

The Utilization of the Approaches in Developing the Literacy Skills of the Kindergarten Learners in General Luna District, Division of Quezon

Jusa Mae A. Rodrin¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Early Literacy; Kindergarten; Phonics; Phonemic Awareness; Teacher-Reported Utilization; General Luna; Kendall Concordance	The study investigated kindergarten literacy teaching and reading-related development in public elementary schools of the Division of Quezon in school year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey, the study gathered five-point questionnaire ratings and analyzed descriptive statistics and rank agreement across groups. The report presents different participant totals in its narrative and respondent table; this figure requires confirmation. Reported findings indicated that teaching-approach utilization by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 4.59 (VME); reported literacy-related utilization by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 4.47 (MU). The concordance tests described agreement in questionnaire item rankings rather than a causal link between the studied domains. The findings identify perceived implementation priorities and should be interpreted within the limits of respondent-rating data.

1. Introduction

Early literacy development is an essential foundation for later comprehension, classroom participation and independent reading. In kindergarten classrooms, alphabetic knowledge, phonological sensitivity, meaningful oral language and guided comprehension experiences are developed through repeated and developmentally appropriate teaching opportunities.

The study examined the reported utilization of reading approaches within public elementary schools of General Luna District, Division of Quezon, during school year 2025–2026. The local inquiry distinguished classroom teaching approaches from the literacy-related skills that educators reported observing or developing; these constructs should not be conflated with measured improvement among children.

The National Reading Panel (2000) distinguished phonemic-awareness instruction, phonics, guided oral reading, vocabulary and text comprehension as complementary aspects of effective reading instruction. The study's instructional domains, particularly explicit phonics, integrated comprehension strategies and language promotion, therefore cover several distinct instructional functions.

Alneyadi et al. (2023) examined the influence of learning environments on literacy in fourth graders, while Elston et al. (2022) discussed explicit comprehension-strategy instruction for an English-language learner. Their populations and designs differ from a kindergarten district survey, but both underscore the importance of specifying which aspect of literacy was actually assessed.

The study addressed teachers' reported implementation of four teaching domains, corresponding ratings for foundational literacy domains, and agreement in item rankings among school-size groups. The school-size comparison was a comparison of ratings and rankings, not an experimental test of the effects of instruction.

The objectives were to characterize reported ratings in the major constructs, compare the priority order of items across the respondent groups, identify comparatively lower-rated aspects, and translate the reported observations into proportionate implications for educational policy and practice. These objectives were approached as descriptive and rank-concordance questions, notwithstanding causal terms in the retained study title.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study employed a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey. It examined kindergarten literacy teaching and reading-related development in the Division of Quezon during school year 2025–2026. The quantitative components described respondent ratings and used item-rank concordance analyses; no random assignment, matched comparison group or longitudinal change estimate was presented.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The study involved kindergarten teachers and school heads in public elementary schools in General Luna District, grouped into large, medium, and small schools. Respondent counts require author reconciliation: the narrative summary states 36 teachers, whereas the respondent table enumerates 22 kindergarten teachers and 15 school heads (total 37). The table was not silently altered. The quantitative findings below are reported as domain and indicator means without inferring the unresolved effective sample denominator.

2.3 Instrument and variables

The study used a researcher-developed questionnaire organized around explicit phonics instruction, comprehension strategies, data-driven instruction, language development, phonics/decoding, phonemic awareness, fluency, and vocabulary enrichment. The instrument used a five-point response framework; numerical ratings and their accompanying verbal interpretations are retained as tabulated. Questionnaire preparation, juror validation and revisions were described, but a fully auditable scale-validation dataset was

not supplied. Results are therefore described as respondent ratings of the stated variables.

2.4 Data gathering and statistical treatment

The stated procedure involved securing permissions, preparing and validating the survey, administering questionnaires, tabulating responses and assessing the research questions. The reported statistical tools were frequencies, percentages, weighted means, rank ordering, Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W), and chi-square statistics, evaluated against a stated .05 threshold. Domain weighted means and item rankings were treated descriptively. Kendall's W was used to assess agreement in item orderings across school-size or congressional-district groupings, with reported chi-square decision statistics. The displayed p-threshold labels were not substituted with unreported exact p values.

