



AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (AJMRI)

ISSN: 2158-8155 (ONLINE), 2832-4854 (PRINT)

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 2 (2023)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Cross-Sectioning the Literacy Status of the Schools Division of Calbayog City

Erwin L. Purcia^{1*}, Lourdes L. Matan¹, Geraldine P. Sumbise¹

Article Information

Received: March 03, 2023

Accepted: March 21, 2023

Published: April 01, 2023

Keywords

Literacy Status, EGRA, CRLA, PHIL-IRI, Cross-Sectional Research

ABSTRACT

This study cross-sectionally assessed the literacy status among schools in the Schools Division of Calbayog City. It employed a descriptive cross-sectional research design utilizing the EGRA, CRLA and Phil-IRI reading tools fielded out, developed and adopted as principal research instruments in this study. Results revealed that most Grade level learners yielded a significant decrease in the number of learners that are in full refresher and frustration level from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment results. There was a significant decrease in the number of learners identified with frustration level from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result. Grades 7-12 did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid-assessment results for PHIL-IRI Filipino and English. Therefore, it is recommended that intensification of these tools and orientation to teachers relative to the conduct of the assessment processes may be instituted in the entire division.

INTRODUCTION

Because it has such a significant impact on how an individual can function within a society, literacy can be viewed as empowering. Literacy is traditionally defined as the capacity to read and write (Purcia & Merida, 2021). Currently, it refers to a person's competence in a particular field or discipline as well as their knowledge. A person's capacity for reading, writing, speaking, listening, conceptualization, and innovation opens up many opportunities. "Literacy encompasses the knowledge and skills students need to access, understand, analyze, and evaluate information, make meaning, express thoughts and emotions, present ideas and opinions, interact with others, and participate in activities at school and in their lives beyond school," according to the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (n.d.), educators have been interested in literacy education problems, issues, and trends for a very long time. in 2016, Ewing, para. 3).

Through surveys conducted by various experts in the field, the International Literacy Association (ILA) publishes a report on pressing issues pertaining to literacy education each year. According to Selangan (2015), these kinds of surveys are meant to "reveal wide gaps between what educators across the globe consider important topics in literacy education and those garnering the most attention." 1). Issues in literacy education are categorized as "hot" (those that receive a lot of attention) and "not hot" (those that are not popular and don't need a lot of attention) in accordance with the goal of ILA. In order to provide teachers, professors, researchers, administrators, and policymakers with information on issues that require immediate discussions and solutions, ILA has a tradition of presenting "hot" and "not hot" issues.

According to Cassidy & Ortlieb (2011), educators' interest in literacy education began in the 1990s when they observed significant gaps in the field's understanding of its development. However, many important issues were left unresolved because there were not enough studies and data to spread literacy education (Purcia, Albuladura & Velarde, 2021). As a result, literacy experts came up with the idea of compiling a list of timely and pertinent issues related to the field in order to assist their fellow advocates in putting their academic endeavors into context. "This body of work would allow us, as literacy professionals, to learn from the past and in turn, refine our practices to suit the ever-changing needs of the educational community," as stated by Cassidy & Ortlieb (2011).

According to a report published in 2000 by the Department of Education (DepEd), the literacy rate among Filipinos is 96.6 percent. In addition, the United Nations Development Report (2009) asserts that the Philippines has a high literacy rate of 93.4% (Imam, 2016), and the literacy rate of children was 98.2% in 2015 (Balinas, Rodriguez, Santillan, & Villena, 2017). Since a number of studies have demonstrated the alarming decline in reading proficiency among Filipino students over the past few years (Bacal, 2005; Imam, 2016; Luz, 2007; Orenca, 2006; & Selangan, 2015).

Contrarily, according to Cristobal (2015), 1.2 million Filipinos between the ages of five and fifteen are out of school and have limited literacy skills. Balinas, Rodriguez, Santillan, and Villena (2017) also show that remote Mindanao kindergarteners have consistently low reading scores. Luz's (2007) claim that the Philippines is "a nation of non-readers" may become one of the country's major challenges in the future if these numbers continue to rise. It is impossible to deny that the nation has encountered

¹ Department of Education, Schools Division of Calbayog City, Philippines

* Corresponding author's e-mail: erwin.purcia@deped.gov.ph

a number of difficulties, particularly with regard to the dissemination of its literacy education and its enhancement. Given that Imam (2016) stated that “without literacy, all other learning is impossible,” such issues cannot be ignored (para. 1). Nevertheless, he excludes poverty as the primary reason why many Filipinos struggle with literacy. Due to a lack of resources that will enable them to attend school and receive a decent education, many students cannot complete their education para. 4). Additionally, Graham & Perin (2007) emphasized that literacy is declining in the Philippines and that the three main causes are as follows: (1) corruption; (2) unqualified teachers and staff; and (3) the media that is hostile to intellectual thought.

