SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

EFFECTIVENESS OF A STRUCTURED READING PROGRAM ON LITERACY DEVELOPMENT OF GRADE 1 LEARNERS

Kamille Kay O. Celestra,[1] Melinda F. Marquez, PhD, PDP-TQM[2]
[1] *MAED EM Student, University of Perpetual Help System DALTA - Las Piñas City*
[2] *Associate Professor, University of Perpetual Help System DALTA - Las Piñas City*

ABSTRACT

Literacy is an essential foundation for lifelong learning, social participation, and academic achievement. However, assessments such as the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) reveal that Filipino learners continue to perform poorly in reading literacy, indicating a critical need for evidence-based interventions. This study examined the effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 learners in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Rizal for the school year 2025–2026. Specifically, it determined the level of teacher preparedness, extent of program implementation, and perceived effectiveness of the program in developing learners' phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and spelling accuracy. Anchored on the Simple View of Reading Theory and the Cognitive Information Processing Theory, the study utilized a descriptive-quantitative research design with Grade 1 teachers as respondents. Data were gathered through a validated researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to determine relationships and differences among variables. Findings revealed that teachers are highly competent, adequately trained, and well-prepared to implement structured reading programs. The program was consistently applied across schools and perceived to significantly improve literacy outcomes, particularly in spelling and vocabulary, though further emphasis on phonemic awareness remains necessary. Moreover, results indicated a positive but weak correlation between teacher preparedness and program effectiveness, while demographic variables showed no significant influence. The study concludes that structured reading programs, when implemented systematically by competent teachers, substantially enhance literacy skills among Grade 1 learners. Hence, the proposed Project READI (Reading Enhancement through Active Development and Instruction) is recommended to further strengthen teacher proficiency, ensure consistent implementation, and sustain literacy growth in the early grades.

KEYWORDS: *Learning Materials, Reading Activities, Reading Assessment, Reading Instruction, Reading Pedagogy, Reading Practices, Structured Reading Program.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Literacy is often seen as a basic ability of the utmost importance for academic achievement, lifelong learning and active involvement in social activities. At the international level, the acquisition of reading skills may be considered a predictor of academic achievement and future success (UNESCO, 2022). However, increasing scrutiny of the use of standardized exams such as PISA and other national examinations have shown significant disparities in reading abilities, especially in developing countries. The latest results of ELLNA and Phil-IRI tests in the Philippines reveal students' failure to read at the projected competency levels (Haw et al., 2020; Chi, 2023).

The answer is strong education, sufficient resources and well-designed literacy programs that address phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension and spelling. The teachers play a vital part in the execution of such programs. However their efficacy relies on their training levels and the amount to which they use the resources at hand coupled with the extent to which the programs have been implemented. There are reading programs but not much study on their usefulness.

This research is based on the Simple View of Reading Theory and Cognitive Information Processing Theory, highlighting the relevance of decoding and comprehension as well as systematic and repeated learning processes in the development of literacy abilities. Such theories point to the need of organized and scaffolded teaching and the ability of learners to attain mastery and maintain reading abilities over time.

The purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness and level of implementation of a structured reading program to build literacy skills of Grade 1 learners. The study examines key literacy areas and teacher characteristics with the aim to provide empirical data that might impact teaching methods, improve literacy results and help create effective early grade reading interventions.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

1. What is the profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of age, number of teaching years, highest educational attainment, and training attended on structured reading?
2. What is the composite mean on the level of teacher preparedness in the implementation of the structured reading program with respect to reading pedagogy, learning materials, reading instruction, and reading assessment?

