

# The Teaching Strategies Utilized by the English Teachers in Enhancing the Reading Proficiency Skills of the Grade 7 Learners in the 5 Congressional Districts of the Division of Camarines Sur

Christine Diane Galvan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

| ARTICLE INFORMATION                                                                                                                  | ABSTRACT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Article history:</b><br>Published: October 2026                                                                                   | The study examined teaching strategies, perceived reading outcomes, challenges, and solutions among English teachers serving Grade 7 learners in the five congressional districts of the Division of Camarines Sur during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design involved 370 teachers and a researcher-made questionnaire. Analyses used weighted means, frequencies, percentages, ranks, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance with chi-square tests at the 0.05 level. Six instructional domains were rated Very Much Utilized, and five perceived outcome domains were rated Very Much Effective. Significant agreement was reported across strategy rankings and across outcome rankings except reading fluency. Challenge classifications ranged from Challenging to Very Much Challenging; agreement was reported except for language barrier. Offered solutions were predominantly Very Much Evident and showed significant ranking agreement. Reading intervention material was reported as developed, without evaluation results. The findings support differentiated literacy support, professional collaboration, and attention to implementation barriers. They describe teacher ratings and rank-order concordance rather than causal effects or independently measured reading gains. |
| <b>Keywords:</b><br>Teaching Strategies<br>Reading Proficiency<br>Grade 7<br>English Teachers<br>Reading Challenges<br>Camarines Sur |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

## 1. Introduction

Reading instruction in the early secondary grades must address differences in word reading, language knowledge, comprehension, and engagement. Teachers may combine individual support, group instruction, digital resources, authentic texts, feedback, and assessment. These approaches serve different purposes: diagnosis identifies needs, scaffolding supports task completion, and feedback directs subsequent effort. Their value depends on alignment with learners' actual reading profiles and the conditions under which instruction occurs. Baker et al. (2014) recommend intensive academic vocabulary instruction, integration of oral and written language with content learning, structured writing opportunities, and small-group intervention for English learners. These recommendations provide a relevant point of comparison for language and literacy support in the middle grades. They do not imply that the study's learners were assessed using that framework or that every technology-supported reading activity is effective. The relationship between a strategy and an outcome needs evidence beyond favorable perceptions.

The study examined six instructional domains and five perceived outcome domains across the five congressional districts of the Division of Camarines Sur. It also considered constraints involving resources, varied reading levels, parental support, language, curriculum time, and motivation. This combination recognizes that reported instructional practice and perceived learner outcomes occur within an organizational and social context. A high rating for a strategy may coexist with substantial difficulties in delivering it consistently. The study asked about the extent of strategy utilization, perceived effectiveness, challenges, offered solutions, and agreement in rankings. It also reported development of reading intervention material. Teacher collaboration can provide a setting for examining these findings and refining activities; the Learning Action Cell policy supports school-based professional learning around instructional problems (Department of Education, 2016). The present study supplies local questionnaire evidence, while evaluation of the intervention material and direct measurement of learner gains remain separate questions.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Research design and scope

The study used a descriptive-evaluative-correlational research design in the five congressional districts of the Division of Camarines Sur. The stated study period was School Year 2025–2026.

The study assessed reported practices and perceived outcomes through questionnaire responses. Allocation to an intervention, a comparison condition, and repeated outcome measurement were not reported. The findings are interpreted as descriptive evaluations and rank-order analyses; the design label alone does not establish a tested relationship or a causal effect.

### 2.2 Participants and setting

The study involved 370 English teachers in the five congressional districts of the Division of Camarines Sur. The respondents were the raters of the questionnaire indicators; the number of learners represented by their judgments was not reported.

The sampling frame, selection procedure, eligibility criteria, number invited, and response rate were not specified. Consequently, the representativeness of the respondents and the extent to which their judgments describe all schools in the setting cannot be established. No unreported school-level or respondent-group sample sizes were inferred.

### 2.3 Instrument and measures

The main data-gathering instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire. It assessed the domains presented in the Results, using indicator-level weighted means and verbal classifications. The response anchors, full scoring rules, interpretation cutoffs, validation procedures, pilot testing and reliability estimates were not reported. Category labels are therefore presented as the study's classifications rather than assigned from an assumed rating scale.

The unit represented in each descriptive table is the stated questionnaire indicator. Reported item means are retained without calculating new domain composites. Duplicate statements remain separate reported entries, and an unreported item value is identified as such where applicable. The ratings do not constitute independently scored learner assessments or administrative measures of school performance.

