

Teachers' Instructional Delivery on Learners Reading Performance

Anna Grace D. Catamco 

Author Information:

Sinunuc Elementary School, Zamboanga City,
Philippines

Correspondence:

annagrace.diongson@deped.gov.ph

Article History:

Date Received: September 26, 2026

Date Revised: October 05, 2026

Date Accepted: October 17, 2026

Date Published: October 23, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0617>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0617

Recommended Citation:

Catamco, A. G. D. (2026). Teachers' Instructional Delivery on Learners Reading Performance. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(9), 614-626. <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0617>

Abstract. This study investigated the effects of teachers' instructional delivery on the reading performance of Grade One learners in Filipino. Specifically, it examined teachers' instructional delivery in terms of explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction and determined their relationship with learners' reading performance. The study also explored differences in learners' reading performance when grouped according to teachers' profile variables, namely age, educational attainment, years of service, and academic rank. The study employed a quantitative research design utilizing a pre-experimental one-group pretest-posttest approach, supplemented by descriptive, correlational, comparative, and predictive analyses. Data were collected using validated survey questionnaires to assess teachers' instructional delivery and standardized reading assessments administered before and after the instructional intervention. Descriptive statistics, tests of difference, correlation analysis, and regression analysis were used to analyze the data. Findings revealed that teachers demonstrated very high levels of instructional delivery across the dimensions of explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction. Learners' reading performance significantly improved from pretest to posttest, indicating the effectiveness of the instructional delivery intervention. However, results showed no significant relationship between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance. Likewise, no significant differences were found in learners' posttest reading performance when grouped according to teachers' age, educational attainment, years of service, and academic rank. Furthermore, regression analysis revealed that explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction did not significantly predict learners' reading performance. The findings suggest that while instructional delivery contributed to improvements in learners' reading performance, its direct predictive influence was not established. Reading achievement appears to be influenced by a combination of factors beyond instructional delivery alone. The study recommends continuous professional development for teachers, further investigation of learner, family, and school-related factors affecting reading achievement, and the conduct of similar studies in different educational settings to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Keywords: Instructional Delivery; Explicit Instruction; Fluency; Student-Teacher Interaction; Reading Performance

Introduction

Early literacy development remains a major concern in primary education because learners' foundational reading skills influence their future academic performance. While various literacy programs have been implemented, classroom instruction remains a critical factor that determines how learners acquire foundational reading skills. As emphasized by Lesiak (2015), teaching involves helping students learn how to perform tasks, offering instruction, and facilitating understanding. Because learners have diverse needs, teachers must be equipped to apply a range of instructional strategies effectively. This highlights the importance of instructional delivery, which refers to the way teachers organize and present learning experiences in the classroom (Lukman 202, 6).

One of the most essential skills that instruction must develop in early education is reading. Reading is the process of constructing meaning from written texts, images, or a combination of both (Sari 2017). It is considered a foundational skill, particularly in the primary grades, as it supports learning across all subject areas. Developing reading proficiency early is crucial because it is strongly associated with learners' overall academic performance (Linder et al. 2017). Despite its importance, many learners continue to experience

difficulties with reading, raising concerns about how instructional delivery can better support literacy development.

Among the different approaches to teaching reading, explicit instruction is widely recognized as an effective method, especially for beginning learners. This approach involves clear, direct, and systematic teaching of skills, allowing learners to understand both the process and expectations of learning tasks (Archer and Hughes 2011; Rosenshine 2012). In addition, reading fluency plays a vital role in literacy development. Fluency refers to the ability to read with accuracy, appropriate speed, and proper expression, enabling learners to focus more on comprehension rather than decoding individual words (Rasinski 2012). Without sufficient fluency, learners may struggle to understand texts, which can negatively affect their reading performance.

Another important component of instructional delivery is student interaction. Learning becomes more meaningful when learners are actively engaged in the process through participation, discussion, and collaboration. Interaction allows learners to practice language skills, expand vocabulary, and deepen comprehension through shared learning experiences. When teachers create opportunities for meaningful interaction, learners are more likely to develop confidence and improve their reading abilities (Maulana, Opdenakker, and Bosker 2016).

In the Philippine educational context, Filipino and English are commonly used as media of instruction in developing learners' literacy skills. The use of these two languages presents both opportunities and challenges for young learners, particularly those who are still developing proficiency in reading. Learners may have difficulty understanding when they are not yet fully familiar with the language used in instruction. This situation highlights the need for effective instruction that supports learners in understanding texts in Filipino while strengthening their reading skills. Research on mother tongue and multilingual education suggests that language familiarity significantly influences literacy development and reading comprehension (Cummins 2000; Ricablanca 2014).

Despite the use of various teaching strategies and efforts to improve literacy instruction, many learners still struggle with reading performance. Difficulties in word recognition, fluency, and comprehension remain evident among primary-grade learners (Snow, Burns, and Griffin 1998; Torgesen 2002). These challenges suggest that the effectiveness of instructional delivery—particularly in explicit instruction, fluency development, and student interaction—needs closer examination.

Thus, this study aims to investigate the effects of teachers' instructional delivery on Grade One learners' reading performance. By focusing on key components of instructional delivery, the study seeks to provide insights that may help improve teaching practices and enhance learners' reading abilities in both Filipino and English.