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

3. What is the composite mean on the extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 learners in terms of reading activities, reading instruction, reading practices, reading strategies, and reading assessment?
4. What is the composite mean on the perceived effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 learners in terms of phonemic awareness, vocabulary skills, reading fluency, reading comprehension, and spelling accuracy?
5. Is there a significant difference in teacher preparedness and the extent of implementation of the structured reading program on literacy development among Grade 1 learners when grouped according to their profile?
6. Is there a significant relationship between teacher preparedness, the extent of implementation of the structured reading program, and the perceived effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 learners?
7. What enhancement program may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES AND STUDIES

The process of literacy skills begins at a very young age and is an essential prerequisite for lifelong learning, academics, and social participation (Septiani & Syaodih, 2021; Kearns, 2024). According to research, language proficiency in the early years of children is positively associated with reading proficiency in the future, emphasizing the significance of teaching literacy starting from an early age (Phillips et al., 2021). Literacy education aims at bringing together listening, speaking, reading, writing, and thinking skills to solve the issue and make sure the learners get engaged in the process of studying (Prasetia & Adlan, 2022; Kartikasari & Nuryasana, 2022). Moreover, another approach towards achieving effective literacy development is creating a language-enriched learning environment (Prawira et al., 2023).

In order for them to be applied effectively, the educators have to employ personalized evidence-based teaching strategies in the teaching of key areas like phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension (Varghese et al., 2021; Demchak et al., 2025). Effectiveness of literacy learning will rely on the teacher's preparation, instructional materials, and training (Tandika, 2022; Hampshire, 2024). Moreover, there are methods of teaching reading which require systematic and organized approaches, such as phonics, that contribute to developing effective reading skills (Flynn et al., 2021; Duke et al., 2021).

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used a descriptive quantitative research approach to examine the effectiveness of a structured reading curriculum for the development of Grade 1 learners. Descriptive research is the description of a phenomena as it exists at the current time without any alteration. Therefore, the researcher may explore and describe the actual situation using descriptive research (Mishra & Alok, 2022). On the other hand, quantitative research comprises observation, analysis and interpretation of variables, their connection and trends using numerical data (Taherdoost, 2022; Vale, 2023).

The required data was collected by a questionnaire prepared by the researcher. It is interesting that the data on teachers' attitudes, preparedness and implementation were obtained from them using the same instrument .

Population and Sampling

The target population was the Grade 1 teachers in selected public elementary schools in the Division of Rizal. The researcher used stratified random sampling to select the study's target respondents. The schools were selected as subgroups, and respondents from each school were randomly selected.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents in the study were Grade 1 teachers from selected public elementary schools in the Division of Rizal. The respondents included one hundred ten (110) Grade 1 teachers who provided the observed data needed for analyzing and describing the effectiveness of the structured reading program for the literacy development of Grade 1 learners.

Research Instrument

The major tool for data collection was a researcher-designed questionnaire. The instrument was developed according to the study goals to measure the influence of the structured reading program on literacy development of Grade 1 learners.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections. The first portion collected demographic information of the respondents such as age, number of years of teaching, greatest educational attainment and training attended on organized reading. The second section examined the teachers' readiness to administer the structured reading program and focused on reading pedagogy, learning resources, reading instruction, reading practices, and reading assessment.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

The third section determined the depth of implementation of the organized reading program in terms of reading activities, teaching, practices, methods and evaluation. Part four examined the views of learners on the usefulness of the program on their literacy development such as phonemic awareness, vocabulary skills, reading comprehension, reading fluency and spelling accuracy.

All sections used a four-point Likert scale to measure the impressions of the respondents and to determine the level of readiness, execution and success of the organized reading program.

Validation of the Instrument

For the reliability and validity of the research instrument, a validation of the researcher-made questionnaire was done systematically. The content validation of the instrument was performed through the evaluation of the panel of experts composed of university professors and subject matter experts to guarantee that the questions are accurate, clear, and relevant. The researcher considered the suggestions and comments of the experts to modify the instrument accordingly. After validation, pilot testing of the questionnaire was performed to examine its reliability through the Cronbach alpha coefficient. Acceptable results regarding the reliability of the instrument established that it can yield reliable results in the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

To provide the best quality of data needed by the study, a systematic approach for data gathering was employed to guarantee its accuracy and validity. Prior to the administration of the instrument, the questionnaire was subjected to validation and reliability testing. Then, after securing the necessary permission from the institution and the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent in Rizal, the researcher secured clearance from the school administrators and the participants' written consent to participate in the study.