### 2.4 Data collection and analysis

Questionnaire administration was the stated data-collection approach. The administration mode, collection dates, instructions to respondents, procedures for incomplete responses, and evidence used by raters were not specified. Ethics review, institutional permission, consent and confidentiality procedures were not reported; no approval or consent process is asserted.

The reported analyses were weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) with corresponding chi-square tests. The significance level was 0.05. The tables retain the reported W values, chi-square values and probability thresholds; exact probabilities were not inferred from inequalities. The group-level ranks, degrees of freedom, tie adjustments and statistical software were not specified.

Kendall's W describes concordance in rankings. The reported significance decisions address agreement in indicator orderings; they do not test causal effects, equality of mean ratings, or the relationship between strategy use and outcomes. No direct strategy–outcome correlation coefficient was reported. Nonsignificant concordance is not interpreted as evidence that an activity was unused or that a learner skill was low.

## 3. Results

The tables present the reported findings by domain, with interpretation immediately after each presentation. Item statements and values remain in their reported order. Uniform verbal classifications appear in table notes; mixed classifications are displayed by item. No missing numerical results or composite scores have been imputed.

Table 1. Strategy utilization in Individual Instruction

| Indicator                                                                                                            | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher employs flexible pacing, allowing learners to progress according to their own reading fluency            | 5.00          |
| The teacher monitors each learner's progress through personalized feedback and targeted interventions                | 5.00          |
| The teacher adapts reading materials to match the learner's current proficiency level and interests                  | 5.00          |
| The teacher uses individualized questioning techniques to develop critical thinking and comprehension skills         | 5.00          |
| The teacher applies tailored scaffolding strategies, gradually reducing support as the learner gains independence    | 4.96          |
| The teacher provides corrective feedback and reinforcement during individual reading practice                        | 4.87          |
| The teacher provides one-on-one reading sessions to address each learner's specific decoding and comprehension needs | 4.83          |
| The teacher designs individualized reading plans based on diagnostic assessments and learner profiles                | 4.73          |
| The teacher integrates individualized vocabulary-building exercises to strengthen word recognition and usage         | 4.73          |
| the teacher records and analyzes individual learner performance to refine instructional approaches continuously      | 4.63          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Utilized."

Table 1 shows reported item means from 4.63 to 5.00. Flexible pacing, personalized monitoring, material adaptation and individualized questioning shared the highest reported value. Record-based refinement was relatively lower. The pattern highlights a distinction between providing support and systematically analyzing its results. Neither the high ratings nor their ordering establishes the effect of individualized instruction on reading gains.

Table 2. Strategy utilization in Group Instruction

| Indicator                                                                                                   | Weighted mean |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher applies group-based formative assessments to monitor collective progress in reading proficiency | 4.96          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                    | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher fosters a supportive environment where learners provide feedback and encouragement to peers during group reading | 4.86          |
| The teacher facilitates shared reading activities where learners collectively analyze vocabulary, context, and meaning       | 4.84          |
| The teacher encourages collaborative problem-solving when encountering difficult words, passages, or comprehension tasks     | 4.84          |
| The teacher organizes group reading sessions that encourage collaborative decoding and comprehension of texts                | 4.83          |
| The teacher utilizes heterogeneous grouping to balance strengths and weaknesses, ensuring peer mentoring opportunities       | 4.81          |
| The teacher incorporates group projects that require synthesis of information from multiple texts                            | 4.81          |
| The teacher implements cooperative learning strategies such as jigsaw reading or think-pair-share to build comprehension     | 4.76          |
| The teacher assigns group tasks that promote peer-assisted reading and mutual support among learners                         | 4.75          |
| The teacher integrates role-play and dramatization of texts to enhance group engagement and comprehension                    | 4.75          |
| the teacher uses group discussions to develop critical thinking and deeper understanding of reading materials                | 4.74          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Utilized.”

Table 2 shows reported item means from 4.74 to 4.96. Group formative assessment was prominent, while discussion and dramatization were relatively lower. This suggests that group work was viewed as both a monitoring arrangement and a learning format. The study does not establish how learners were grouped or whether group participation concealed differences in individual comprehension.

