

The Utilization of the Intervention Activities in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Grade 1 Learners in the Public Elementary Schools in Calabanga West District, Division of Camarines Sur

Aiza N. Calisura¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	The study examined Grade 1 literacy intervention activities in the Calabanga West District during school year 2025–2026. The researcher reported a descriptive–evaluative–correlational design and 36 teacher respondents, and analyzed five-point survey ratings using descriptive and Kendall rank-concordance statistics. Overall utilization of intervention activities was Very Much Utilized (4.65), led by one-to-one or individual support (4.79), followed by classroom-based activities (4.74) and small groups (4.69). Community-based activities were lower (4.37). Among reported literacy-skill domains, phonics ranked highest (4.34) and writing strategies lowest (3.71). The findings justify targeted support and the formulation of intervention activities, but do not demonstrate pupil-level skill gains caused by the activities. An inconsistency concerning respondents' grade level requires author clarification.
Keywords: Literacy Intervention Activities For Grade 1 Learners Philippines School-Based Survey Kendall's Coefficient Of Concordance Teacher Perceptions	

1. Introduction

In the Philippine basic education system, literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners is situated at the intersection of classroom practice, school policy and local resource conditions. The way educational practices are organized within a district cannot be inferred from national policy statements alone; information on local implementation and the views of the personnel responsible for delivery is also necessary. The study therefore focused on public elementary schools in Calabanga West District, Division of Camarines Sur, a setting in which the routines supporting one-to-one intervention, community-based intervention and interactive peer-based activities can vary across schools.

The phenomenon examined by the study involves more than the presence of a program or institutional requirement. What respondents recognize as frequent, substantial or effective practice may depend on exposure, school size, resource access, the specific indicator being rated and the standards used for judging it. For this reason, evidence about literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners must distinguish the extent of reported implementation from measurable changes in teachers' work or learners' outcomes. The ratings obtained in a cross-sectional questionnaire provide one form of evidence, but not every form required for a causal claim. The study organized its inquiries around substantive domains rather than a single unqualified effectiveness score. The domains included one-to-one intervention, small-group support, classroom-based intervention, community-based intervention. Considering these areas separately makes it possible to identify strengths and weaknesses that may be hidden by a favorable overall mean. It also allows school leaders to direct follow-up observation and support toward specific activities instead of treating all facets of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners as interchangeable.

A second analytical concern was whether respondent groups ranked the indicators similarly. Concordance across group rankings addresses the consistency of priorities or perceptions, not the magnitude of implementation or a relationship between an intervention and an educational outcome. Accordingly, the study treated means and ranks as descriptive indicators while interpreting the significance tests within the narrower meaning of Kendall's coefficient of concordance.

The study is also relevant to established educational guidance. The relevant work by Castles et al., 2018 sets out a policy or research framework against which reported practices may be considered. Such guidance offers analytical context without transforming survey responses into direct observational evidence. The research questions therefore concerned the extent of practices in the specified setting, respondent-group agreement about their ordering, and implications for local educational improvement.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey with researcher-made questionnaire and reported validation. It investigated literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners in public elementary schools in Calabanga West District, Division of Camarines Sur during the study period. The design was observational. Although the term “correlational” appeared in the design description, the inferential results reported in the study primarily concerned agreement among ranked indicators; the resulting statistics did not estimate causal effects or the strength of a learner-level association.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The reported study participants consisted of 36 teachers as stated in the abstract. Respondents were grouped by the school

classifications or school groupings shown in the results. Survey estimates should be read in light of the actual respondent composition rather than as probability-sample estimates for all Philippine schools. Where the study did not provide distinct pupil assessments or repeated measures, teachers' accounts of student development were interpreted as perceptions.

2.3 Instrument and procedure

The study used a structured questionnaire or researcher-made rating scale encompassing the stated domains of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners. Item-level statements were evaluated through the verbal-response categories and weighted-mean interpretation bands displayed with the study tables. The study described instrument preparation and administration through participating schools and used grouped ratings to address the research questions. Reported validity, reliability and response-handling details were not independently reconstructed or substituted where documentation was incomplete.

2.4 Data treatment and interpretation

The study reported frequency, percentage, weighted mean, rank, Kendall's W and chi-square. Weighted means described central tendencies in ordinal rating responses, while reported ranks established the relative order of indicators. Kendall's W described concordance in ranks across the specified school groups; related chi-square results were treated according to the reported thresholds. No new significance calculations, sample-based confidence intervals or unreported multivariable estimates were introduced. Tables reproduce printed figures, including any discrepancies requiring verification.