Validated instruments were directly administered to the Grade 1 teacher-participants along with the particular guidance on how to respond them. The participants were given sufficient time to complete the instrument; after one week the questionnaires were collected and rigorous ethical concerns such as anonymity, confidentiality and unbiased data collecting were used.

The data gathered were analyzed after ensuring their accuracy and organizing them for encoding purposes using SPSS. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study were formulated, and these were used in the formulation of an enhancement program for the structured reading program.

Statistical Treatment

The data were analyzed using the following statistical procedures. The profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of age, number of years of teaching, highest degree earned, and training attended on organized reading were described using frequency and percentage distributions. The weighted mean was used to measure teachers' preparation in the execution of the structured reading program and amount of implementation in the reading activities, instructions, practices, methods and assessment.

The weighted mean was also utilized to determine the perceived success of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 learners along the dimension of phonemic awareness, vocabulary skills, reading comprehension, reading fluency, and spelling accuracy. The paired t-test was used to examine the significant difference in the teachers' preparation and amount of implementation when categorized according to their profile.

Finally, Pearson's r correlation coefficient was used to explore the link between teachers' readiness, level of implementation, and perceived efficacy of the structured reading program.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of age, number of teaching years, highest educational attainment, and training attended on structured reading.

Table 1

Demographic profile of the teacher-respondents

		f	%	Ranking
Age	21 - 30	15	13.6	4.5
	31 - 40	46	41.8	1
	41 - 50	18	16.4	2
	51 - 60	16	14.5	3
	61 years old and above	15	13.6	4.5
	Total	**110**	**100.0**	
Number of Teaching Years	1 - 5	30	27.3	2
	6 - 10	32	29.1	1
	11 - 15	21	19.1	3

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

	16 - 20	12	10.9	5
	21 years and above	15	13.6	4
	Total	**110**	**100.0**	
Training Attended in Structured Reading	School Level	5	4.5	5
	District Level	6	5.5	4
	Division Level	67	60.9	1
	Reginal Level	18	16.4	2
	National Level	4	3.6	6
	International Level	10	9.1	3
	Total	**110**	**100.0**	
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	26	23.6	2
	With a master's degree, Unit	61	55.5	1
	Master's Degree Graduate	15	13.6	3
	With Doctorate Degree Units	8	7.3	4
	Total	**110**	**100.0**	

Table 1 show the results reveal that most of the teacher-respondents are in the middle stage of their professional careers with the majority falling within the age range of 31-40 years and the teaching experience of 6-10 years. This shows a staff that is mature, instructional in capability and stable, which are needed to successfully administer organized reading programs. The preponderance of women in teaching is also in line with current trends in the teaching profession. With respect to the highest educational attainment, the majority of respondents are either working on or have finished master's degrees, which indicates a high degree of dedication to professional development and sophisticated pedagogical expertise. This level of academic preparation improves teachers' competence to use research-based reading practices and promote literacy development of Grade 1 learners.

In terms of professional development, the majority of teachers have engaged in division-wide reading programs, showing good local efforts to enhance literacy teaching. However, the number of teachers who received regional, national or international training was less which shows that there are areas for further professional enrichment to improve instructional quality.

The overall findings show that the respondents were typically skilled, experienced and appropriately equipped to effect organized reading programs efficiently. These findings are consistent with earlier studies which showed that teachers with mid-career experience have higher levels of instructional competence and flexibility in teaching literacy (Garcia & Mendoza, 2023), teachers with moderate experience levels have greater skills in implementing structured literacy programs (Santos & Villanueva, 2023), teachers with postgraduate training have better skills in implementing instruction and curriculum (Del Rosario & Jimenez, 2022), and teachers who have taken part in advanced literacy training show better teaching effectiveness and learner engagement (Santos & Rivera, 2023).