Table 3. Strategy utilization in Reading Activities with Technology Integration

| Indicator                                                                                                                          | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher integrates online research tasks to develop learners’ critical reading and digital literacy skills                     | 4.85          |
| The teacher uses interactive reading apps and platforms to strengthen vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills                | 4.84          |
| The teacher leverages speech-to-text and text-to-speech tools to support learners with reading difficulties                        | 4.82          |
| The teacher monitors learner engagement and comprehension through technology-based formative assessments and analytics             | 4.80          |
| The teacher utilizes digital annotation tools to guide learners in highlighting, commenting, and analyzing texts                   | 4.76          |
| The teacher facilitates online collaborative reading activities through discussion boards, shared documents, or virtual classrooms | 4.76          |
| The teacher integrates multimedia resources (audio books, videos, animations) to support multisensory reading experiences          | 4.75          |
| The teacher incorporates e-books and digital libraries to provide learners with diverse and accessible reading materials           | 4.74          |
| The teacher employs adaptive learning software that personalizes reading tasks based on learner performance                        | 4.73          |
| the teacher designs gamified reading activities using technology to motivate learners and track progress                           | 4.63          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Utilized.”

Table 3 shows reported item means from 4.63 to 4.85. Online research and interactive applications were prominent, while gamified design was relatively lower. These activities involve different instructional purposes. The ratings should not be interpreted as a comparison of technology effectiveness; they describe use without documenting access, task quality or the amount of teacher support.

Table 4. Strategy utilization in Incorporating Authentic Materials

| Indicator                                                                                                                | Weighted mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher uses letters, emails, and social media posts to build learners’ ability to understand everyday communication | 4.85          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

|                                                                                                                                                        |      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| The teacher applies authentic literary texts (short stories, poems, novels) to enhance appreciation and critical reading                               | 4.84 |
| The teacher utilizes advertisements, brochures, and posters to develop learners' skills in interpreting informational texts                            | 4.83 |
| The teacher incorporates menus, schedules, and timetables to strengthen functional reading and comprehension                                           | 4.83 |
| The teacher incorporates authentic cultural materials (songs, folktales, local stories) to connect reading with learners lived experiences             | 4.76 |
| The teacher integrates newspapers, magazines, and journals into reading lessons to expose learners to real-world language use                          | 4.75 |
| The teacher evaluates learners' comprehension of authentic materials through performance-based tasks such as summarizing, critiquing, or presenting    | 4.75 |
| The teacher encourages learners to analyze authentic charts, graphs, and infographics to strengthen interpretive reading skills                        | 4.74 |
| The teacher introduces public documents (announcements, government notices, community bulletins) to develop contextual reading skills                  | 4.74 |
| The teacher designs reading tasks around authentic online resources such as blogs, websites, and forums                                                | 4.72 |
| the teacher employs authentic audio-visual materials (news broadcasts, interviews, podcasts) to support integrated reading and listening comprehension | 4.71 |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Utilized."

Table 4 shows reported item means from 4.71 to 4.85. Everyday communication and literary materials were prominent within authentic-text use. Audio-visual materials occupied the lower end. The profile suggests a range of text types, but authenticity alone does not establish appropriate difficulty or comprehension support. Selection should be considered in relation to learners' language and reading needs.

Table 5. Strategy utilization in Providing Regular and Constructive Feedback

| Indicator                                                                                                                                | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher provides corrective feedback during reading tasks to immediately address errors in pronunciation, decoding, or comprehension | 5.00          |
| The teacher tracks and documents feedback given to learners to inform future instructional planning and interventions                    | 4.99          |
| The teacher highlights learners' strengths in reading while identifying specific areas for improvement                                   | 4.98          |
| The teacher uses constructive comments that guide learners toward strategies for better comprehension and fluency                        | 4.98          |
| The teacher consistently provides timely feedback on learners' reading performance after individual or group activities                  | 4.96          |
| The teacher delivers feedback in both oral and written forms to ensure clarity and reinforcement                                         | 4.95          |
| The teacher encourages self-reflection by prompting learners to evaluate their own reading performance based on feedback                 | 4.95          |
| The teacher incorporates feedback sessions into regular reading instruction to monitor progress                                          | 4.92          |
| The teacher tailors feedback to individual learner needs, ensuring it is specific, actionable, and supportive                            | 4.86          |
| the teacher uses positive reinforcement to motivate learners and build confidence in their reading abilities                             | 4.54          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Utilized."

Table 5 shows reported item means from 4.54 to 5.00. Corrective feedback and documentation received high ratings, while positive reinforcement was relatively lower. This distinguishes error correction and tracking from motivational support. The study does not establish whether learners understood the feedback or used it independently, which is necessary for interpreting feedback as an instructional process.