2.5 Ethical and reporting considerations

The study was reported using aggregated responses. Individual-level datasets, consent documentation, and institutional ethics reference numbers were not reproduced in the available study chapters, and none is supplied here as though verified. Interpretation avoids identifying individual teachers or learners and refrains from attributing perceived outcomes to the surveyed practices without appropriate longitudinal or comparative evidence.

3. Results

The tables present the numerical entries and response-scale labels reported for each domain. Domain-level means describe respondent ratings; significance tests refer to group rank concordance.

Table 1. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in terms of One-to-one/Individual

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. The teacher provides one-on-one reading instruction to struggling learners.	4.75	VMU	9.5	4.92	VMU	2	4.73	VMU	2.5	4.80	VMU	4
2. The teacher gives individualized feedback on learners' reading performance.	4.92	VMU	3	4.69	VMU	9.5	4.64	VMU	6.5	4.75	VMU	7.5
3. The teacher conducts personalized phonics drills for learners.	4.92	VMU	3	4.69	VMU	9.5	4.64	VMU	6.5	4.75	VMU	7.5
4. The teacher monitors individual learner progress regularly.	4.92	VMU	3	4.92	VMU	2	4.73	VMU	2.5	4.86	VMU	1.5
5. The teacher adjusts instruction based on individual learner needs.	4.83	VMU	7	4.85	VMU	6	4.55	VMU	10	4.74	VMU	9.5
6. The teacher provides guided reading sessions for individual learners.	4.75	VMU	9.5	4.85	VMU	6	4.64	VMU	6.5	4.74	VMU	9.5

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with one-to-one intervention. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of one-to-one intervention would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 2. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in terms of Small Group

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. The teacher organizes learners into small groups based on ability level.	4.67	VMU	7.5	4.77	VMU	7	4.55	VMU	8.5	4.66	VMU	10
2. The teacher facilitates group reading sessions.	4.83	VMU	1.5	4.77	VMU	7	4.55	VMU	8.5	4.72	VMU	3.5
3. The teacher provides differentiated instruction within groups.	4.67	VMU	7.5	4.85	VMU	3	4.55	VMU	8.5	4.69	VMU	6
4. The teacher assigns group-based literacy tasks.	4.67	VMU	7.5	4.69	VMU	9.5	4.64	VMU	4.5	4.67	VMU	7.5
5. The teacher encourages peer discussion during reading activities.	4.67	VMU	7.5	4.69	VMU	9.5	4.64	VMU	4.5	4.67	VMU	7.5
6. The teacher monitors each group's progress regularly.	4.67	VMU	7.5	4.85	VMU	3	4.64	VMU	4.5	4.72	VMU	3.5

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with small-group support. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of small-group support would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 3. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in terms of Classroom based

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. The teacher integrates literacy activities into daily lessons.	4.67	VMU	8.5	4.92	VMU	3.5	4.64	VMU	4.5	4.74	VMU	5.5
2. The teacher uses whole-class reading instruction strategies.	4.75	VMU	5.5	4.77	VMU	8.5	4.45	VMU	10	4.66	VMU	10
3. The teacher incorporates storytelling in teaching literacy.	4.92	VMU	1	4.92	VMU	3.5	4.55	VMU	8	4.80	VMU	2.5
4. The teacher uses visual aids and instructional materials in reading lessons.	4.83	VMU	3	4.92	VMU	3.5	4.55	VMU	8	4.77	VMU	4
5. The teacher conducts class-wide reading exercises.	4.75	VMU	5.5	4.85	VMU	7	4.64	VMU	4.5	4.74	VMU	5.5

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with classroom-based intervention. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of classroom-based intervention would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 4. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in terms of Community based

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. The teacher involves parents in learners' reading activities.	4.67	VMU	4	4.77	VMU	4	4.45	MU	4	4.63	VMU	4
2. The teacher encourages reading at home.	4.83	VMU	1.5	4.92	VMU	2	4.82	VMU	1	4.86	VMU	1
3. The teacher provides take-home reading materials.	4.83	VMU	1.5	4.92	VMU	2	4.73	VMU	2	4.83	VMU	2
4. The teacher coordinates with parents for learner progress monitoring.	4.75	VMU	3	4.92	VMU	2	4.64	VMU	3	4.77	VMU	3
5. The teacher promotes community reading programs.	4.25	MU	10	4.38	MU	7	3.91	MU	9	4.18	MU	8
6. The teacher encourages participation in local literacy activities.	4.42	MU	6.5	4.31	MU	8	4.09	MU	6.5	4.27	MU	7
7. The teacher collaborates with stakeholders for literacy support.	4.33	MU	8	4.46	MU	6	4.09	MU	6.5	4.30	MU	6