Composite Mean Table on the level of teacher Preparedness on the implementation of the structured reading program with respect to reading pedagogy, learning materials, reading instruction, and reading assessment.

Table 2

Composite table on the level of teacher Preparedness on the implementation of the structured reading program in terms of reading pedagogy, learning materials, reading instruction, reading assessment.

	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Verbal Interpretation**
Reading Pedagogy	3.84	0.19	Strongly Agree
Learning Materials	3.78	0.24	Strongly Agree
Reading Instruction	3.73	0.28	Strongly Agree
Reading Assessment	3.75	0.29	Strongly Agree
Teacher Preparation on the Implementation of the Structured Reading Program	**3.77**	**0.17**	**Strongly Agree**

Legend: *4 (3.50 - 4.00) – Strongly Agree* *2 (1.50 - 2.49) – Disagree*
3 (2.50 - 3.49) – Agree *1 (1.00 - 1.49) – Strongly Disagree*

Table 2 display the results show that the teacher-respondents are well prepared in the implementation of the structured reading program in all areas. The overall scores were evaluated as Strongly Agree. The reading pedagogy had the highest mean score of 3.84 (SD = 0.19) which shows the great competency of teachers in providing age-appropriate literacy instruction. This was followed by learning materials with a mean of 3.78 (SD = 0.24) which indicated teachers' competence to develop and use suitable instructional resources.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Similarly, in terms of reading teaching, teachers also shown high levels of preparedness with a mean of 3.73 (SD = 0.28) which showed their skill in handling reading activities and engaging learners. teachers were also well equipped in reading assessment (Mean = 3.75; SD = 0.29) which indicated the competence of teachers to monitor and evaluate learners' literacy development.

The overall composite mean of 3.77 (SD = 0.17) reveals that teachers are well equipped to conduct organized reading program. The low standard deviations of all measures indicate uniform replies and common confidence among the respondents.

Findings of this study indicate that the teachers have the pedagogical knowledge, instructional skills and assessment capacities to successfully promote the development of literacy in Grade 1 learners. These findings are consistent with earlier studies that teacher competence has a positive impact on literacy achievement (Lopez, 2023; Garcia & Santos, 2024), quality of instructional materials has a positive impact on reading achievement (Reyes & Dela Cruz, 2022; Nguyen, 2024), and teacher preparedness has a positive impact on the implementation of structured reading programs (Lopez & Santos, 2023; Nguyen, 2021).

Composite Mean Table on the Extent of implementation of the structured reading program on literacy development of Grade 1 learners in terms of reading activities, reading instruction, reading practices, and reading assessment

Table 3

Composite table on the Extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners in terms of reading activities, reading instruction, reading practices, reading strategies, and reading assessment

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Reading Activities	3.42	0.23	Often
Reading Instruction	3.44	0.25	Often
Reading Practices	3.47	0.30	Often
Reading Strategies	3.41	0.27	Often
Reading Assessment	3.42	0.27	Often
EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STRUCTURED READING PROGRAM ON LITERACY DEVELOPMENT OF GRADE 1 LEARNERS	**3.43**	**0.11**	**Often**

Legend: *4 (3.50 - 4.00) – Always* *2 (1.50 - 2.49) – Rarely*
3 (2.50 - 3.49) – Often *1 (1.00 - 1.49) – Never*

Table 3 shows the results showed that the level of execution of the structured reading program by the Grade 1 teachers is scored mostly as Often with an overall composite mean of 3.43 (SD = 0.11) which indicates consistent application in all areas but not to the fullest extent.

The mean of reading activities that teachers used was 3.42 (SD = 0.23), which showed that literacy-enhancing activities were often applied, and phonemic awareness exercises were given the most attention (M = 3.65). The mean of 3.44 (SD = 0.25) indicated that structured teaching techniques were used often for reading instruction, especially for help to struggling readers (M = 3.55). Likewise, the highest domain mean of 3.47 (SD = 0.30) for reading practices indicated considerable participation in oral reading activities (M = 3.58) but independent and home reading activities were not strongly emphasized. For reading assessment, a mean of 3.42 (SD = 0.27) indicated consistent implementation, with oral reading evaluations often implemented (M = 3.54), but rapid feedback less often implemented.