2.5 Scope of inference and ethical considerations

The analysis is limited to the reported cross-sectional survey responses. No individual record-level dataset, independent longitudinal outcome series or identifiable participant records was included in the manuscript. Permission and validation procedures were described in the study; the authors should supply an explicit ethics/consent declaration and data-availability statement required by the intended journal. No ethics approval number has been inferred or inserted.

3. Results

The numbered tables report the findings relevant to the study's research questions. The domain summary tables give the reported overall means, verbal interpretation labels and ranks; the indicator tables reproduce selected highest- and lowest-scoring indicators, retaining their printed means and labels; and the concordance tables retain reported Kendall W, χ^2 , degrees of freedom and statistical significance labels. All tabulated figures are transcribed rather than calculated anew.

Table 1. Teaching-approach utilization by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Explicit Phonics Instruction	4.61	VME	1
Integration of Comprehensive Strategies	4.59	VME	2
Data-Driven Instruction	4.58	VME	3.5
Promotion of Language Development	4.58	VME	3.5
Average Wx	4.59	VME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for kindergarten literacy teaching and reading-related development. The highest was Explicit Phonics Instruction (mean 4.61; VME), whereas Data-Driven Instruction was lowest (mean 4.58; VME). The tabulated overall average was 4.59 (VME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 2. Teaching approaches by school-size group

Domain / indicator	Big schools	Medium schools	Small schools	Overall
Explicit Phonics Instruction	4.57	4.72	4.54	4.61
Integration of Comprehensive Strategies	4.56	4.67	4.53	4.59
Data-Driven Instruction	4.60	4.60	4.54	4.58
Promotion of Language Development	4.48	4.67	4.57	4.58
Average Wx	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.59

Table preserves the tabulated group-level weighted means across the school-size classifications. These variations offer a descriptive profile of where individual instructional domains were more or less highly rated.

The group means were transcribed from the reported tabulation and should not be interpreted as statistically significant between-school differences. Respondent denominators and measurement reliability would need confirmation before inferential comparisons.

Table 3. Agreement in rankings of teaching approaches

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Explicit Phonics Instruction	0.16	4.32	9	NS
Integration of Comprehensive Strategies	0.32	7.68	8	NS
Data-Driven Instruction	0.23	6.21	9	NS
Promotion of Language Development	0.39	11.70	10	NS

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 0 of 4 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 4 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS).

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 4. Selected indicators: explicit phonics instruction

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Introduces letter-sound relationships systematically from simple to complex sounds.	4.47	ME
Uses visual aids to reinforce sound-symbol connections.	4.72	VME
Provides blending activities to help learners read simple words.	4.51	VME
Conducts segmenting activities to break words into individual sounds.	4.62	VME
Uses multi-sensory strategies to strengthen phonics understanding.	4.62	VME
Gives immediate feedback for correct sound production.	4.69	VME
Provides scaffolded practice in reading CVC words, syllables, and sight words.	4.62	VME
Assesses phonics skills regularly and adjusts instruction.	4.59	VME
Models correct phoneme pronunciation and guides learner imitation.	4.62	VME
Uses phonics games, songs, and rhymes to reinforce sounds and word recognition.	4.62	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Uses visual aids to reinforce sound-symbol connections.” (4.72; VME). The lowest selected average was for “Introduces letter-sound relationships systematically from simple to complex sounds.” (4.47; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 5. Selected indicators: integration of comprehension strategies

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Uses varied, developmentally appropriate strategies for different learning needs.	4.51	VME
Provides differentiated activities for diverse abilities and readiness levels.	4.59	VME
Connects lessons to real-life experiences for meaningful learning.	4.59	VME
Integrates literacy, numeracy, socio-emotional, and motor-skill activities.	4.69	VME
Uses multi-sensory approaches to improve engagement and retention.	4.62	VME
Provides guided discovery and hands-on exploration.	4.62	VME
Promotes collaboration through group play and partner activities.	4.69	VME
Uses formative assessment to monitor learner progress.	4.44	ME
Adjusts instruction based on assessment results.	4.51	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Integrates literacy, numeracy, socio-emotional, and motor-skill activities.” (4.69; VME). The lowest selected average was for “Uses formative assessment to monitor learner progress.” (4.44; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 6. Selected indicators: data-driven instruction