Research Questions

This study was conducted to determine the effects of teachers' instructional delivery on learners' reading performance among Grade One learners in Sinunuc Elementary School, Ayala District, Zamboanga City Division, School Year 2025-2026.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the teachers' instructional delivery in terms of:
 - 1.1 Explicit Instruction
 - 1.2 Fluency; and
 - 1.3 Student-Teacher Interaction
2. What is the level of learners' reading performance in the pre-test and post-test?
3. Is there a significant difference between pre-test and post-test reading performance of the learners?
4. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance?
5. Is there a significant difference in learners' post-test reading performance when grouped according to teachers' age, educational attainment, years of service, and academic rank?
6. On the basis of the findings, what intervention can be proposed?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study examines the effects of teachers' instructional delivery on the reading performance of Grade One learners at Sinunuc Elementary School, Zamboanga City, during the School Year 2025-2026. Specifically, it focuses on key components of instructional delivery, namely explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction. The study also considers selected teacher-related variables, including age, educational attainment, years of service, and academic rank, to determine their possible relationship with instructional delivery. The respondents of the study include Grade others in reporting. Their parenthood, however, makes it less likely that they will see or report child abuse. Teachers with experience tend to report or help with a report. One teacher and learners from Sections A to K of the said school. This study is limited only to the

identified respondents and setting; therefore, the findings may not be generalized to other schools or grade levels. In addition, the study focuses solely on reading performance in Filipino and does not cover other subject areas.

Literature Review

Teachers' Age

Alufohai (2015, 2) found that experienced teachers rapidly recognize students' potential and contribute to higher academic achievement. However, younger teachers often bring enthusiasm, creativity, and technological competence to the classroom, which can increase learner engagement and participation (Radjuni 2021). Thus, while experience is important, younger teachers' energy and technology skills may also contribute positively to student achievement, highlighting the dynamic role of age in shaping instructional effectiveness and reading outcomes.

The reviewed literature presents contrasting perspectives regarding teacher age. While younger teachers may contribute technological adaptability and innovative practices, experienced teachers often possess stronger classroom management skills. These differences suggest that age alone may not determine instructional effectiveness. However, they may initially encounter challenges in classroom management and discipline (Cariño 2018). In contrast, experienced teachers have extensive knowledge and strong classroom management skills, although some may rely on traditional teaching approaches that are less responsive to contemporary learners' needs (Radjuni 2021).

Educational Attainment

Teachers' educational qualifications are generally associated with improved classroom management and instructional delivery (Denull 2018). However, Hu (2015) argues that there is limited evidence that higher academic qualifications alone directly improve student learning outcomes. While advanced education may provide teachers with deeper content knowledge and pedagogical understanding, its impact on student achievement depends largely on how effectively that knowledge is applied in the classroom (Denull 2018). Therefore, in the context of early grade reading instruction, academic qualifications may influence teachers' pedagogical knowledge; however, classroom application remains a critical consideration.

Number of Years in Service

Graham, Harris, and Adkins (2020, 549) uncovered conflicting findings regarding the effectiveness of experienced educators. Some studies indicate that experience correlates with improved teaching quality (Kini and Podolsky 2016, 549), while others show that less-experienced instructors can achieve comparable performance in certain settings (Araujo et al. 2016).

König and Kramer (2016) argue that teachers are more successful in supportive settings where they consistently teach the same grade level or subject area. Evidence learning environment. Experienced teachers refine their instructional practices over time, which can positively influence students' reading abilities (Kini and Podolsky 2016, 550). However, when provided with adequate guidance and support, beginning teachers can also thrive and contribute innovative ideas and enthusiasm to the classroom (Ong and Padilla 2020).

Academic Rank

Salivio (2019) noted that higher academic rank, which often reflects continuous professional development, contributes to improved teaching quality. Higher-ranking teachers frequently serve as models for colleagues and students, helping foster a positive learning environment. Academic rank may reflect a teacher's competence, which can influence learners' cognitive, emotional, and psychomotor development and, consequently, their reading performance.

Teachers' Instructional Delivery

According to Bolkan and Griffin (2017), teaching styles influence student involvement and motivation. Kim (2014) asserts that explicit instruction, characterized by clear and systematic guidance from educators, enhances reading proficiency by breaking down complex tasks into manageable components. Although discovery-based methods can foster learner independence, direct instruction remains particularly important during the early years of education (Ashman 2021). Effective lesson delivery, whether explicit or discovery-based, is essential for enhancing reading proficiency and represents a primary focus in understanding its effects on learners' reading outcomes.

Fluency

Reading success requires strong fluency, encompassing accuracy, rate, and expression. Shanahan (2017) and Konza (2016) emphasize the importance of teaching fluency to promote reading comprehension and engagement. Teachers who prioritize fluency help learners read with greater confidence and overall proficiency. Effective reading practices and feedback can further improve vocabulary development and reading speed (Alviz 2018; Ong and Padilla 2020). Moreover, positive student-teacher relationships increase motivation, which contributes to higher achievement (Alfonga and Napil 2022; Maulana, Opdenakker, and Bosker 2016).