The results show that teachers utilize the key elements of reading program structures often; but it seems likely that the application of guided reading, independent reading, and feedback procedures could be more consistent. If there will be an improvement in that aspect, the literacy achievement of the learners is going to increase even more.

These findings are corroborated by earlier research indicating that frequent engagement in structured reading exercises increases phonemic awareness and fluency (Reyes & Villanueva, 2022); that systematic instruction improves comprehension skills (Cruz & Mendoza, 2022); that frequent reading activities develop vocabulary and confidence (De la Cruz & Ramos, 2023); that continued assessment with feedback fosters literacy development (Santos & Cruz, 2022); and that systematic application of reading therapies contributes to excellent literacy results (Garcia & Lim, 2023).

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Composite Mean Table on the perceived effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners in terms of Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary Skills, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, and Spelling Accuracy

Table 4

Composite table on the effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Phonemic Awareness	3.42	0.26	Often
Vocabulary Skills	3.49	0.35	Often
Reading Fluency	3.44	0.45	Often
Reading Comprehension	3.43	0.46	Often
Spelling Accuracy	3.50	0.42	Always
Effectiveness of Structured Reading Program on Literacy Development of Grade 1 Learners	**3.46**	**0.25**	**Often**

Legend: *4 (3.50 - 4.00) – Always* *2 (1.50 - 2.49) – Rarely*
3 (2.50 - 3.49) – Often *1 (1.00 - 1.49) – Never*

Table 4 shows the results that the perceived effectiveness of structured reading program in increasing literacy of Grade 1 learners is mostly regarded as Often with an overall mean of 3.46 (SD = 0.25). This shows a consistent positive influence on all literacy categories. Mean value of phonemic awareness score is 3.42 (SD = 0.26), which means that this program worked well to develop the ability of the learners in phonological processing. Amongst the areas where there were improvements, sound discrimination scored the most (M = 3.48). It helped improve the score of vocabulary abilities to mean value of 3.49 (SD = 0.35), meaning that the learners gained great advancement in the ability to understand new words. In particular, the score for oral vocabulary improved the most (M = 3.53). There was an improvement even in reading fluency where the mean value was 3.44 (SD = 0.45). Reading tempo is the one where learners scored the most (M = 3.50), although confidence while reading out loud should be enhanced. Similarly, there was an improvement even in the area of reading comprehension, scoring mean value of 3.43 (SD = 0.46). The ability for inference has significantly advanced (M = 3.50), with some scope for improving literal comprehension. The mean score was greatest in spelling accuracy in all domains (M = 3.50, SD = 0.42). This finding indicates the usefulness of the program in establishing proper spelling via planned and frequent practice.

Finally, the findings show that an organized reading program is beneficial in helping to enhance many areas of literacy abilities including spelling, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension skills however regular practice is needed for phonemic awareness skills. This result is consistent with other research that indicates structured reading programs boost decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and literacy abilities (Smith, 2021; McLean & Peterson, 2022; Reyes & Dizon, 2023).

Significant difference in teacher Preparedness and the Extent of implementation of a structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners when grouped according to their profiles.

Table 5

Significant difference in the teacher Preparedness and the Extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners when grouped according to their profiles

		F	Sig.	Decision	Remarks
Age	Teachers' preparedness for the implementation of the structured reading program	1.326	0.265	Accept	Not Significant
	The extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of grade 1 learners	0.795	0.531	Accept	Not Significant
Number of Teaching Years	Teachers' preparedness for the implementation of the structured reading program	0.807	0.524	Accept	Not Significant
	The extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of grade 1 learners	0.551	0.699	Accept	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Teachers' preparedness for the implementation of the structured reading program	0.455	0.714	Accept	Not Significant
	The extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of grade 1 learners	0.764	0.517	Accept	Not Significant
Training Attended on Structured Reading	Teachers' preparedness for the implementation of the structured reading program	1.841	0.111	Accept	Not Significant
	The extent of implementation of the structured reading program on the literacy development of grade 1 learners	0.711	0.616	Accept	Not Significant