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with community-based intervention. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of community-based intervention would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 5. The Summary of the Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. One-to-one/Individual	4.86	VMU	1	4.84	VMU	2	4.66	VMU	1	4.79	VMU	1
2. Small group	4.70	VMU	3	4.77	VMU	3	4.60	VMU	3	4.69	VMU	3
3. Classroom based	4.76	VMU	2	4.86	VMU	1	4.61	VMU	2	4.74	VMU	2
4. Community Based	4.48	MU	4	4.44	MU	4	4.18	MU	4	4.37	MU	4
Average Weighted Mean	4.70	VMU		4.73	VMU		4.51	VMU		4.65	VMU	

Legend:	4.50 - 5.00	Very Much Utilized (VMU)	Wx	- Weighted Mean
	3.50 - 4.49	Much Utilized (MU)	Int	- Interpretation
	2.50 - 3.49	Utilized (U)	R	- Rank
	1.50 - 2.49	Fairly Utilized (FU)		
	1.00 - 1.49	Not at All (NAA)		

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes.

An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting phonics, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 6. The Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teacher

Indicator	One-to-one/ Individual	Small Groups	Classroom Based	Community Based
Sum of Squares of the difference	225.50	358	237.50	1169
Number of Groups	3	3	3	3
Number of Indicators	10	11	10	12
Coefficient of Concordance (W)	0.30	0.36	0.32	0.91
Computed χ^2 value	8.10	10.80	8.64	30.03
Degree of Freedom	9	10	9	11
Tabular value at				
0.05	16.92	18.31	16.92	19.68
0.025	19.68	21.16	19.68	22.68
0.01	21.67	23.21	21.67	24.73
0.005	23.59	25.19	23.59	26.76
0.001	27.88	26.76	27.88	31.26
Decision on the Null Hypothesis (H_0)	Accepted	Accepted	Accepted	Rejected
Significance of Agreement	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	0.005

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on phonemic awareness could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

Table 7. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learner

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners can recognize the letters of the alphabet.	4.58	VME	1	4.85	VME	1.5	4.45	ME	1	4.63	VME	1
2. Learners can identify consonant and vowel sounds.	4.50	VME	2	4.85	VME	1.5	4.36	ME	2	4.57	VME	2
3. Learners can blend sounds to form simple words.	4.42	ME	4	4.77	VME	3.5	4.09	ME	7	4.43	ME	4.5
4. Learners can segment words into individual sounds.	4.42	ME	4	4.69	VME	5	4.18	ME	5	4.43	ME	4.5
5. Learners can recognize rhyming words.	4.42	ME	4	4.77	VME	3.5	4.27	ME	3	4.49	ME	3
6. Learners can decode unfamiliar words using letter-sound correspondence.	4.25	ME	6	4.31	ME	8	4.18	ME	5	4.25	ME	6

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with fluency development. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of fluency development would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 8. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learners

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners can identify the initial sound in a word.	4.91	VME	1	5.00	VME	1	4.45	ME	1	4.79	VME	1
2. Learners can identify the final sound in a word.	4.50	VME	2	4.77	VME	2.5	4.09	ME	5.5	4.45	ME	2
3. Learners can segment words into syllables.	4.42	ME	3.5	4.62	VME	4	4.09	ME	5.5	4.37	ME	4
4. Learners can blend sounds to form a word.	4.42	ME	3.5	4.54	VME	5	4.09	ME	5.5	4.35	ME	5
5. Learners can isolate individual sounds in words.	4.17	ME	8	4.23	ME	7.5	4.00	ME	8.5	4.13	ME	8
6. Learners can manipulate sounds to form new words.	4.25	ME	5.5	4.13	ME	9	3.27	ME	11	3.89	ME	11
7. Learners can recognize alliteration in words and sentences.	4.17	ME	8	3.85	ME	10.5	4.00	ME	8.5	4.00	ME	9