Table 6. Strategy utilization in Assessment

| Indicator                                                                                                      | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher administers diagnostic assessments to identify learners' initial reading levels and specific needs | 4.98          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                      | Weighted mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher integrates technology-based assessments (e.g., online quizzes, reading apps) to track learner progress efficiently | 4.96          |
| The teacher conducts formative assessments regularly to monitor learners' progress in decoding, fluency, and comprehension     | 4.95          |
| The teacher utilizes peer-assessment activities to promote collaborative evaluation and feedback among learners                | 4.95          |
| The teacher uses summative assessments to evaluate overall reading proficiency at the end of instructional periods             | 4.94          |
| The teacher incorporates self-assessment tools to encourage learners to reflect on their reading strengths and weaknesses      | 4.94          |
| The teacher analyzes assessment results to adjust instructional strategies and provide targeted interventions                  | 4.94          |
| The teacher communicates assessment outcomes clearly to learners, parents, and stakeholders to support continuous improvement  | 4.92          |
| The teacher maintains comprehensive records of learners' reading performance to inform long-term instructional planning        | 4.90          |
| The teacher designs performance-based tasks (e.g., oral reading, retelling, summarizing) to assess comprehension and fluency   | 4.86          |
| the teacher applies rubrics and scoring guides to ensure consistency and objectivity in evaluating reading tasks               | 4.85          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Utilized."

Table 6 shows reported item means from 4.85 to 4.98. Diagnostic assessment was prominent, with rubrics and performance tasks relatively lower. The distinction matters because identifying a starting level and judging complex reading responses require different evidence. The favorable ratings do not independently establish scoring consistency, diagnostic accuracy or the use of results in subsequent instruction.

Table 7. Rank-order agreement for teaching-strategy utilization

| Domain                                         | Kendall's W | Chi-square | Reported probability |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| Individual Instruction                         | 0.90        | 40.50      | p<0.001              |
| Group Instruction                              | 0.95        | 47.50      | p<0.001              |
| Reading Activities with Technology Integration | 0.69        | 31.05      | p<0.001              |
| Incorporating Authentic Materials              | 0.88        | 44         | p<0.001              |
| Providing Regular and Constructive Feedback    | 0.89        | 40.50      | p<0.001              |
| Assessment                                     | 0.86        | 43         | p<0.001              |

Note. Significance level = 0.05. Numerical strings and probability notation are retained as reported; no p-values were recalculated.

Table 7 addresses the research question on rank-order agreement. All six strategy domains were reported to show significant agreement. The result concerns the relative order of indicators within each strategy, rather than equality of use across districts or proof of effectiveness. High concordance can identify a shared pattern of priorities, but the study does not provide the group-level ranks or variation needed to assess how that pattern arose.

Table 8. Perceived effectiveness in Reading Fluency

| Indicator                                                                                                                  | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The learner shows increased confidence in reading aloud, engaging actively in individual and group reading activities      | 5.00          |
| The learner transitions smoothly between sentences and paragraphs, maintaining coherence and flow in oral reading          | 4.99          |
| The learner demonstrates comprehension by responding accurately to questions related to the text read                      | 4.98          |
| The learner sustains attention and focuses during reading tasks, completing passages with minimal hesitation or repetition | 4.97          |
| The learner applies decoding skills and contextual clues effectively to read unfamiliar words fluently                     | 4.97          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                                             | Weighted mean |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The learner exhibits consistent improvement in reading speed and fluency across varied materials, including authentic and technology-integrated texts | 4.97          |
| The learner participates actively in feedback and assessment activities, using teacher guidance to refine fluency and comprehension skills            | 4.97          |
| The learner reads with appropriate intonation, rhythm, and phrasing that reflect comprehension of the text                                            | 4.95          |
| the learner demonstrates accuracy and speed in oral reading, showing improved word recognition and automaticity                                       | 4.92          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 8 shows reported item means from 4.92 to 5.00. Confidence and smooth oral transitions were prominent in fluency, while accuracy and speed occupied the lower end of a narrow profile. These judgments describe different dimensions of oral reading. The study does not report timed scores or independent ratings, so the table should not be treated as a measured fluency gain.

Table 9. Perceived effectiveness in Vocabulary Growth

| Indicator                                                              | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The learner improves spelling and pronunciation of new vocabulary      | 5.00          |
| The learner recalls and applies vocabulary in later lessons            | 5.00          |
| The learner applies synonyms, antonyms, and related forms              | 4.99          |
| The learner expands word knowledge through authentic and digital texts | 4.98          |
| The learner engages in vocabulary-focused feedback and assessments     | 4.98          |
| The learner uses learned words in discussions and group work           | 4.97          |
| The learner infers word meaning using context clues                    | 4.95          |
| The learner confidently uses vocabulary in writing and presentations   | 4.91          |
| the learner understands and uses new words in oral and written tasks   | 4.83          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 9 shows reported item means from 4.83 to 5.00. Spelling, pronunciation and later use of vocabulary were highly rated. Understanding and using new words across tasks was relatively lower. This suggests that retention of taught forms and flexible word knowledge should be distinguished. The ratings do not provide a direct measure of vocabulary breadth or depth.