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 5 shows the findings that there is no significant difference on teacher preparedness and extent of implementation of the structured reading program when the respondents are grouped according to their profile variables such as age, years of teaching experience, highest educational attainment and training attended. The calculated values of F varied from 0.455 to 1.841 and the associated p-values ranged from 0.111 to 0.714, all of which are larger than the 0.05 threshold of significance. This led to the adoption of the null hypothesis which states that teachers are equally prepared and implement similarly regardless of their demographics.

The findings indicate that the structured reading program is executed in a consistent manner across different groups of teachers and the standardized nature of the program allows for consistent implementation across classroom settings. The efficacy of the program is not determined by the personal qualities of teachers, but by the structure and systematicity of the program teaching.

Findings support other studies that suggest that literacy programs using standardization decrease disparities in implementation among teachers (Santos & De Guzman, 2023); systematic reading programs increase effectiveness irrespective of the teacher's qualifications (Brown & Taylor, 2021); and fidelity of the program, rather than the qualities of the instructor, is the key to consistency in literacy education outcomes (Lee, 2024).

Significant relationship between the teacher Preparedness, the Extent of implementation of the structured reading program, and the perceived effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners

Table 6

Correlation between the teacher preparedness, the Extent of implementation of the structured reading program, and the perceived effectiveness of the structured reading program on the literacy development of Grade 1 Learners

		EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF STRUCTURED READING PROGRAM ON LITERACY DEVELOPMENT OF GRADE 1 LEARNERS	EFFECTIVENESS OF STRUCTURED READING PROGRAM ON LITERACY DEVELOPMENT OF GRADE 1 LEARNERS
TEACHER PREPARATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STRUCTURED READING PROGRAM	Pearson Correlation	.199*	0.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.037	0.729
	N	110	110
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*			

Table 5 showed that there is a significant but weak positive association between teacher readiness and the amount to which the structured reading program was implemented, r = 0.199, p = 0.037, which is below the 0.05 threshold of significance. This implies that as teacher readiness improves, program implementation effects are somewhat larger. However, the link between the teachers' preparation and the perceived efficacy of the structured reading program was not significant (r = 0.033, p = 0.729). This implies that the teachers' readiness does not have a direct impact on the perceived literacy results among the learners.

The findings suggest that teacher readiness is linked to improved implementation techniques. However, the overall performance of the structured reading program is more reliant on its design, structure and instructional framework than on the individual teacher qualities. This underscores the necessity of adherence to program compliance and ongoing training and assistance for optimal reading results.

The results are consistent with prior research indicating teacher readiness is highly connected to program implementation (Delos Reyes & Manalo, 2022), but not necessarily directly related to reported learning outcomes (Johnson, 2023). Despite differences in teacher readiness, organized reading programs nevertheless lead to consistent results in literacy development since these programs are methodical and based on research (Garcia & Chua, 2024).

Enhancement Program may be developed based on the findings of the study

Project Title: *"**Project READI**: Reinforcing Educators' Application and Delivery of Instruction in Structured Reading"*