Despite the fact that a number of studies have identified some of the issues associated with literacy education in the Philippines, it is evident that these identified issues are limited and may not fully clarify literacy issues that require immediate or significant attention. As a result, the researcher sought to provide a “clearer image” of literacy status in the Schools Division of Calbayog as a representative sample of the vast literacy population in the region and the nation in general.

Research Questions

This study cross-sectionally assessed Literacy status in the Schools Division of Calbayog for the SY 2022-2023.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions

1. What is the status of Literacy in the Schools Division of Calbayog City as assessed by teachers using EGRA, CRLA and Phil-IRI tools in terms of
 - 1.1 pre-assessment; and
 - 1.2 mid-assessment?
2. Is there a significant difference between the pre-assessment and mid-assessment results using the CRLA and Phil-IRI tools as assessed by teachers?
3. What problems do the teachers encounter in the process of assessment?
4. Based on the study’s findings, what program may be

proposed to improve the assessment process?

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive cross-sectional research design which assessed the literacy status in the Schools Division of Calbayog City for the SY 2022-2023. The EGRA, CRLA and Phil-IRI tools fielded out and developed were utilized and adopted as principal research instruments in this study. A checklist for the problems encountered by the teachers in the assessment was also administered. Data were gathered based on Regional Memorandum No. 965, s. 2022 on the scheme of specific time span when pre- and mid- assessments were conducted.

Further, data gathered were collated, tallied and analyzed based on identified research problems using SPSS version 28. A simple frequency count was used for both the pre-assessment and mid-assessment results. For the problems encountered, for the significant difference of the results for both pre and mid-assessments, paired sample t-test was used for both CRLA and Phil-IRI. Only the EGRA results were not subjected to inferential analysis due to the nature of the assessment tool which is developmental in context and that there is no available data yet for comparison since the post-assessment will still be undertaken.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The tables below show the data analysis on both pre and mid-assessment results. (Please see Excel data for the frequency count of pre and mid-assessment results).

On the Significant Difference between the Pre and Mid-Assessment Results for both CRLA and Phil-IRI

The tables below present the inferential analysis on the significant difference between the pre and mid-assessment results of both the CRLA and Phil-IRI.

On the Significant Difference between the Pre and Mid-Assessment Results for both CRLA and Phil-IRI

The tables below present the inferential analysis on the significant difference between the pre and mid-assessment results of both the CRLA and Phil-IRI.

Table 1: CRLA Mother Tongue Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 1 Pre-Assessment CRLA Mother Tongue | 198.75 | 12 | 142.052 | 41.007 |
| Grade 1 Mid-Assessment CRLA Mother Tongue | 108.92 | 12 | 64.814 | 18.710 |
| Pair 2 Grade 2 Pre-Assessment CRLA Mother Tongue | 147.42 | 12 | 110.419 | 31.875 |
| Grade 2 Mid-Assessment CRLA Mother Tongue | 81.42 | 12 | 52.528 | 151.163 |
| Pair 3 Grade 3 Pre-Assessment CRLA Mother Tongue | 114.42 | 12 | 71.327 | 20.590 |
| Grade 3 Mid-Assessment CRLA Mother Tongue | 77.92 | 12 | 44.449 | 12.831 |

Table 2: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 1 Pre-Assessment | 89.833 | 111.175 | 32.094 | 19.196 | 160.471 | 2.799 | 11 | 0.017 |
| CRLA Mother Tongue | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 1 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA Mother Tongue | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 2 Pre-Assessment | 66 | 73.108 | 21.104 | 19.55 | 112.45 | 3.127 | 11 | 0.01 |
| CRLA Mother Tongue | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 2 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA Mother Tongue | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 3 Pre-Assessment | 36.5 | 45.065 | 13.009 | 7.867 | 65.133 | 2.806 | 11 | 0.017 |
| CRLA Mother Tongue | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 3 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA Mother Tongue | | | | | | | | |

Grades 1,2,3 have significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for CRLA Mother Tongue. There was significant decrease in the number of learners that are in full refresher from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result. Grade 2 pre- and mid assessment results have a significant difference for CRLA Filipino.