Table 10. Perceived effectiveness in Comprehension Skills

| Indicator                                                        | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The learner identifies main ideas and supporting points          | 4.99          |
| The learner reads increasingly complex texts independently       | 4.99          |
| The learner performs well in comprehension assessments           | 4.98          |
| The learner answers comprehension questions with analysis        | 4.97          |
| The learner applies comprehension skills in speaking and writing | 4.97          |
| The learner uses context clues to infer word meanings            | 4.93          |
| The learner applies feedback to improve comprehension            | 4.92          |
| The learner understands ideas and details in texts               | 4.90          |
| the learner participates in discussions to clarify understanding | 4.86          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 10 shows reported item means from 4.86 to 4.99. Identifying main ideas and reading more complex texts were prominent, while discussion-based clarification was relatively lower. The pattern suggests favorable judgments across comprehension activities, but task difficulty and scoring are unspecified. Independent assessment would be needed to establish whether learners understood unfamiliar texts rather than familiar classroom material.

Table 11. Perceived effectiveness in Classroom Engagement

| Indicator                                                             | Weighted mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The learner collaborates effectively during group activities          | 4.97          |
| The learner actively participates in class discussions                | 4.81          |
| The learner shows initiative in completing classroom responsibilities | 4.79          |
| The learner engages in interactive learning with peers and teachers   | 4.71          |
| The learner demonstrates enthusiasm in classroom tasks                | 4.70          |
| The learner maintains focus and attention during lessons              | 4.66          |
| The learner responds attentively to teacher instructions              | 4.66          |
| The learner contributes ideas and insights to classroom activities    | 4.61          |
| the learner asks questions to clarify and deepen understanding        | 4.59          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 11 shows reported item means from 4.59 to 4.97. Collaboration received the strongest engagement rating, while asking questions was relatively lower. This indicates that visible group participation and learner-initiated inquiry may not be equally prominent. Engagement should not be equated with comprehension, and the table does not establish why some behaviors were rated differently.

Table 12. Perceived effectiveness in Independent Use of English

| Indicator                                                                     | Weighted mean |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The learner engages in conversations with peers and teachers in English       | 5.00          |
| The learner uses appropriate vocabulary in varied contexts                    | 4.99          |
| The learner writes sentences and paragraphs independently in English          | 4.98          |
| The learner communicates ideas in English without relying on translation      | 4.96          |
| The learner applies grammar rules correctly in oral and written tasks         | 4.96          |
| The learner understands and responds to questions using English alone         | 4.95          |
| The learner expresses opinions and arguments confidently in English           | 4.92          |
| The learner applies English skills in real-life situations and academic tasks | 4.86          |
| the learner reads and interprets texts independently in English               | 4.54          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 12 shows reported item means from 4.54 to 5.00. Conversation and vocabulary use were prominent, while independent interpretation of English texts was relatively lower. The distinction suggests that social language use and independent academic reading should be examined separately. The favorable domain classification should not obscure the comparatively lower reading-independence item.

Table 13. Rank-order agreement for the perceived outcome domains

| Domain                     | Kendall's W | Chi-square | Reported probability |
|----------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| Reading Fluency            | 0.38        | 15.20      | p>0.05               |
| Vocabulary Growth          | 0.63        | 25.20      | p<0.001              |
| Comprehension Skills       | 0.66        | 26.40      | p<0.001              |
| Classroom Engagement       | 0.79        | 31.20      | p<0.001              |
| Independent Use of English | 0.89        | 35.60      | p<0.001              |

Note. Significance level = 0.05. Numerical strings and probability notation are retained as reported; no p-values were recalculated.

Table 13 addresses the research question on rank-order agreement. Significant agreement was reported for vocabulary, comprehension, engagement and independent English use, while reading fluency was nonsignificant. Favorable fluency ratings therefore coexist with a less consistent ordering. This is not evidence that fluency was low. The tests also do not estimate differences in actual reading achievement across congressional districts.