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with vocabulary. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of vocabulary would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 9. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learners

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners can read words quickly and accurately.	4.33	ME	1	4.38	ME	1	3.82	ME	3	4.18	ME	1
2. Learners can read sentences smoothly without hesitation.	4.08	ME	4	4.08	ME	4	3.91	ME	2	4.02	ME	3
3. Learners can read aloud with proper intonation.	4.08	ME	4	3.92	ME	7.5	3.64	ME	9.5	3.88	ME	8
4. Learners can maintain an appropriate reading pace.	4.00	ME	8	4.08	ME	4	3.73	ME	6.5	3.93	ME	6
5. Learners can reread familiar texts for better understanding.	4.08	ME	4	4.08	ME	4	4.09	ME	1	4.08	ME	2
6. Learners can recognize high-frequency sight words automatically.	4.08	ME	4	4.00	ME	6	3.73	ME	6.5	3.94	ME	5
7. Learners can self-correct errors while reading.	4.00	ME	8	4.23	ME	2	3.73	ME	6.5	3.99	ME	4

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with comprehension. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of comprehension would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 10. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learners

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners can understand new words introduced in class.	3.92	ME	2.5	4.31	ME	2	3.82	ME	2	4.01	ME	2
2. Learners can use new words in sentences.	3.75	ME	6.5	4.00	ME	4	3.73	ME	6.5	3.83	ME	4
3. Learners can define words accurately.	3.75	ME	6.5	3.77	ME	10	3.55	ME	11	3.69	ME	9.5
4. Learners can match words with pictures or meanings.	4.33	ME	1	4.62	ME	1	4.00	ME	1	4.32	ME	1
5. Learners can categorize words based on meaning.	3.67	ME	8.5	3.92	ME	5.5	3.82	ME	3.5	3.80	ME	5.5
6. Learners can recognize synonyms and antonyms.	3.92	ME	2.5	4.23	ME	3	3.82	ME	3.5	3.99	ME	3
7. Learners can spell new words correctly.	3.67	ME	8.5	3.92	ME	5.5	3.73	ME	6.5	3.77	ME	7

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with writing strategies. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of writing strategies would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 11. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learners

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners can recall the main idea of a text.	3.67	ME	6	3.92	ME	8	4.09	ME	3.5	3.89	ME	7
2. Learners can identify key details in a story.	3.67	ME	6	4.00	ME	5	4.18	ME	1	3.95	ME	3
3. Learners can make predictions about a text.	3.83	ME	1.5	4.00	ME	5	4.00	ME	7	3.94	ME	4.5
4. Learners can ask and answer questions about a passage.	3.67	ME	6	4.00	ME	5	4.09	ME	3.5	3.92	ME	6
5. Learners can retell a story in sequence.	3.50	ME	9.5	3.92	ME	8	4.00	ME	7	3.81	ME	8
6. Learners can draw conclusions from a text.	3.50	ME	9.5	3.92	ME	8	3.91	ME	9	3.78	ME	9
7. Learners can summarize what they have read.	3.67	ME	6	3.77	ME	10	3.82	ME	10	3.75	ME	10
8. Learners can recognize cause and effect relationships.	3.75	ME	3	4.08	ME	3	4.09	ME	3.5	3.97	ME	2

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with interactive peer-based activities. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of interactive peer-based activities would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 12. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learners

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners can write letters clearly and correctly.	4.17	ME	1	4.69	VME	1	4.27	ME	1	4.38	ME	1
2. Learners can write simple words independently.	4.08	ME	2	4.46	ME	2	4.00	ME	2	4.18	ME	2
3. Learners can compose simple sentences.	3.58	ME	3.5	4.00	ME	4	3.82	ME	3.5	3.80	ME	4
4. Learners can organize sentences into a short paragraph.	3.42	E	5.5	3.46	ME	11	3.64	ME	7.5	3.50	ME	8.5
5. Learners can use correct punctuation and capitalization.	3.42	E	5.5	3.69	ME	5.5	3.64	ME	7.5	3.58	ME	5
6. Learners can spell common words accurately.	3.58	ME	3.5	4.23	ME	3	3.82	ME	3.5	3.88	ME	3
7. Learners can express ideas clearly in writing.	3.33	E	7.5	3.54	ME	10	3.73	ME	5.5	3.53	ME	7

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with one-to-one intervention. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of one-to-one intervention would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 13. The Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skills of the Learners