Table 3: CRLA FILIPINO Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 2 Pre-Assessment | 142.25 | 12 | 107.833 | 31.129 |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 2 Mid-Assessment | 74.25 | 12 | 41.379 | 11.945 |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 3 Pre-Assessment | 114.83 | 12 | 80.753 | 23.311 |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 3 Mid-Assessment | 99.08 | 12 | 109.089 | 31.491 |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | |

Table 4: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 2 Pre-Assessment | 68 | 82.461 | 23.804 | 15.607 | 120.393 | 2.857 | 11 | 0.016 |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 2 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 3 Pre-Assessment | 15.75 | 73.33 | 21.169 | -30.842 | 62.342 | 0.744 | 11 | 0.472 |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 3 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA Filipino | | | | | | | | |

The number of learners who were in the full refresher decreased after the mid-assessment result. No significant difference was found in pre- and mid assessment results of Grade 3 for CRLA Filipino.

Table 5: CRLA ENGLISH Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------------|-------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 3 Pre-Assessment | 98.67 | 12 | 52.574 | 15.177 |
| CRLA English | | | | |
| Grade 3 Mid-Assessment | 61.25 | 12 | 32.1 | 9.266 |
| CRLA English | | | | |

Table 6: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 3 Pre-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA English | 37.417 | 44.005 | 12.703 | 9.457 | 65.376 | 2.945 | 11 | 0.013 |
| Grade 3 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| CRLA English | | | | | | | | |

Grade 3 pre- and mid assessment results have a significant difference for CRLA English. The number of learners who were in the full refresher decreased after the mid-assessment result in CRLA English.

Table 7: GRADE 4-6 PHIL-IRI FILIPINO Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 4 Pre-Assessment | 107.58 | 12 | 47.368 | 13.674 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 4 Mid-Assessment | 71.58 | 12 | 30.42 | 8.781 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 5 Pre-Assessment | 98 | 12 | 58.574 | 16.909 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 5 Mid-Assessment | 54.5 | 12 | 36.567 | 10.556 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 6 Pre-Assessment | 73.17 | 12 | 49.023 | 14.152 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 6 Mid-Assessment | 39.5 | 12 | 29.583 | 8.54 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |

Table 8: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 4 Pre-Assessment | 36 | 27.472 | 7.931 | 18.545 | 53.455 | 4.539 | 11 | 0.001 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 4 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 5 Pre-Assessment | 43.5 | 38.855 | 11.217 | 18.813 | 68.187 | 3.878 | 11 | 0.003 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|----|-------|
| Pair 3 Grade 6 Pre-Assessment | 33.667 | 38.306 | 11.058 | 9.328 | 58.005 | 3.045 | 11 | 0.011 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 6 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |

Grades 4, 5, and 6 showed significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI Filipino. There was significant decrease in the number of learners identified in frustration level from pre-

assessment result to mid-assessment result.

Grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI Filipino.

Table 9: GRADE 7-10 PHIL-IRI FILIPINO, Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 7 Pre-Assessment | 80.583 | 12 | 67.4745 | 19.4782 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 7 Mid-Assessment | 54.917 | 12 | 35.2664 | 10.1805 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 8 Pre-Assessment | 54.917 | 12 | 40.0374 | 11.5578 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 8 Mid-Assessment | 39.083 | 12 | 29.6233 | 8.5515 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 9 Pre-Assessment | 62.833 | 12 | 62.7098 | 18.1028 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 9 Mid-Assessment | 42.667 | 12 | 53.5729 | 15.4652 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 4 Grade 10 Pre-Assessment | 49.833 | 12 | 53.6891 | 15.4987 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 10 Mid-Assessment | 29.917 | 12 | 27.1141 | 7.8272 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |

Table 10: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 7 Pre-Assessment | 25.6667 | 51.0104 | 14.7254 | -6.7438 | 58.0771 | 1.743 | 11 | 0.109 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 7 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 8 Pre-Assessment | 15.8333 | 39.863 | 11.5075 | -9.4944 | 41.1611 | 1.376 | 11 | 0.196 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 8 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 9 Pre-Assessment | 20.1667 | 69.5764 | 20.085 | -24.0401 | 64.3734 | 1.004 | 11 | 0.337 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 9 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 4 Grade 10 Pre-Assessment | 19.9167 | 37.597 | 10.8533 | -3.9714 | 43.8047 | 1.835 | 11 | 0.094 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 10 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |

Grades 11 and 12 also did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI Filipino
Grades 4, 5, and 6 showed significant differences between

their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI English. There was significant decrease in the number of learners identified in frustration level from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result.