Table 14. Challenges in Limited Resources and Materials

| Indicator                                                                                                                             | Weighted mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher is unable to provide individualized reading tasks since resources are not enough for all learners                         | 3.42          |
| The teacher encounters challenges in sustaining reading activities because of inadequate classroom libraries                          | 3.41          |
| The teacher struggles to expose learners to multimedia reading tools due to limited technological resources                           | 3.32          |
| The teacher cannot maximize enrichment activities like guided reading or peer reading because of insufficient copies of texts         | 3.32          |
| The teacher faces difficulty in integrating authentic materials because of limited access to newspapers, magazines, and digital texts | 3.32          |
| The teacher struggles to provide diverse reading texts because of insufficient books and printed materials                            | 3.32          |
| The teacher cannot fully implement differentiated instruction due to the lack of leveled readers and varied materials                 | 3.31          |
| the teacher relies heavily on outdated or worn-out reading resources that limit learner engagement                                    | 3.23          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Challenging.”

Table 14 shows reported item means from 3.23 to 3.42. Insufficient resources were reported as constraining individualized tasks and sustained reading activities. These judgments identify an implementation concern even alongside favorable strategy ratings. The table does not quantify material shortages or show how resources were distributed, so it cannot determine which procurement response would be most useful.

Table 15. Challenges in Varied Reading Level Among Learners

| Indicator                                                                                                                | Weighted mean |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher faces difficulty in assessing reading comprehension fairly across learners with varied abilities             | 3.56          |
| The teacher struggles to maintain learner engagement when texts are either too easy for some or too difficult for others | 3.55          |
| The teacher spends extra time differentiating tasks, which reduces efficiency in covering the required curriculum        | 3.55          |
| The teacher experiences challenges in providing individualized feedback due to the diverse range of reading levels       | 3.54          |
| The teacher struggles to balance instruction when some learners read far below grade level while others read above it    | 3.53          |
| The teacher encounters challenges in grouping learners effectively because of wide gaps in reading proficiency           | 3.53          |
| The teacher finds it difficult to design lessons that simultaneously meet the needs of struggling and advanced readers   | 3.52          |
| the teacher finds it hard to sustain collaborative reading activities when learners progress at different paces          | 3.52          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Much Challenging.”

Table 15 shows reported item means from 3.52 to 3.56. Fair assessment and maintaining engagement across different reading levels were prominent challenges. These items suggest that differentiation affects assessment, pacing and feedback simultaneously. The study does not provide actual learner-level distributions, so the extent of reading variation and the most suitable grouping arrangements remain unmeasured.

Table 16. Challenges in Insufficient Parental Support

| Indicator                                                                                                                 | Weighted mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher finds it hard to involve parents in school-based reading programs due to low participation                    | 5.00          |
| The teacher experiences difficulty in addressing reading gaps when parents do not communicate learners’ struggles at home | 4.99          |
| The teacher struggles to reinforce reading habits at home because parents do not monitor or encourage practice            | 4.81          |
| The teacher encounters challenges in motivating learners whose parents show little interest in their reading development  | 4.80          |
| The teacher cannot maximize take-home reading assignments due to lack of parental supervision                             | 4.77          |

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

| Indicator                                                                                                                       | Weighted mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher struggles to maintain consistency in reading routines because parents do not establish supportive home environments | 4.59          |
| The teacher finds it difficult to sustain learners' progress when parents fail to provide time for reading activities           | 4.56          |
| the teacher faces challenges in building reading confidence when parental encouragement and praise are absent                   | 4.55          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Challenging."

Table 16 shows reported item means from 4.55 to 5.00. Participation in school reading programs and communication about home difficulties were prominent concerns. These are teacher perceptions of home-school relationships rather than direct reports from parents. The findings support examining barriers to participation, but do not justify attributing reading difficulties solely to parental motivation or responsibility.

Table 17. Challenges in Language Barrier

| Indicator                                                                                                                               | Weighted mean |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher struggles to maintain learner engagement when texts are linguistically too complex for their level                          | 4.71          |
| The teacher experiences challenges in assessing comprehension fairly when learners misinterpret questions due to language gaps          | 4.70          |
| The teacher finds it difficult to build vocabulary because learners have limited exposure to English outside the classroom              | 4.70          |
| The teacher encounters challenges in teaching comprehension when learners cannot easily connect English texts to their cultural context | 4.70          |
| The teacher spends extra time translating or simplifying instructions due to learners' limited English proficiency                      | 4.69          |
| The teacher faces difficulty in correcting pronunciation and fluency errors rooted in first-language interference                       | 4.68          |
| The teacher cannot maximize peer reading activities when learners use different mother tongues, limiting collaboration                  | 4.68          |
| the teacher struggles to explain reading concepts when learners' mother tongue differs significantly from the language of instruction   | 4.60          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Challenging."