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Learners actively participate in group reading activities.	4.50	VME	1	5.00	VME	1	4.45	ME	1	4.65	VME	1
2. Learners collaborate in peer storytelling sessions.	4.25	ME	3.5	4.77	VME	4.5	4.36	ME	2	4.46	ME	2.5
3. Learners engage in paired reading exercises.	4.25	ME	3.5	4.85	VME	3	4.27	ME	3	4.46	ME	2.5
4. Learners give and receive constructive feedback from classmates.	4.08	ME	5.5	4.69	VME	6	3.91	ME	7.5	4.23	ME	6
5. Learners participate in classroom discussions.	4.08	ME	5.5	4.92	VME	2	4.18	ME	4	4.40	ME	4
6. Learners share ideas and thoughts in group writing tasks.	3.92	ME	9	4.46	ME	9.5	4.09	ME	5	4.16	ME	7

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The reported indicators in this table examine a specific dimension of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners, including operational aspects associated with small-group support. Their weighted means and respondent-group ranks describe how participants judged the prevalence, visibility or perceived effectiveness of the activity in their own schools.

The range of responses across individual statements should be interpreted as a pattern of relative strengths and areas for attention, not as direct evidence that any one activity produced an improvement. Rating scales capture perceptions that may also depend on school conditions, the opportunities respondents had to observe a practice and their interpretation of the response categories.

For practice, the findings point to the value of verifying the relevant activity through lesson plans, logs, classroom observations or other direct indicators. A focused review of small-group support would help establish whether the reported ratings correspond with the consistency and quality of actual implementation.

Table 14. The Summary of the Extent of the Level of the Utilization of the Intervention Activities Employed by the Teachers in Enhancing the Literacy Skill

Indicators	Big Schools			Medium Schools			Small Schools			Average		
	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R	Wx	I	R
1. Phonics	4.32	ME	1	4.55	VME	2	4.16	ME	1	4.34	ME	1
2. Phonemic Awareness	4.30	ME	2	4.39	ME	3	4.05	ME	3	4.25	ME	3
3. Fluency Development	4.07	ME	4	4.02	ME	4	3.78	ME	5	3.95	ME	4
4. Vocabulary Enhancement	3.74	ME	5	3.86	ME	7	3.72	ME	7	3.77	ME	6
5. Comprehension Strategies	3.68	ME	6	3.99	ME	5	4.03	ME	4	3.90	ME	5
6. Writing Strategies	3.52	ME	7	3.87	ME	6	3.75	ME	6	3.71	ME	7
7. Interactive and Peer Based	4.13	ME	3	4.70	VME	1	4.08	ME	2	4.30	ME	2
Average Weighted Mean	3.91	ME		4.20	ME		3.94	ME		4.03	ME	

Legend:

4.50 - 5.00	Very Much Employed (VME)	Wx	- Weighted Mean
3.50 - 4.49	Much Employed (ME)	Int	- Interpretation
2.50 - 3.49	Employed (E)	R	- Rank
1.50 - 2.49	Fairly Employed (FE)		
1.00 - 1.49	Not at All (NAA)		

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

The summary consolidates the domain-level ratings and makes visible the relative standing of major components of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners. The relative order of these reported domains is more informative for local prioritization than the overall mean alone, because the domains may involve distinct resources and implementation processes.

An apparently favorable average does not mean every school implemented each activity equally or that learners experienced the same educational benefits. The reported categories reflect a survey scale; they should not be read as externally verified proficiency standards or comparable units of learning gain.

The practical use of this finding is diagnostic. Components with lower ratings, including potential constraints affecting classroom-based intervention, may warrant closer monitoring, better implementation documentation and targeted professional support before a district-level improvement claim is made.

Table 15. The Significant Agreement on the Rank Orders of the Extent of the Intervention Activities in Enhancing the Literacy Skills along the Different Gr