I. RATIONALE

The research results demonstrated that teachers regardless of their age, experience, educational attainment and training had equal levels of Preparedness and implementation in the structured reading program. However, the data also showed there was a substantial positive correlation between instructor Preparedness and the Extent of program implementation. This suggests that as teachers develop and gain confidence, the delivery of organized reading instruction also improves. Project READI thus, seeks to build teachers' Preparedness, promote consistent implementation and improve reading results of Grade 1 pupils via continual training, mentorship and resource support.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Objectives	Persons Involved	Persons Responsible	Time Frame	Estimated Cost	Expected Output
1. To enhance teachers' preparedness and consistency in implementing the structured reading program regardless of demographic factors.	Grade 1 Teachers, School Head, Reading Coordinator	School Head, Reading Coordinator	1st Quarter (June–August)	₱10,000	Teachers demonstrate uniform mastery and consistent application of the structured reading program.
2. To strengthen the relationship between teacher preparedness and the effective implementation of structured reading activities.	Grade 1 Teachers, Reading Coordinator	Reading Coordinator, Master Teachers	2nd Quarter (September–November)	₱8,000	Improved alignment between teacher preparedness and implementation, as shown in monitoring and evaluation results.
3. To conduct professional development workshops focusing on effective reading pedagogy, assessment, and learner engagement.	Grade 1 Teachers, Literacy Experts	School Head, District Reading Supervisor	3rd Quarter (December–February)	₱12,000	Teachers gain enhanced instructional skills and confidence in implementing reading interventions.
4. To develop and distribute standardized instructional materials and assessment tools to ensure consistent program delivery.	Reading Coordinator, Teachers, Learners	School Head, Reading Coordinator	4th Quarter (March–May)	₱15,000	Availability of unified teaching guides, reading materials, and evaluation tools for structured reading.
5. To establish a peer mentoring and coaching system to sustain effective reading instruction practices.	Master Teachers, New Teachers	School Head, Master Teachers	Continuous (Throughout the School Year)	₱5,000	Sustained teacher collaboration and improvement in reading instruction strategies.
6. To monitor and evaluate the implementation of the structured reading program through class observations and learner performance data.	School Head, Teachers, Reading Coordinator	School Head, Reading Coordinator	Every End of Quarter	₱3,000	Regular monitoring reports reflecting improved program fidelity and literacy outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study found that most of the Grade 1 teacher-respondents are in their early to mid-career stage, namely at their 30s to 40s, with 6-10 years of teaching experience. Many have postgraduate credentials and have participated in formal reading training, especially at division level, showing a trained and professionally developed staff involved in literacy education. The teachers had a high degree of readiness in terms of their capacity to implement the structured reading program in terms of reading pedagogy; however, other aspects of instruction may still need some improvement. The degree of implementation is consistent at the "often" level since reading techniques are consistently applied in classes. However, some issues still remain, specifically the consistency in terms of reading strategies and methodologies.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

It was found out that the reading program was successful in enhancing the literacy skills of the participants, particularly in spelling, accuracy, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills. It appears that there is a relatively small improvement in phonemic awareness and that more effort is needed for this particular skill. The study also revealed that there is no significant difference with regards to teacher readiness and implementation based on demographics which indicates that the program is effectively conducted regardless of the profile of the teachers.

Also, a small but significant association between teacher readiness and program implementation was seen, suggesting that teachers who felt better prepared tended to execute the program more successfully. However, teacher readiness did not substantially affect perceived efficacy of the program, indicating that the program structure and design are more important in literacy results.

The results lead to the conclusion that the organized reading program is successful and uniformly administered among teachers with various background. instructor competency – training and experience help here, but the organized and standardized nature of the program means that the results will be consistent, no matter what instructor is using it. Teachers are often well prepared, but there is a need for continual professional development to improve teaching approaches, especially in phonemic awareness.

It is recommended that teachers participate in professional development through national and international training programs to ensure improved implementation and performance. There should be mentoring and coaching programs to help the teachers, provide adequate teaching materials, and monitor and evaluate the implementation process of the programs. The phonemic awareness activities should be emphasized.

The implementation of the Project READI is further recommended in order to improve teacher readiness, provide an organized training and support system, and ensure the successful delivery of reading programs. Professional assistance, resource provision, and monitoring would greatly improve literacy development among the grade one learners.