Student–Teacher Interaction

Strong relationships between teachers and students are essential for creating a positive learning environment. Sen (2021) argues that students who experience positive relationships with their teachers tend to demonstrate better academic performance, particularly in reading. When mutual respect and effective communication are present, students show greater involvement and motivation, which directly affect their learning outcomes.

Learners' Reading Performance

The first language (L1) is the native language or mother tongue of an individual—the language first learned and typically spoken fluently from early childhood. For many individuals, L1 is the language spoken at home, within the family, and in the community. In contrast, a second language (L2) refers to any language learned after the first language. L2 is typically acquired through formal education, immersion, or interaction with speakers of that language. It may be a foreign language learned in school or a second language used alongside the first language in a particular region or country (Ellis 2008; Grosjean 2010).

Alimi et al. (2020) discussed interdependence theory, which explains how literacy skills can transfer from L1 to L2. The theory suggests that the level of L2 literacy competence attained by a learner depends partly on the level of competence already developed in L1 when intensive L2 instruction begins. This implies that if learners are immersed in L2 without first strengthening their L1 literacy skills, their L2 development may be hindered, while their continued development in L1 may also be restricted. Sustained use of a foreign language as the medium of instruction may negatively affect how children learn and process information, thereby influencing cognitive development. Consequently, imposing a foreign language while disregarding learners' linguistic background may inhibit cognitive growth (Ricablanca 2014).

Students' learning is influenced by factors such as age, experience, competence, academic qualifications, instructional approaches, and teacher characteristics. Explicit instruction and fluency development are two areas in which teachers' instructional decisions have a substantial impact on learners' reading proficiency. However, teachers' qualifications and experience are equally important. Effective interaction between teachers and students and meaningful knowledge exchange remain essential components of successful classroom instruction.

Explicit Instruction

Despite the use of various instructional methods, some learners continue to experience challenges with phonological awareness and word recognition, particularly in the early grades (Tomas et al., 2021). Research suggests that explicit instruction is an effective intervention for developing reading skills (Relojo 2016).

Ultimately, regardless of a teacher's age or educational attainment, the ability to implement effective instructional strategies and provide meaningful support for learners remains essential in improving reading outcomes.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research design using a descriptive-correlational approach with a one-group pretest-posttest assessment. The descriptive component was used to determine the level of teachers' instructional delivery in terms of explicit instruction, fluency, and student–teacher interaction, as well as the reading performance of Grade One learners in the pretest and posttest. The pretest-posttest component was used to determine whether there was a significant change in learners' reading performance following the regular instructional period. No researcher-imposed instructional intervention or treatment was introduced; teachers carried out their regular instructional practices. Correlational analysis was employed to determine whether a significant relationship existed between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance. Comparative analysis was used to determine whether significant differences existed in learners' posttest reading performance when grouped according to teachers' profile variables.

Overall, the design enabled the researcher to describe teachers' instructional delivery, assess changes in learners' reading performance over the instructional period, and examine the association and predictive relationship between instructional delivery and reading outcomes.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Sinunuc Elementary School, located in Barangay Sinunuc, along the west coast of Zamboanga City during School Year 2025–2026. The school was purposively selected as the research locale due to its relevance to the study on teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance. Specifically, the study focused on Grade 1 teachers and learners to examine how instructional delivery influences reading performance. The school provided an appropriate setting for assessing teaching practices and foundational literacy skills, generating findings that may contribute to improved reading instruction and learner achievement.

Research Participants

The participants of the study consisted of 11 Grade One teachers and 343 learners from Sinunuc Elementary School during School Year 2025–2026. The participants were drawn from 11 sections, labeled SA to SK, with each section having one teacher and approximately 30 to 32 learners. The Grade One teachers served as respondents in assessing instructional delivery, while the learners' reading performance was evaluated to determine its relationship with teachers' instructional practices. Total enumeration was employed to include all 11 teachers and 343 learners directly involved in the reading instruction process. The inclusion of all Grade One sections ensured comprehensive representation of the target population and provided relevant data for examining the relationship between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance.

Research Instrument

This study utilized two instruments: a self-made questionnaire checklist and the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA), a standardized tool developed by the Department of Education. The self-made questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part collected respondents' profiles on age, educational attainment, years of service, and academic rank. The second part assessed teachers' instructional delivery in teaching reading, focusing on explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction. The questionnaire aimed to determine the extent to which teachers implement explicit instruction, the effectiveness of fluency practices, and the level of student-teacher interaction among Grade One learners. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale, where 5 corresponds to *Strongly Agree*, 4 to *Agree*, 3 to *Neutral*, 2 to *Disagree*, and 1 to *Strongly Disagree*. For interpretation purposes, the following scale was used: 4.21–5.00 interpreted as Very High, 3.41–4.20 as High, 2.61–3.40 as Moderate, 1.81–2.60 as Low, and 1.00–1.80 as Very Low. On the other hand, the learners' pre-test and post-test results from the Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA) were used to assess the reading performance of Grade One learners for the School Year 2025–2026.