Table 17 shows reported item means from 4.60 to 4.71. Linguistic text complexity and fair comprehension assessment were prominent concerns. The profile suggests that language demands may complicate interpretation of reading performance. The later nonsignificant concordance does not establish a minor barrier; its relevance should be assessed through learner language profiles and the demands of instructional texts.

Table 18. Challenges in Time Constraints in Curriculum Delivery

| Indicator                                                                                                                  | Weighted mean |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher relies on outdated or worn-out materials that limit learner engagement                                         | 5.00          |
| The teacher faces difficulty in providing varied reading texts due to insufficient instructional resources                 | 4.99          |
| The teacher cannot fully implement differentiated instruction because leveled readers and diverse texts are lacking        | 4.98          |
| The teacher finds it challenging to sustain reading activities without a well-stocked classroom library                    | 4.96          |
| The teacher cannot maximize multimedia reading tools because of limited technological resources                            | 4.91          |
| The teacher is unable to design individualized reading tasks since resources are inadequate for all learners               | 4.91          |
| The teacher struggles to integrate authentic materials owing to limited access to newspapers, magazines, and digital texts | 4.58          |
| the teacher reduces opportunities for guided or peer reading sessions due to insufficient copies of texts                  | 4.58          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Challenging."

Table 18 shows reported item means from 4.58 to 5.00. Although the domain is labeled time constraints, the statements concern resources, libraries and availability of texts. The ratings therefore describe those stated difficulties rather than a direct measure of curriculum time. The mismatch must remain visible, and conclusions about scheduling pressure cannot be drawn from this table alone.

Table 19. Challenges in Low Motivation and Reading Interest

| Indicator                                                                                                                                      | Weighted mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| The teacher struggles to sustain collaborative reading sessions when learners demonstrate minimal enthusiasm for group tasks                   | 4.87          |
| The teacher struggles to identify texts that effectively match diverse learner preferences and interests                                       | 4.84          |
| The teacher experiences setbacks in comprehension development as learners resist engaging with longer or complex texts                         | 4.83          |
| The teacher finds it challenging to sustain learner engagement in reading tasks due to limited intrinsic interest                              | 4.75          |
| The teacher encounters difficulty fostering confidence and persistence among learners who quickly disengage when faced with reading challenges | 4.74          |
| The teacher finds it difficult to motivate learners who prioritize non-reading activities such as games or social media                        | 4.66          |
| The teacher encounters difficulty maintaining consistent participation when learners perceive reading activities as irrelevant or monotonous   | 4.65          |
| the teacher experiences difficulty encouraging voluntary reading outside the classroom because of low learner motivation                       | 4.57          |

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Challenging.”

Table 19 shows reported item means from 4.57 to 4.87. Sustaining collaboration and matching texts to interests were prominent motivation concerns. These ratings suggest that participation may depend on both social activity and text selection. They do not directly measure learners’ intrinsic motivation or establish why disengagement occurs; learner perspectives would be needed to examine those explanations.

Table 20. Rank-order agreement for the challenge domains

| Domain                                  | Kendall’s W | Chi-square | Reported probability |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| Limited Resources and Materials         | 0.80        | 28         | $p < 0.001$          |
| Varied Reading Level Among Learners     | 0.59        | 20.65      | $p < 0.005$          |
| Insufficient Parental Support           | 0.92        | 32.20      | $p < 0.001$          |
| Language Barrier                        | 0.19        | 6.65       | $p > 0.05$           |
| Time Constraints in Curriculum Delivery | 0.68        | 23.80      | $p < 0.005$          |
| Low Motivation and Reading Interest     | 0.97        | 33.95      | $p < 0.001$          |

Note. Significance level = 0.05. Numerical strings and probability notation are retained as reported; no p-values were recalculated.

Table 20 addresses the research question on rank-order agreement. All challenge domains except language barrier were reported as showing significant agreement. A common ordering can coexist with different perceived severity, so agreement should not be treated as an estimate of how many learners were affected. The malformed language-barrier probability notation is retained. Its verbal nonsignificance and the mismatch in the time-constraints item content require author clarification.

Table 21. Solutions offered

| Indicator                                   | Weighted mean | Classification    |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Integrating reading across subjects         | 5.00          | Very Much Evident |
| Focusing on essential learning competencies | 4.99          | Very Much Evident |
| Organizing small-group instruction          | 4.99          | Very Much Evident |
| Embedding assessments within lessons        | 4.95          | Very Much Evident |
| Applying technology for faster delivery     | 4.87          | Very Much Evident |
| Giving feedback during activities           | 4.81          | Very Much Evident |
| Strengthening home-school collaboration     | 4.73          | Very Much Evident |
| Using flexible pacing guides                | 4.67          | Very Much Evident |

| Indicator                           | Weighted mean | Classification    |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Promoting peer-assisted learning    | 4.56          | Very Much Evident |
| Incorporating quick, engaging tasks | 4.43          | Much Evident      |

Note. Verbal classifications are retained as reported.