REFERENCES

1. *Abayan, M. R. A., Placigo, M. R., & Las Johansen, B. C. (2021). Evaluating kindergarten instructional materials: Inputs for materials production. International Journal of Research Publications, 69(1), 476–483.*
2. *Acido, N. J. V., & Caballes, N. D. G. (2024). Assessing educational progress: A comparative analysis of PISA results (2018 vs. 2022) and HDI correlation in the Philippines. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 21(1), 462–474. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0020*
3. *Bouchrika, I. (2024). What is information processing theory? Stages, models & limitations.*
4. *Chi, C. (2023, December 6). Philippines still lags behind the world in math, reading and science – PISA 2022. Philstar.com.*
5. *Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 56(S1), S25–S44.*
6. *Duke, N. K., Ward, A. E., & Pearson, P. D. (2021). The science of reading comprehension instruction. The Reading Teacher, 74(6), 663–672. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1993*
7. *Flynn, N., Powell, D., Stainthorp, R., & Stuart, M. (2021). Training teachers for phonics and early reading: Developing research-informed practice. Journal of Research in Reading, 44(2), 301–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12336*
8. *Hampshire, N. (2024). Preparing excellent reading teachers. https://rmcresearchcorporation.com*
9. *Haw, J. Y., King, R. B., & Trinidad, J. E. R. (2021). Need-supportive teaching is associated with greater reading achievement: What the Philippines can learn from PISA 2018. International Journal of Educational Research, 110, 101864. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101864*
10. *Kartikasari, E., & Nuryasana, E. (2022). School literacy movement program in elementary school: Literature review. Journal of Education and Learning, 16(3), 336–341.*
11. *Kearns, A. J. (2024). From language to literacy: Supporting early childhood educators' knowledge of phonological awareness (Doctoral dissertation).*
12. *Miremba, B. K. (2024). Role of instructional materials in students' academic performance. Research Invention Journal of Current Research in Humanities and Social Sciences, 3(2), 24–27.*
13. *Mishra, S. B., & Alok, S. (2022). Handbook of research methodology. Educreation Publishing.*
14. *OECD. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en*
15. *Phillips, B. M., Kim, Y. G., Lonigan, C. J., Connor, C. M., Clancy, J., & Otaiba, S. A. (2021). Supporting language and literacy development with intensive small-group interventions. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 57, 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.05.004*
16. *Piasta, S. B., Park, S., Fitzgerald, L. R., & Libnoch, H. A. (2022). Young children's alphabet learning as a function of instruction and letter difficulty. Learning and Individual Differences, 93, 102113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102113*
17. *Prasetia, I., & Adlan, M. (2022). Management of the literacy movement program to improve reading culture. Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research, 3(3), 316–322.*
18. *Prawira, N. N. P., Artini, L. P., Marsakawati, N. P. E., Padmadewi, N. N., Ratminingsih, N. M., & Utami, I. G. A. L. P. (2023). The implementation of literacy activities in primary school. Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran, 7(1), 150–156. https://doi.org/10.23887/jipp.v7i1.56108*

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

19. *Septiani, N., & Syaodih, E. (2021). Emergent literacy in early childhood. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210322.012*
20. *Taherdoost, H. (2022). What are different research approaches? A review of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods. Journal of Management Science & Engineering Research, 5(1), 53–63.*
21. *Tandika, P. B. (2022). Instructional materials and 21st-century skills. Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 36(1), 31–45.*
22. *Tassone, M. (2023). Literacy assessment in early schooling in an era of neoliberalism. Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 25(2), 422–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984231161119*
23. *UNESCO. (2022). Literacy for life: Education for all global monitoring report.*
24. *Vale, M. (2023). Descriptive research design and its uses. Elsevier Author Services.*
25. *Varghese, C., Bratsch-Hines, M., Aiken, H., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2021). Teachers' intervention fidelity. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54(6), 484–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219421999844*
26. *Weadman, T., Serry, T., & Snow, P. C. (2022). Emergent literacy skills of preschoolers. International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders, 58(1), 154–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12777*
27. *Zajda, J. (2023). Quality education in schools. Curriculum and Teaching, 38(2), 93–108. https://doi.org/10.7459/ct/38.2.07*