Data Gathering Procedure

A permission letter was sought from the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent of Zamboanga City to gather data from grade one learners and teachers of Sinunuc Elementary School, Ayala District, in Zamboanga City Division. The approved letter was presented to the School Principal for the data collection schedule. The researcher explained the study's purpose, goals, and benefits to the school head and agreed to gather data after 2 weeks, giving teachers time to complete the research questionnaire and conduct the post-test CRLA. The researcher distributed questionnaires personally and communicated with teachers, providing clear explanations about the study's goals, potential benefits, risks, and data collection criteria. Teachers were informed of the survey questionnaire responses and had the option to withdraw from the study. The grade-level chairperson conducted the retrieval, considering teachers' busy schedules with Department of Education-mandated activities. The instrument was tabulated using Excel and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What are the teachers' instructional delivery in terms of explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction?

Table 1. Teachers' Instructional Delivery in terms of Explicit Instruction

Statement	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I decide and sets specific, transparent success criteria.	4.64	.481	Strongly Agree	Very High
2. I show learners what to do and how to do it during the physical demonstration.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
3. I check learners' understanding.	4.82	.383	Strongly Agree	Very High
4. I provide the learners all the information needed before the assessment.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
5. I demonstrate systematic and sequential instruction.	4.82	.383	Strongly Agree	Very High
Overall Mean/Description	4.82	.285	Strongly Agree	Very High

Table 1 presents teachers' instructional delivery, as measured by explicit instruction, across several key indicators. The findings reveal consistently high ratings across all items, with mean scores ranging from 4.64 to 4.91 and an overall mean of 4.82 (SD = .285). This indicates that, on average, teachers strongly agree that they practice explicit instruction at a very high level. Specifically, the highest mean scores (4.91) were observed in the items: "I show learners what to do and how to do it during the physical demonstration" and "I provide the learners all the information needed before the assessment." This suggests that teachers place significant emphasis on modeling tasks and ensuring that students are well-informed before assessments. This practice is consistent with Archer and Hughes (2011), who highlight that explicit instruction requires clear modeling and the provision of all necessary information for students to succeed. Other aspects, such as setting specific and transparent success criteria (M = 4.64), checking learners' understanding (M = 4.82), and demonstrating systematic and sequential instruction (M = 4.82), also received very high ratings. Hattie (2012) emphasizes that setting clear learning intentions and success criteria enhances instructional effectiveness, while Rosenshine (2012) underscores the importance of checking for understanding and delivering instruction in logical, sequential steps as essential components of explicit teaching. The uniformly "Strongly Agree" responses across all indicators reflect a strong commitment among teachers to deliver clear, structured, and supportive instruction. These findings align with existing literature suggesting that explicit instruction, characterized by clarity, modeling, and systematic delivery, is linked to improved student achievement (Archer & Hughes 2011; Hattie 2012; Rosenshine 2012). These results imply that explicit instruction is a well-integrated component of teachers' instructional delivery, and the high level of agreement among teachers suggests a shared understanding and consistent implementation of explicit teaching strategies, which are crucial for enhancing student learning outcomes.

Table 2. Teachers' Instructional Delivery in terms of Fluency

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I use Filipino as a medium of instruction.	3.73	.872	Agree	High
2. I use correct diction, pronunciation of words and intonation.	4.55	.655	Strongly Agree	Very High
3. I demonstrate proper expressions of the words, phrases, or sentences in teaching reading.	4.82	.383	Strongly Agree	Very High
4. I Plan lessons that explicitly teach students about the subject matter.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
5. I give learners the opportunity to practice reading with the correct expressions and use of punctuation.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High

Table 2 presents that teachers exhibit a very high level of fluency in their instructional practices, as reflected by an overall mean of 4.59 (SD = .262), interpreted as "Strongly Agree" and "Very High". Among the specific indicators, the highest mean scores (4.91) were observed in the statements, "I plan lessons that explicitly teach students about the subject matter," and "I give learners to practice reading with the correct expressions and use of punctuation." This highlights the teachers' strong commitment to explicit lesson planning and providing ample opportunities for students to develop reading fluency through guided practice. According to Rasinski (2012), providing students with opportunities for repeated and expressive reading is fundamental to building fluency and overall reading competence. Similarly, teachers strongly agreed that they "demonstrate proper expressions of the words, phrases, or sentences in teaching reading" (M = 4.82), and "use correct diction, pronunciation of words, and intonation" (M = 4.55). These findings are consistent with the recommendations of Kuhn and Stahl (2003), who emphasized the importance of modeling fluent reading,

including attention to expression, diction, and intonation, to support students' fluency. The statement "I use Filipino as a medium of instruction" received a slightly lower, but still high, mean score ($M = 3.73$), suggesting that while Filipino instruction is practiced, it is not as consistently emphasized as other aspects of fluency. This aligns with findings by Cummins (2000), that using the learners' first language can support comprehension and fluency, but its implementation may vary based on context and teacher preference. Overall, these results indicate that teachers prioritize explicit instruction and modeling of fluent reading, as well as providing students with meaningful practice opportunities. Such practices are widely supported by research as essential for the development of reading fluency (Rasinski 2012; Kuhn & Stahl 2003).

