checklist
Active learning highest (3.94)	Define observable participation linked to learning	Lesson observations and exit tickets
Peer teaching lowest strategy (3.81)	Introduce reciprocal explanation protocols	Peer-feedback observation notes

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Observed pattern	Proposed response	Verification metric
Writing strategy mean 3.82	Model drafting, feedback and revision cycles	Baseline and follow-up writing samples

5. Conclusion

The study reported that Grade 3 literacy skills in Tigaon District were generally rated as Much Evident (4.35). Phonological and phonemic awareness (4.41 each) led the domain ratings, whereas cognitive skills (4.19) ranked lowest. Teachers reported using all six instructional approaches at the Much Employed level (overall 3.86), especially active learning (3.94); peer teaching (3.81) ranked lowest. The reported Kendall coefficients indicated strong consistency in the ordering of domain indicators among three school-size groups. The analyses do not show causal effects of instructional strategies on individually assessed reading achievement. A follow-up classroom-based evaluation should connect specific instructional practices to independently scored literacy outcomes.

References

- [1] Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016; revised 2019). Foundational skills to support students in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/21>
- [2] Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012; revised 2018). Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCEE 2012-4058). Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/17>
- [3] Department of Education. (2017). DO 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/>