Indicator	Phonics	Phonemic Awareness	Fluency Development	Vocabulary Enhancement	Comprehension Strategies	Writing Strategies	Interactive and Peer Based
Sum of Squares of the difference	650	534.75	442	1040.50	441.50	752.25	578.50
Number of Groups	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Number of Indicators	10	11	10	12	10	11	10
Coefficient of Concordance (W)	0.88	0.54	0.59	0.81	0.59	0.76	0.78
Computed χ^2 value	23.76	16.20	15.93	24.30	15.93	22.80	21.04
Degrees of Freedom	9	10	9	11	9	10	9
Tabular value at							
0.05	16.92	18.30	16.92	19.68	16.92	18.30	16.92
0.025	19.68	21.16	19.68	22.68	19.68	21.16	19.68
0.01	21.67	23.21	21.67	24.73	21.67	23.21	21.67
0.005	23.59	25.19	23.59	26.76	23.59	25.19	23.59
0.001	27.88	26.76	27.88	31.26	27.88	26.76	27.88
Decision on the Null Hypothesis (H_0)	Rejected	Accepted	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted	Rejected	Rejected
Significance of Agreement	0.005	Not Significant	Not Significant	0.025	Not Significant	0.025	0.025

Note. Numerical values, group categories, ranks, and verbal labels are reproduced as presented in the study; no recomputation or silent correction was applied.

This table addresses the study question concerning agreement in the ordering of the reported indicators. The statistical decision must be understood alongside the coefficient, chi-square value, number of ranked cases and stated significance level; it does not evaluate how strongly literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners changed in practice.

Concordance among school-group rank profiles is analytically different from agreement among all individual respondents. Particularly when some groups are smaller, highly similar aggregate rankings can coexist with unreported within-group variation. Conversely, a nonsignificant concordance result does not establish the absence of an educational practice.

The immediate implication is to examine whether the observed group differences reflect school circumstances, access to support or indicator interpretation. Follow-up work on community-based intervention could use school-level records, interviews, observation protocols or direct learner measures, depending on the outcome being investigated.

4. Discussion

Taken together, the findings suggest a differentiated profile of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners within public elementary schools in Calabanga West District, Division of Camarines Sur. Some domains were rated more favorably than others, but the study's comparisons concerned respondents' evaluations of program activity or practice. The interpretation should therefore emphasize the organization and visibility of those practices rather than unobserved changes in educational outcomes.

The domains must also be considered conceptually. For example, one-to-one intervention and interactive peer-based activities involve different operational demands even when they appear in the same questionnaire. An overall rating cannot establish that schools have equivalent capacity, resources or instructional conditions. Follow-up should identify the precise activities behind each item and test whether respondents applied a shared meaning to the measurement scale.

The study's rank-concordance analysis makes an additional contribution by examining alignment in the order assigned to indicators. Kendall's W is sensitive to patterns of ranking among the selected groups; it does not assess causation, pupil-level correlations or improvements over time. A statistically significant result should therefore be explained as concordance of ordered profiles, while nonsignificant outcomes should not be called evidence that a practice was ineffective.

The cited scholarship and policy provide context but should not be treated as validating the local mean scores. Guidance from Castles et al., 2018, Institute of Education Sciences, 2016 highlights the importance of clearly specified practices, appropriate pedagogical support or relevant educational standards. Applying such guidance requires attention to local implementation, documentation and direct assessment rather than reliance on favorable response categories alone.

Implications for school administrators include establishing observable criteria for high-priority activities, checking participation and resource access across schools, and using professional conversations to determine why some dimensions received lower assessments. If the objective is to understand effects on actual teacher or learner performance, a subsequent design should add independent outcome data, repeated observations and an appropriate comparison framework.

The main limitations arise from the local scope of the respondents, reliance on reported ratings, the unequal or limited respondent groups in some analyses, and incomplete access to item-level observations for independent verification. In addition, the underlying survey cannot by itself separate the contribution of interactive peer-based activities from other school, family, learner or policy influences. The conclusions therefore remain descriptive and context-specific; extension beyond the study setting requires additional evidence.

5. Conclusion

The study documented the reported status of literacy intervention activities for Grade 1 learners in public elementary schools in Calabanga West District, Division of Camarines Sur. Its domain-level results and agreement tests offer an account of local respondent perceptions, areas of comparatively stronger implementation and aspects warranting closer attention. Reported means and statistical decisions were retained as presented, without reinterpretation as experimental effects.

The findings support evidence-informed review of one-to-one intervention, phonemic awareness and interactive peer-based activities. Implementation monitoring, clearer criteria for rating performance, and direct observational or learner-level evidence are suitable priorities for further research. The study does not demonstrate that an individual practice caused an improvement in school, teacher or learner outcomes.

References

- [1] Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 19(1), 5–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271>
- [2] Institute of Education Sciences. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). U.S. Department of Education. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/www/PracticeGuide/21>