Table 3. Teachers' Instructional Delivery in terms of Student-Teacher Interaction

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I apply different classroom activities in order to boost learners motivation, and participation in classroom learning.	4.73	.447	Strongly Agree	Very High
2. I make learners feel a welcoming learning environment.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
3. I encourages learners to interact with one another with a positive and receptive discussion.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
4. I motivate the learners to do their best work, express opinions, and experience during the class discussion.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
5. I provide adequate challenges for a meaningful and effective teaching-learning process.	4.91	.283	Strongly Agree	Very High
Overall Mean/Description	4.875	.282	Strongly Agree	Very High

Table 3 indicates a very high level of positive student-teacher interaction, as indicated by the overall mean of 4.88 ($SD = .282$), which is described as "Strongly Agree" and interpreted as "Very High." Notably, the highest mean scores (4.91) were observed across several items: "I make learners feel a welcoming learning environment," "I encourage learners to interact with one another with a positive and receptive discussion," "I motivate the learners to do their best work, express opinions, and experience during the class discussion," and "I provide adequate challenges for a meaningful and effective teaching-learning process." These results reflect the teachers' strong commitment to fostering a supportive, motivating, and interactive classroom environment. According to Pianta, Hamre, and Allen (2012), positive student-teacher relationships and a welcoming classroom climate are critical factors that enhance student engagement, motivation, and academic achievement. Additionally, teachers strongly agreed that they "apply different classroom activities to boost learners' interests, motivation, and participation in classroom learning" ($M = 4.73$). This finding is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, which emphasizes the importance of social interaction and collaborative activities in facilitating learning and cognitive development. Furthermore, Marzano (2003) highlights that providing appropriate challenges and encouraging active student participation are essential for an effective teaching-learning process. Overall, these results suggest that teachers in the study recognize the importance of creating positive interactions and an inclusive classroom atmosphere. Such practices are widely supported in the literature as essential for promoting student engagement and learning outcomes (Pianta et al. 2012; Vygotsky 1978; Marzano 2003).

Research Question 2: What is the level of learners' reading performance in the pre-test and post-test?

Table 4. Level of learners' reading performance in the pre-test and post-test using the CRLA

Indicator	Reading Proficiency Level	Pre-test Reading performance of the Learners		Post-test Reading Performance of the Learners	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
The learners read out loud the given tasks.	Low Emerging Reader	273	79.6	95	27.7
	High Emerging Reader	55	16.0	13	3.8
	Developing Reader	13	3.8	19	5.5
	Transitioning Reader	2	.6	51	14.9
	Reading at Grade level	0	0	165	48.1
	Total	343	100.0	343	100.0

Table 4 shows a marked improvement in reading proficiency following instructional interventions. In the pre-test, the majority of learners were categorized as "Low Emerging Reader" ($n = 273$, 79.6%), indicating limited ability to read aloud the given tasks. Only a small proportion fell into higher proficiency categories: "High Emerging Reader" (16.0%), "Developing Reader" (3.8%), "Transitioning Reader" (0.6%), and none were "Reading at Grade Level" (0%). After the intervention, post-test results revealed a substantial shift in reading performance. The number of learners classified as "Low Emerging Reader" decreased significantly to 95 (27.7%), while those reading at grade level increased dramatically to 165 (48.1%). Additionally, there were

notable increases in the "Transitioning Reader" (14.9%) and "Developing Reader" (5.5%) categories. The sharp rise in learners attaining grade-level proficiency and the reduction in those at the lowest proficiency levels indicate the effectiveness of the implemented instructional strategies. These findings are consistent with research showing that explicit and systematic reading instruction can lead to significant gains in students' reading achievement (Archer & Hughes 2011; Hattie 2012). Furthermore, Rosenshine (2012) emphasizes the importance of guided practice, feedback, and gradual release of responsibility, all of which contribute to improvements in reading performance as observed in this study. Overall, the results demonstrate a positive impact of the instructional delivery on learners' reading proficiency, highlighting the critical role of effective teaching practices in supporting reading development and moving students toward grade-level achievement.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference between pre-test and post-test?

Table 5. Differences in the Pre-test and Post-test Reading Performance of the Learners

Reading Performance	Median	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
1. Pre-test	1.00	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
2. Post-test	4.00			

Table 5 presents the statistical analysis of learners' reading performance before and after the CRLA assessment. The median reading performance increased from 1.00 on the pre-test to 4.00 on the post-test, indicating a substantial improvement in learners' reading proficiency. The p-value ($p = 0.000$) is significantly below the conventional threshold of 0.05, leading to rejection of the null hypothesis and confirming a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores. This significant improvement demonstrates the effectiveness of the instructional strategies employed. This result aligns with Slavin et al. (2009), who found that evidence-based reading programs and systematic instruction produce significant and measurable gains in students' reading achievement. Similarly, Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) emphasized that explicit, well-structured teaching methods are critical for effective literacy development, especially for struggling learners. Moreover, the findings support the assertion of Ehri et al. (2001) that systematic phonics instruction and consistent reading practice can significantly improve children's reading fluency and comprehension. The positive change in learners' reading performance further corroborates Duffy's (2009) work, which noted that high-impact instructional interventions, coupled with ongoing assessment and feedback, are essential for promoting literacy growth. Furthermore, the analysis confirms that the instructional delivery not only resulted in statistically significant gains but also moved a substantial number of learners toward grade-level reading proficiency, as supported by the broader literature on effective reading instruction (Slavin et al. 2009; Snow et al. 1998; Ehri et al. 2001; Duffy 2009).