Table 21 shows reported item means from 4.43 to 5.00. Integration across subjects and emphasis on essential competencies were prominent proposed responses. Quick engaging tasks received a lower classification than the other solutions. The pattern suggests different levels of reported visibility, not evidence that one solution was more effective. Implementation and learner outcomes were not compared across these responses.

Table 22. Rank-order agreement for offered solutions

| Domain            | Kendall's W | Chi-square | Reported probability |
|-------------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| Solutions offered | 0.96        | 43.20      | p<0.001              |

Note. Significance level = 0.05. Numerical strings and probability notation are retained as reported; no p-values were recalculated.

Table 22 addresses the research question on rank-order agreement. The reported result indicates significant concordance in the ranking of offered solutions. This suggests a shared ordering under the stated analysis, not evidence that the solutions removed the barriers. Their feasibility, implementation and effects remain separate questions. The result can inform collaborative planning, but cannot justify a causal claim about improved reading proficiency.

#### 4. Development output

Reading intervention material was reported as developed from the findings. Its content, implementation schedule and evaluation results were not reported. The existence of this development output is retained without attributing validated effectiveness to it.

#### 5. Discussion

The study indicates favorable perceptions of a broad repertoire of teaching strategies, but its challenge findings complicate a uniformly positive interpretation. Teachers reported substantial difficulties with parental participation, language, motivation, and aspects labeled curriculum time. These ratings should be read alongside strategy use rather than treated as evidence that barriers had already been resolved. No analysis estimates which constraint most strongly predicts a learner outcome.

The instructional pattern is compatible with a combination of targeted support and integrated language learning. Baker et al. (2014) provide a basis for examining vocabulary, structured language practice, and small-group intervention. The study's data do not identify the most effective combination or the amount of instruction needed. Direct assessment would be required to determine whether learners with different starting levels benefit similarly from the reported approaches.

Reading fluency received favorable descriptive ratings but did not show significant rank-order agreement. This does not show that fluency was poor. Conversely, agreement in vocabulary or comprehension rankings does not demonstrate equal proficiency across districts. Mean ratings and concordance describe different features of the responses. Keeping those features separate prevents a ranking result from being used as an unsupported diagnosis of achievement.

The challenge domain labeled Time Constraints in Curriculum Delivery contains resource-related statements. Its ratings cannot therefore be interpreted as a clean measure of scheduling pressure. Similarly, the general conclusion describing challenges as Much Challenging compresses several distinct categories. Detailed item content and classifications should guide the interpretation until the instrument and labeling are confirmed. The reported intervention material is a development output rather than an evaluated treatment. Recommendations for piloting, feedback, and revision acknowledge this distinction. Learning Action Cell sessions could support review of the material's alignment with learner needs and classroom conditions (Department of Education, 2016). Claims about effectiveness, scalability, or long-term benefit would require subsequent implementation evidence and outcome assessment.

#### 6. Implications for practice and further research

The study supports using the indicator-level pattern as a starting point for local review. Decisions should connect a stated need with a feasible response and a criterion for judging progress. Relative positions within a favorable profile are not equivalent to measured deficits, and a significant ranking result is not evidence that a proposed policy will work. Recommendations should be implemented with attention to context and evaluated rather than assumed effective.

Further research should use clearly defined outcomes and document how they are measured. Direct performance tasks, observations, or independently recorded school indicators could complement questionnaire ratings. A longitudinal or comparative evaluation could examine change over time, provided the design addresses baseline differences and alternative explanations. These are proposed directions for future work, not procedures undertaken in the study.

#### 7. Conclusion

The study rated the six teaching-strategy domains Very Much Utilized and the five perceived reading-outcome domains Very Much Effective. Reported concordance was significant across instructional strategies, across outcomes except reading fluency, and across challenges except language barrier. Solutions showed significant ranking agreement, but challenge and solution classifications varied. The findings informed reading intervention material and recommendations for differentiated support. They do not establish causal reading improvement, and evaluation of the material remains necessary.

**References**

- [1] Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/practiceguide/english\\_learners\\_pg\\_040114.pdf](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/practiceguide/english_learners_pg_040114.pdf)
- [2] Department of Education. (2016). The Learning Action Cell (LAC) as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016). [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO\\_s2016\\_035.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DO_s2016_035.pdf)