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Collects assessment data to track learner progress.	4.48	ME
Uses diagnostic assessments to identify strengths and needs.	4.62	VME
Provides targeted interventions for learning gaps.	4.49	ME
Plans lessons based on developmental levels and observed needs.	4.52	VME
Adjusts strategies using assessment data.	4.69	VME
Documents learner progress to guide instruction.	4.52	VME
Shares assessment findings with parents and guardians.	4.58	VME
Analyzes results to identify gaps and intervention needs.	4.62	VME
Uses formative assessments to check daily understanding.	4.59	VME
Reflects on data to improve lesson design and instruction.	4.69	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Adjusts strategies using assessment data.” (4.69; VME). The lowest selected average was for “Collects assessment data to track learner progress.” (4.48; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 7. Selected indicators: promotion of language development

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Uses varied vocabulary to expose learners to meaningful language.	4.54	VME
Engages learners in conversations about ideas, feelings, and experiences.	4.72	VME
Models correct grammar and sentence structure.	4.44	ME
Reads aloud using age-appropriate storybooks and discusses key ideas.	4.48	ME
Provides daily oral language activities.	4.51	VME
Uses visual aids, gestures, and context clues for comprehension.	4.72	VME
Supports emergent writing through tracing, drawing, and labeling.	4.51	VME
Encourages phonological awareness activities.	4.62	VME
Provides differentiated language activities for enrichment and remediation.	4.51	VME
Monitors language progress and adjusts instruction.	4.66	VME
Uses storytelling, retelling, and picture description to build speaking and comprehension.	4.62	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Engages learners in conversations about ideas, feelings, and experiences.” (4.72; VME). The lowest selected average was for “Models correct grammar and sentence structure.” (4.44; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 8. Reported literacy-related utilization by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Phonics	4.50	VMU	2
Phonemic Awareness Skills	4.54	VMU	1
Fluency Development	4.39	MU	4
Vocabulary Enrichment	4.48	MU	3
Average Wx	4.47	MU	

Table summarizes the reported domains for kindergarten literacy teaching and reading-related development. The highest was Phonemic Awareness Skills (mean 4.54; VMU), whereas Fluency Development was lowest (mean 4.39; MU). The tabulated overall average was 4.47 (MU).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 9. Literacy domains by school-size group

Domain / indicator	Big schools	Medium schools	Small schools	Overall
Phonics	4.40	4.60	4.51	4.50
Phonemic Awareness Skills	4.52	4.60	4.49	4.54
Fluency Development	4.37	4.46	4.34	4.39
Vocabulary Enrichment	4.33	4.60	4.51	4.48
Average Wx	4.39	4.55	4.47	4.47

Table preserves the tabulated group-level weighted means across the school-size classifications. These variations offer a descriptive profile of where individual instructional domains were more or less highly rated.

The group means were transcribed from the reported tabulation and should not be interpreted as statistically significant between-school differences. Respondent denominators and measurement reliability would need confirmation before inferential comparisons.

Table 10. Agreement in rankings of literacy-development domains

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Decoding	0.44	11.88	9	NS
Phonemic Awareness Skills	0.34	8.16	8	NS
Fluency Development	0.23	6.21	9	NS
Vocabulary Development	0.10	3.00	10	NS

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 0 of 4 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 4 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS).

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 11. Selected indicators: phonics and decoding

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Recognizes and names alphabet letters.	4.48	MU
Blends sounds to read simple CVC words.	4.34	MU
Segments simple words into sounds.	4.41	MU
Reads simple syllables accurately.	4.56	VMU
Identifies beginning sounds in familiar words.	4.54	VMU
Reads CVC words with minimal support.	4.34	MU
Uses picture cues to decode unfamiliar words.	4.69	VMU
Shows phonological awareness through rhyming, syllable clapping, or ending sounds.	4.58	VMU
Improves decoding fluency through repeated reading.	4.58	VMU
Produces correct letter sounds using letter or picture cues.	4.51	VMU

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Uses picture cues to decode unfamiliar words.” (4.69; VMU). The lowest selected average was for “Blends sounds to read simple CVC words.” (4.34; MU). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 12. Selected indicators: phonemic awareness