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance?

Table 6. Significant relationship between teachers' instructional delivery and reading performance

Variable Mean		R-value	P-value	Interpretation
X	Y			
Teachers' Instructional Delivery	Learners' Reading Performance (Post-test)	-0.040	0.461	Not Significant

Table 6 examines the relationship between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance in the post-test. The correlation analysis yielded an r-value of -0.040 and a p-value of 0.461, indicating no significant relationship between the two variables. The very weak negative correlation ($r = -0.040$) suggests essentially no linear association between the quality or frequency of teachers' instructional delivery and learners' measured reading performance on the post-test. The high p-value ($p > 0.05$) supports this finding, indicating that the observed relationship is not statistically significant. This result indicates that, within the context of this study, variations in teachers' self-reported instructional delivery practices were not directly associated with differences in students' post-test reading performance. It is possible that other factors—such as student motivation, prior knowledge, parental involvement, or classroom resources—may have had a more substantial impact on reading outcomes, as noted by Pressley et al. (2001) and Torgesen (2002). Additionally, the lack of a significant relationship could be due to measurement tools or to the homogeneity of teacher practices, as suggested by Creemers and Kyriakides (2008), who argue that effective teaching is multifaceted and interacts with numerous contextual variables. Overall, while effective instructional delivery is widely recognized as essential for promoting student learning (Hattie, 2009; Creemers

& Kyriakides, 2008), this specific analysis did not find a statistically significant correlation between teachers' instructional delivery and learners' reading performance in the post-test.

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference in learners' post-test reading performance when grouped according to teachers' profile

Table 7. Differences in the Post-test Reading Performance of the Learners according to Teachers' Age

Reading Performance of the Learners	Teachers' Age (years old)	Median	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Post-test	30 years and below	3.00	.364	Retain Ho	Not Significant
	31 to 40 years old	-			
	41 to 50 years old	-			
	51 years old and below	5.00			

Table 7 examines whether learners' post-test reading performance differs significantly by the teachers' age groups. The analysis shows median post-test reading performance scores of 3.00 for learners with teachers aged 30 years and below, 0.00 for those with teachers aged 31 to 40 and 41 to 50, and 5.00 for those with teachers aged 51 and below. However, the p-value of 0.364 is well above the conventional significance threshold of 0.05. Consequently, the decision is to retain the null hypothesis, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in learners' post-test reading performance across the different teacher age groups. This result suggests that, in this context, the teacher's age does not significantly affect learners' reading outcomes. This finding aligns with research suggesting that teacher effectiveness is not necessarily a function of age, but rather of professional skills, instructional strategies, and ongoing development (Rice, 2010; Wayne & Youngs, 2003). While experience can contribute to teaching proficiency, it is the quality of instruction and responsiveness to student needs that more strongly influence student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Therefore, the lack of a significant difference here underscores the importance of focusing on evidence-based instructional practices and ongoing teacher development, regardless of age, to ensure positive student outcomes.

Table 8. Differences in the Post-test Reading Performance of the Learners according to Teachers' Educational Attainment

Reading Performance of the Learners	Educational Attainment	Median	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Post-test	Bachelor's Degree	4.50	.111	Retain Ho	Not Significant
	Master's Degree with units earned	5.00			
	Master's Degree Holder	4.50			
	Doctoral's Degree with units earned	-			
	Doctoral's Degree Holder	-			

Table 8 examines whether there are significant differences in learners' post-test reading performance by teachers' educational attainment. The findings show median post-test reading scores of 4.50 for learners whose teachers hold a Bachelor's degree, 5.00 for those with teachers who have earned units toward a Master's degree, and 4.50 for those with Master's degree holders. The p-value of .111 exceeds the standard significance threshold of 0.05, leading to the retention of the null hypothesis and indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in learners' reading performance by their teachers' educational attainment. This result suggests that, within the context of this study, having a higher academic degree (such as a Master's degree) does not correspond to significantly different reading outcomes among learners. This finding aligns with research that indicates teacher effectiveness is not determined solely by formal educational qualifications, but rather by the quality of instructional practice, ongoing professional development, and classroom experience (Rice, 2003; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2006). While advanced degrees can enhance teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical skills, other factors, such as instructional methods, classroom management, and student engagement, are also critical to student achievement (Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Thus, the lack of a significant difference in this analysis highlights the importance of comprehensive teacher development that goes beyond academic attainment, focusing on practical instructional strategies that directly impact student learning.