Table 11: GRADE 11-12 PHIL-IRI FILIPINO, Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 11 Pre-Assessment | 24.750 | 12 | 25.2807 | 7.2979 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 11 Mid-Assessment | 13.917 | 12 | 14.1322 | 4.0796 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 12 Pre-Assessment | 39.500 | 12 | 45.8287 | 13.2296 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |
| Grade 12 Mid-Assessment | 19.083 | 12 | 19.1000 | 5.5137 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | |

Table 12: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 11 Pre-Assessment | 10.8333 | 18.5660 | 5.3595 | -.9630 | 22.6296 | 2.021 | 11 | .068 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 12 Pre-Assessment | 20.4167 | 32.6119 | 9.4143 | -.3040 | 41.1373 | 2.169 | 11 | .053 |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 12 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI Filipino | | | | | | | | |

Table 13: GRADE 4-6 PHIL-IRI ENGLISH, Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 4 Pre-Assessment | 116.67 | 12 | 50.694 | 14.634 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 4 Mid-Assessment | 84.75 | 12 | 39.724 | 11.467 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 5 Pre-Assessment | 120.25 | 12 | 53.997 | 15.588 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 5 Mid-Assessment | 75.25 | 12 | 42.437 | 12.251 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 6 Pre-Assessment | 97.417 | 12 | 66.1314 | 19.0905 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 6 Mid-Assessment | 59 | 12 | 32.7136 | 9.4436 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |

Table 14: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 4 Pre-Assessment | 31.917 | 29.172 | 8.421 | 13.382 | 50.452 | 3.79 | 11 | 0.003 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 4 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 5 Pre-Assessment | 45 | 28.54 | 8.239 | 26.866 | 63.134 | 5.462 | 11 | 0 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 6 Pre-Assessment | 38.4167 | 42.348 | 12.2248 | 11.51 | 65.3233 | 3.143 | 11 | 0.009 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 6 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |

Grades 7, 8, and 10 showed significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI English. There was significant decrease in the number of learners identified in frustration level from pre-

assessment result to mid-assessment result in these grade levels. However, no significant difference was found for the pre- and mid assessment results of Grade 10 students in Phil-IRI English.

Table 15: GRADE 7-10 PHIL-IRI ENGLISH, Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------------------------|---------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 7 Pre-Assessment | 107.583 | 12 | 74.4842 | 21.5017 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 7 Mid-Assessment | 71.75 | 12 | 45.8121 | 13.2248 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 8 Pre-Assessment | 87.083 | 12 | 59.7532 | 17.2493 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 8 Mid-Assessment | 52.833 | 12 | 32.9596 | 9.5146 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 9 Pre-Assessment | 102.667 | 12 | 74.6267 | 21.5429 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 9 Mid-Assessment | 65.917 | 12 | 55.1435 | 15.9186 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Pair 4 Grade 10 Pre-Assessment | 87.833 | 12 | 68.8144 | 19.865 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 10 Mid-Assessment | 47.25 | 12 | 36.4246 | 10.5149 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |

Table 16: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 7 Pre-Assessment | 35.8333 | 54.4039 | 15.7051 | 1.2667 | 70.3999 | 2.282 | 11 | 0.043 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|----|-------|
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 7 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 8 Pre-Assessment | 34.25 | 45.9469 | 13.2637 | 5.0568 | 63.4432 | 2.582 | 11 | 0.025 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 8 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 3 Grade 9 Pre-Assessment | 36.75 | 79.582 | 22.9733 | -13.814 | 87.314 | 1.6 | 11 | 0.138 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 9 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 4 Grade 10 Pre-Assessment | 40.5833 | 58.1041 | 16.7732 | 3.6658 | 77.5009 | 2.42 | 11 | 0.034 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 10 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |

Table 17: GRADE 11-12 PHIL-IRI ENGLISH, Paired Samples Statistics

| | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------------------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 Grade 11 Pre-Assessment | 45.333 | 12 | 44.7931 | 12.9307 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 11 Mid-Assessment | 29.75 | 12 | 29.6713 | 8.5654 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 12 Pre-Assessment | 24.5 | 12 | 31.9218 | 9.215 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |
| Grade 12 Mid-Assessment | 19.167 | 12 | 24.0297 | 6.9368 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | |

Table 18: Paired Samples Test

| | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|-------|----|--------------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 Grade 11 Pre-Assessment | 15.5833 | 32.3151 | 9.3286 | -4.9487 | 36.1154 | 1.67 | 11 | 0.123 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 11 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Pair 2 Grade 12 Pre-Assessment | 5.3333 | 29.626 | 8.5523 | -13.4901 | 24.1568 | 0.624 | 11 | 0.546 |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 12 Mid-Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Phil-IRI English | | | | | | | | |

Grades 11 and 12 also did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI English.