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Identifies beginning sounds in familiar words.	4.51	VMU
Identifies ending sounds in simple words.	4.59	VMU
Recognizes and produces rhyming words.	4.59	VMU
Claps or separates words into syllables.	4.69	VMU
Segments CVC words into phonemes.	4.48	MU
Blends phonemes to form simple words.	4.56	VMU
Identifies the number of sounds in short words.	4.52	VMU
Manipulates phonemes in simple tasks.	4.38	MU
Recognizes same beginning or ending sounds in pictures or words.	4.51	VMU

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Claps or separates words into syllables.” (4.69; VMU). The lowest selected average was for “Manipulates phonemes in simple tasks.” (4.38; MU). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 13. Selected indicators: fluency development

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Reads simple words accurately during guided reading.	4.58	VMU
Reads familiar words or phrases with increasing speed.	4.48	MU
Maintains proper pacing when reading aloud.	4.46	MU
Self-corrects reading errors.	4.28	MU
Reads with emerging expression.	4.28	MU
Uses proper phrasing in short sentences.	4.31	MU
Recognizes common sight words quickly.	4.34	MU
Shows improved stamina during short reading tasks.	4.41	MU
Participates confidently in oral reading activities.	4.41	MU
Reads familiar sentences smoothly after guided practice.	4.34	MU

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Reads simple words accurately during guided reading.” (4.58; VMU). The lowest selected average was for “Self-corrects reading errors.” (4.28; MU). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation. The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be

prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 14. Selected indicators: vocabulary enrichment

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Follows simple instructions using familiar vocabulary.	4.48	MU
Uses new words from stories, songs, or discussions.	4.54	VMU
Expresses ideas through meaningful phrases or sentences.	4.44	MU
Asks age-appropriate questions.	4.54	VMU
Understands basic concepts.	4.54	VMU
Uses descriptive words for objects or experiences.	4.44	MU
Improves word recognition through picture-word matching.	4.48	MU
Explains simple story vocabulary from read-alouds.	4.48	MU
Shows growth in receptive vocabulary using context clues.	4.41	MU
Names common objects, animals, colors, and shapes.	4.44	MU
Uses action and naming words correctly.	4.48	MU

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Uses new words from stories, songs, or discussions.” (4.54; VMU). The lowest selected average was for “Shows growth in receptive vocabulary using context clues.” (4.41; MU). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

4. Discussion

The teaching-domain means show how widely respondents reported using a range of developmentally appropriate strategies. High reported use may indicate instructional familiarity and perceived routine implementation, but it does not establish intensity, quality or fidelity of classroom enactment without observation.

A difference between the teaching-approach profile and the literacy-development profile is important: teaching-use measures describe practices, while the literacy ratings describe respondents' assessments of skills or learning support. In the absence of separately measured pretest and posttest learner scores, the survey cannot attribute literacy gains to any one approach.

Phonemic awareness and phonics are related but distinct. Phonemic awareness concerns spoken-sound identification and manipulation, whereas phonics teaches systematic letter-sound associations. The National Reading Panel (2000) treated both as important areas; the comparatively lower fluency pattern merits systematic oral-reading evidence instead of assuming that strongly rated phonics practices necessarily generalize to automatic reading.

The rank-concordance statistics concern how consistently the school-size groups ranked questionnaire items within each dimension. A nonsignificant Kendall statistic is not evidence that the underlying instruction was ineffective; it means that the reported rank orders did not show statistically significant agreement under the stated procedure. Future research should evaluate child-level reading outcomes using validated, age-appropriate tasks and an analysis suited to the actual sampling unit.

The school-size group comparison deserves particular attention because a high aggregate mean can mask differences in the distribution of practices. The descriptive means can help locate where supervision or additional instructional resources may be considered, but without individual response dispersion and school-level sampling information they cannot determine whether school size explains the pattern. Reporting raw sample denominators for each group is essential to any later comparison.

The two literacy-related tables should be interpreted together rather than treated as parallel measures of the same outcome. Fluency needs repeated reading of connected language with sufficient accuracy and automaticity, while vocabulary depends on meaningful exposure and opportunities to use words. Classroom use of strategies targeting these skills cannot substitute for learner-level assessment of progress in the corresponding domains.