Table 9. Differences in the Post-test Reading Performance of the Learners according to the Teachers' Number of Years in Service

Reading Performance of the Learners	Number of Yrs. in Service	Median	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Post-test	5 yrs. and below	3.00	.541	Retain Ho	Not Significant
	6 yrs. to 15 yrs in service	1.00			
	16 yrs. to 25 yrs. in service	5.00			
	26 yrs. and above	5.00			

Table 9 shows whether there are significant differences in learners' post-test reading performance across groups defined by their teachers' years of service. The medians for post-test reading performance varied across groups, from 1.00 (6–15 years in service) and 3.00 (5 years and below) to 5.00 (16–25 years and 26 years and above). Despite these differences in medians, the p-value of .541 is substantially greater than the 0.05 threshold for statistical significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained, indicating no significant difference in learners' reading performance by teachers' length of service. This finding suggests that the number of years a teacher has been in service does not, by itself, significantly affect students' reading outcomes in this context. This aligns with research indicating that while teaching experience can contribute to professional competence, its impact on student achievement tends to plateau after the initial years and is often outweighed by the quality of instructional practices and ongoing professional learning (Kini & Podolsky 2016; Rice 2010). Effective teaching is shaped not only by experience but also by a teacher's adaptability, commitment to evidence-based methods, and responsiveness to student needs (Wayne & Youngs 2003). In summary, the data emphasize that while experience is valuable, continuous growth, reflective practice, and engagement with current instructional strategies are crucial for fostering student achievement, rather than relying solely on years in service.

Table 10. Differences in the Post-test Reading Performance of the Learners according to the Teachers' Academic Rank

Reading Performance of the Learners	Academic Rank	Median	P-value	Decision	Interpretation
Post-test	Teacher I	1.00	.235	Retain Ho	Not Significant
	Teacher II	4.50			
	Teacher III	5.00			
	Master Teacher I	-			
	Master Teacher II	5.00			
	Master Teacher III	-			

Table 10 examines whether learners' post-test reading performance differs significantly by their teachers' academic rank. The results show that median scores increase from 1.00 for Teacher I, to 4.50 for Teacher II, and to 5.00 for both Teacher III and Master Teacher II. Despite this apparent upward trend, the statistical analysis yields a p-value of .235, which is above the conventional 0.05 threshold. Thus, the null hypothesis is retained, indicating that the observed differences are not statistically significant. This finding suggests that, within the present study, teachers' academic rank does not significantly affect learners' reading achievement. This is consistent with existing research, which indicates that while higher academic rank may reflect greater experience or accomplishment, it does not automatically translate to greater effectiveness in improving student performance (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2006; Rice, 2003). The impact of a teacher on student learning is influenced more strongly by instructional quality, adaptability, and engagement with current pedagogical best practices rather than by academic rank alone (Wayne & Youngs, 2003). In summary, the lack of a significant difference in reading performance across academic ranks highlights the importance of focusing on continuous professional development and effective instructional strategies for all teachers, regardless of rank or position.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical principles to ensure the rights, privacy, and welfare of all participants. Prior to data collection, permission was secured from the Schools Division Office and the school principal of Sinunuc Elementary School. Informed consent was obtained from the participating teachers and the parents or guardians of Grade One learners, while age-appropriate assent was sought from the learners. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of their right to withdraw without consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through the use of codes instead of participants' names. All collected data were used exclusively for research purposes, securely stored, and accessed only by authorized individuals in accordance with Republic Act No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The study also ensured that data collection did not disrupt regular classroom instruction or compromise learners' well-being. These ethical measures were observed to uphold the integrity, credibility, and responsible conduct of the research.

Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that Grade One teachers consistently demonstrated very high levels of instructional delivery in terms of explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction, reflecting their adherence to effective teaching practices. Learners' reading performance showed significant improvement from pre-test to post-test, indicating positive gains in reading proficiency. However, no significant relationship was established between teachers' self-reported instructional delivery and learners'

post-test reading performance. Similarly, teachers' profile variables, including age, educational attainment, years in service, and academic rank, showed no significant association with learners' reading outcomes. Regression analysis further revealed that explicit instruction, fluency, and student-teacher interaction were not significant predictors of reading performance. These findings suggest that learners' reading achievement is influenced by multiple factors beyond teachers' instructional practices and demographic characteristics influence learners' reading achievement.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, it is recommended that teachers continue implementing explicit, structured, and interactive instructional strategies to strengthen learners' foundational reading skills. School administrators are encouraged to provide continuous professional development opportunities focusing on evidence-based reading instruction, differentiated teaching approaches, and effective literacy interventions. Additionally, teachers should regularly monitor learners' reading progress through appropriate assessment tools to identify learning difficulties and provide timely instructional support. Future researchers are encouraged to investigate other factors that may influence reading performance, including learners' motivation, home literacy environment, parental involvement, and access to learning resources. The use of more comprehensive assessment instruments and larger, more diverse samples is also recommended to further validate the findings and identify additional predictors of learners' reading achievement.