On the Problems Encountered by the Teachers

during Assessment

Various problems relative to the assessment process confronted the teachers especially on the constraint on time and rigors. The table below presents the frequency and percentage distribution of these problems.

Table 19: Problems Encountered by Teachers on the Assessment Process

| Problems Encountered | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) | Rank |
|---|---------------|----------------|------|
| 1. The request to submit for immediate results wherein the process requires time | 1,965 | 85.6% | 1 |
| 2. Attendance of learners during the assessment | 1,893 | 82.5% | 2 |
| 3. Preparedness of the learners for the tools used in the assessment | 1,523 | 66.4% | 4 |
| 4. Learning/Reading Retention of learners | 1,024 | 44.6% | 6 |
| 5. Lack of parents' support especially on the follow-ups of learning/reading activities | 1,846 | 80.4% | 3 |
| 6. Time constraint on the assessment process | 978 | 42.6% | 7 |
| 7. Readiness and preparedness of teachers on the conduct of the assessments | 1245 | 54.6% | 5 |

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, for CRLA Grades 1,2,3 results showed significant decrease in the number of learners that are in full refresher from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result . No significant difference was found in pre-and mid assessment results of Grade 3 for CRLA Filipino. The number of learners who were in the full refresher decreased after the mid-assessment result in CRLA English for Grade 3. There was significant decrease in the number of learners identified in frustration level from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result. Grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI Filipino. Grades 11 and 12 also did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI Filipino. There was significant decrease in the number of learners identified in frustration level from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result for Grades 4, 5, and 6. For Grades 7, 8, and 10, there was significant decrease in the number of learners identified in frustration level from pre-assessment result to mid-assessment result in these grade levels. However, no significant difference was found for the pre- and mid assessment results of Grade 10 students in Phil-IRI English. Grades 11 and 12 also did not show significant differences between their pre- and mid assessment results for PHIL-IRI English. Consequently, intensifying the utilization of reading assessment tools and strengthened orientation to teachers relative to the conduct of the assessment processes may be instituted in the entire division.

REFERENCES

ACT. (2006). Reading between the lines: What the ACT reveals about college readiness in reading. Iowa City, IA: Author.

Bacal, E. (2005). Improving the Oral Reading Ability of Pupils. Manila.

Balinas, E., Santillan, J., Rodriguez, J., & Valencia, Y. (2017). Remedial Reading Program of AUF-CED: Best Practices and Impact. *4th Asia Pacific Education*

Conference (pp. 83-93). Purwokerto: Atlantis Press.

Cassidy, J., Ortlieb, E., & Shettel, J. (2010/2011). What's hot, what's not for 2011. *Reading Today*, 28.

Department of Education. (2000). Datasets. Retrieved from Department of Education: <http://www.deped.gov.ph/resources/facts-and-figures/datasheets/>

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools-A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Imam, O. (2016). Effects of Reading Skills on Students' Performance in Science and Mathematics in Public and Private Secondary Schools. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(2), 177-186.

Luz, J. M. (2007). A nation of nonreaders. Quezon: Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism.

Miguel, F. (1996). Metacognitive learning strategies in reading: Their effects on writing competence. Doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines-Diliman.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. (2005). Reading to achieve: A governor's guide to adolescent literacy. Washington, DC: Author.

Orencia, M. A. (2006). Enhancing Pupils Reading Comprehension and Attitudes through a Whole Language-Inspired Literature-Based Reading Program. *CELEA Journal*, 29(3), 3-18.

Purcia, E. L., & Merida, L. H. (2021). Faculty and Students' Evaluation of K to 12 English Curriculum in a Philippine Countryside University. *English philology*, 21, 1045-1059.

Purcia, E., Albuladura, A., & Velarde, A. (2021). Quality Management System (QMS) and Personnel Commitment: The Case of Calbayog City National High School.

Selangan. (2015). The Reading Profile of Children in the Philippines. Retrieved from George Lucas Educational Foundation. <http://www.edutopia.org/discussion/reading-profile-children-philippines>