The instrument-development description mentions expert validation and an additional reliability calculation. Because the reliability formula and scale type require clarification, subsequent studies should document exact item construction, scoring anchors, expert-rating procedures, internal-consistency analysis appropriate to ordered rating items, and the extent of missing data. These safeguards matter before combining domains into broad indices.

When kindergarten phonics scores are interpreted, it is useful to separate daily classroom exposure from the specific competence that phonics instruction targets. Explicit presentation of letter-sound correspondences, blending and guided correction are practices, whereas reliable decoding requires a learner to apply those correspondences to unfamiliar printed forms. The questionnaire item means can indicate the reported frequency or perceived utilization of those practices, but accuracy and generalization should be determined with short individual tasks administered under comparable conditions. An appropriate follow-up might collect letter-sound identification, blending and decoding records at several points in a term, while maintaining the current descriptive survey as supplementary implementation evidence.

The study also highlights the relationship between oral-language development and reading comprehension. Storytelling, conversations, picture-supported description and vocabulary activities plausibly provide language experiences that support later comprehension; nevertheless, a high teacher rating for one of those strategies cannot identify how many pupils acquired new

vocabulary or could explain the meaning of a text. A more discriminating classroom evaluation would document the complexity of read-aloud questions, opportunities for verbal response and age-appropriate demonstrations of understanding. In this way, the local findings can generate specific coaching questions without turning correlation-free survey findings into unwarranted improvement claims.

A policy response could proceed in stages. At school level, kindergarten teams can review the lowest-rated indicators, document how lessons are implemented and select one feasible corrective practice; at district level, supervisors can compare implementation records and offer targeted technical assistance. A follow-up evaluation should decide in advance whether its aim is implementation fidelity, growth in foundational skills or both. Those aims require distinct measures and units of analysis. In particular, the school-size ranking tests should not be reinterpreted as individual teacher correlations or used to infer differences in pupil achievement without learner outcome data.

Finally, the disagreement between the narrative respondent count and the enumerated school table is not a minor editorial matter. The denominator affects interpretations of percentages, precision and any model treating respondents as independent. Because school heads and kindergarten teachers may answer survey items from different observational positions, the composition of the responding group also affects construct validity. Confirmation of who completed each component and how school-level aggregation was undertaken should precede more ambitious claims about the generalizability of the estimates.

5. Implications for practice and research

A practical implication is to translate broad perceptions into a small set of observable monitoring indicators, designate responsibility for follow-up, and revisit these indicators at defined intervals. A stronger subsequent design would include independent measurement of relevant practices or outcomes, transparent instrument reliability evidence, clear sampling denominators and analysis at the correct respondent or school level. Such evidence would enable stronger, though still carefully bounded, claims than agreement of item rankings alone.

6. Limitations

The study's central limitations arise from a one-period perception survey, reliance on summary statistics, potential common-rater bias, and limited information on the psychometric performance of the measurement instrument. District- or school-group Kendall concordance indicates ordering similarity but does not establish effect magnitude, student-level improvement, employee-level performance change or temporal precedence. Exact p values, confidence intervals and analytic data were not consistently available. The manuscript consequently avoids unsupported causal conclusions and treats unverified statistical labels as reported.

7. Conclusion

The study found generally high ratings for teaching approaches and favorable ratings across literacy-development domains, with comparatively lower scores in fluency. Reported group rank agreement did not meet the study's significance criterion. The findings justify attention to phonemic-awareness, decoding, vocabulary and fluency support, but should not be presented as causal evidence that the approaches enhanced individual children's literacy.

The recommended next step is independent verification of the sample denominator, scale coding, statistical computation and the evidence needed to substantiate any stronger effectiveness or impact claim. Until such verification, the results should be considered a detailed descriptive basis for local review and hypothesis generation.

References

- [1] Alneyadi, S., Abulibdeh, E., & Wardat, Y. (2023). The impact of digital environment vs. traditional method on literacy skills; reading and writing of Emirati fourth graders. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3418. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043418>
- [2] Elston, A., Tiba, C., & Condry, J. (2022). The role of explicit teaching of reading comprehension strategies to an English as a second language learner. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 12(1), a1097. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v12i1.1097>
- [3] National Reading Panel. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/findings>