References

- Agustin, M. V., & Ramos, P. J. (2021). Performance-based assessments and science academic achievement among senior high school students in Davao City. *Journal of Philippine Science Education*, 5(2), 88–97.
- Alimi, F., Tella, A., Adeyemo, G., & Oyeweso, M. A. (2020). Impact of mother tongue on primary pupils' literacy and numeracy skills in Osun State. *International Online Journal of Primary Education*, 9(2). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1283007.pdf>
- Alfonga, P. J. M., & Napil, M. C. (2022). Student-teacher relationship and classroom social climate as a predictor for language learning motivation. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2013>
- Alufohai, P. J. (2015). Influence of teachers' age, marital status, and gender on students' academic achievement. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(4).
- Alviz, A. A. (2018). Utilizing game-based learning in explicit instruction for early grades reading fluency. GRIN Verlag. <https://www.grin.com/document/436031>
- Araujo, M. C., Carneiro, P., Cruz-Aguayo, Y., & Schady, N. (2016). Teacher quality and learning outcomes in kindergarten. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(3), 1415–1453.
- Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. Guilford Press.
- Ashman, G. (2021). *The power of explicit teaching and direct instruction*. Corwin.
- Bolkan, S., & Griffin, D. J. (2017). Students' use of cell phones in class for off-task behaviors: The indirect impact of instructors' teaching behaviors through boredom and students' attitudes. *Communication Education*, 66(3), 313–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1241888>
- Cariño, S. (2018, June 30). PressReader.com—Digital newspaper & magazine subscriptions. PressReader. <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20180630/281681140619187>
- Creemers, B. P. M., & Kyriakides, L. (2008). *The dynamics of educational effectiveness*. Routledge.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1), 1–44.
- Denull, H. (2018). What is the difference between an MA in education & an M.Ed in education? Classroom. <https://classroom.synonym.com/how-8630059-tenure-teacher-pennsylvania.html>
- Duffy, G. G. (2009). *Explaining reading: A resource for teaching concepts, skills, and strategies*. Guilford Press.
- Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Stahl, S. A., & Willows, D. M. (2001). Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(3), 393–447.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- González, A. (2015). The role of mother tongue in early literacy development in multilingual classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(4), 449–461.

- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Adkins, M. (2020). The impact of teachers' years of experience on student achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 49(8), 549–561.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2006). Teacher quality. In E. A. Hanushek & F. Welch (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of education* (Vol. 2, pp. 1051–1078). Elsevier.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Hu, J. (2015). Review of elevation of primary school teachers' record of schooling in Chinese Mainland. *Jiangsu Education Research*, 262, 7–[page range incomplete].
- Kim, G. (2014). What is explicit instruction? Understood. <https://www.understood.org/en/articles/what-is-explicit-instruction>
- Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research. Learning Policy Institute.
- König, J., & Kramer, C. (2016). Teacher professional knowledge and classroom management: On the relation of general pedagogical knowledge (GPK) and classroom management expertise (CME). *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 48, 139–151.
- Konza, D. (2016). Understanding the process of reading: The big six. In J. Scull & B. Raban (Eds.), *Growing up literate: Australian literacy research for practice* (pp. 149–175). Eleanor Curtain Publishing.
- Kuhn, M. R., & Stahl, S. A. (2003). Fluency: A review of developmental and remedial practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(1), 3–21.
- Lesiak, K. (2015). Teaching English to adolescents. *World Scientific News*, 7, 223–237.
- Linder, D. E., Mueller, M. K., Gibbs, D. M., et al. (2017). Effects of an animal-assisted intervention on reading skills and attitudes in second grade students. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 46, 323–329.
- Lukman, Y. (2021). Managing conflict at institution/s of higher learning: A post-positivist perspective. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(6), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n6p1>
- Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M. C., & Bosker, R. J. (2016). Teacher–student interpersonal relationships in Indonesia: Profiles and importance to student motivation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(2), 115–131.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. ASCD.
- Ong, E. S., & Padilla, P. P. (2020). Explicit contextual and morphemic analysis instruction, vocabulary, and reading comprehension among Grade Four students. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 2(2), 75–104.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Allen, J. P. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 365–386). Springer.
- Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Allington, R., Block, C. C., Morrow, L., Tracey, D., & Woo, D. (2001). A study of effective first-grade literacy instruction. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5(1), 35–58.
- Radjuni, A. J. (2021). Teachers' profile and classroom instruction delivery: The case of a certain university in the Southern Philippines. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 300–308.
- Rasinski, T. V. (2012). Why reading fluency should be hot! *The Reading Teacher*, 65(8), 516–522.
- Relajo, D. (2016). Current developments in reading abilities through phonological processing skills and proficiency in a second language. *I-Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology*, 10(2).
- Rice, J. K. (2003). Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes. Economic Policy Institute.
- Rice, J. K. (2010). The impact of teacher experience: Examining the evidence and policy implications (Brief No. 11). National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
- Ricablanca, K. (2014). Mother tongue-based multilingual education: Implications for education and language planning in the Philippines. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–9.
- Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction: Research-based strategies that all teachers should know. *American Educator*, 36(1), 12–19.
- Salivio, J. P. (2019). Effects of teachers' academic rank and the academic performance of Grade VI pupils in science: A basis for teachers' academic rank enhancement model. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*.
- Sari, N. M. (2017). Factors affecting students' participation in extra-curricular. ResearchGate.
- Sen, K. (2021). Importance of teacher-student interaction. *AERR*, 9(3).
- Shanahan, T. (2017). How to teach fluency so that it takes. *Reading Rockets*. <https://www.readingrockets.org/blogs/shanahan-literacy/how-teach-fluency-so-it-takes>



- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Chambers, B., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2009). Effective reading programs for the elementary grades: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(4), 1391–1466.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. National Academy Press.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 360–407.
- Tomas, M. J. L., Villaros, E. T., & Galman, S. M. A. (2021). The perceived challenges in reading of learners: Basis for school reading programs. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(5), 107–122.
- Torgesen, J. K. (2002). The prevention of reading difficulties. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(1), 7–26.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(1), 89–122.