

Development and Expert Validation of Supplementary Filipino Reading Materials for Grade 1 Learners: A Descriptive-Developmental Study in a Philippine Public Elementary School

Christopher Macasias
Dr. Josephine Rosario
Dr. Priscilla R. Castro

Lyceum Northwestern Universtiy, Philippines

Abstract— This study developed and validated supplementary Filipino reading materials intended to address the reading difficulties of Grade 1 learners in a Philippine public elementary school. Using a descriptive-developmental design, the study analyzed the beginning-of-school-year reading profile of 80 learners, gathered teacher reports on reading difficulties, designed targeted print materials, and subjected these resources to expert evaluation through the Learning Resource Management and Development System checklist. Eighteen experts, including master teachers, school administrators, and curriculum supervisors, assessed the materials' content, format, presentation, and accuracy. Results showed that 53.75% of learners were classified as low or high emerging readers, indicating substantial need for early literacy support. Persistent difficulties were observed in sight-word recognition, decoding unfamiliar words, monotone reading, comprehension, and reading engagement. Expert evaluation rated the materials as very satisfactory for content ($M = 3.62$), format ($M = 3.56$), and presentation and organization ($M = 3.53$), while accuracy and up-to-datedness passed with a perfect score. One-way ANOVA showed significant differences among expert groups on content, presentation and organization, accuracy, and overall ratings, but not on format. The findings indicate that well-structured, developmentally appropriate supplementary reading materials can serve as a viable instructional support for beginning readers and warrant classroom implementation and future effectiveness testing.

Keywords: *supplementary reading materials, Grade 1 learners, early literacy, reading difficulties, expert validation*

I. INTRODUCTION

Foundational literacy in the early grades depends on the coordinated development of decoding, word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Contemporary reading research consistently shows that explicit attention to letter-sound knowledge, decoding, and connected-text reading remains essential for novice readers, especially those at risk of reading difficulty. Review work has also shown that decodable texts and systematic reading support can strengthen early word reading and decoding performance when matched to learners' developmental needs.

Evidence further suggests that supplemental reading support can be a meaningful addition to classroom instruction. Meta-analytic work on supplemental reading interventions implemented by paraprofessionals found positive literacy gains for at-risk learners, while large-scale school implementation research has shown that early-literacy interventions can reduce reading difficulties over time when schools sustain implementation with fidelity. Smaller intervention studies have likewise reported that repeated reading, assisted reading, and culturally relevant reading passages can improve oral reading fluency and comprehension among beginning readers.

Reading difficulty is not limited to decoding failure. Fluency mediates the relationship between lower-level reading skills and comprehension, while motivation and reading engagement are also associated with achievement. Meta-analytic and large-sample studies indicate that motivated readers engage more frequently with text and tend to show stronger reading outcomes. These findings are especially relevant for early-grade learners who may avoid reading tasks when they experience repeated difficulty, low confidence, or weak comprehension.

Within this context, the study at Magtaking Elementary School addressed a pressing instructional need. The uploaded study reports that many Grade 1 learners were below expected reading levels at the beginning of the school year, with persistent difficulties in word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and reading behavior. In response, the researcher designed supplementary Filipino reading materials and subjected them to expert validation using the LRMDS framework to determine their suitability for instructional use.

Accordingly, this article aimed to present a publishable synthesis of that developmental work by examining: (1) the BOSY reading profile of Grade 1 learners, (2) the major reading difficulties observed, (3) the characteristics of the developed supplementary materials, (4) expert evaluation of those materials, and (5) the implications of the findings for early-grade reading instruction.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a **descriptive-developmental research design**. The descriptive component established the reading profile and major reading difficulties of Grade 1 learners, while the developmental component focused on the design and expert validation of supplementary Filipino reading materials. The study site was Magtaking Elementary School in San Carlos City, Pangasinan, Philippines.

The learner-participants consisted of **80 Grade 1 learners**, while **3 Grade 1 teachers** provided classroom-based input on recurring reading difficulties. For material validation, **18 experts** participated: 9 master teachers, 7 school administrators, 1 Education Program Supervisor in Filipino, and 1 Education Program Supervisor in LRMDs.

The study used BOSY reading assessment results to establish learners' reading levels. Teacher responses and assessment evidence were then used to identify reading difficulties across four domains: word recognition, reading fluency, reading comprehension, and learner behavior. These findings served as the basis for developing supplementary reading materials in Filipino. The materials were subsequently evaluated through the **LRMDS Evaluation Checklist**, covering content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-datedness. Descriptive statistics, weighted means, and one-way ANOVA were used to analyze the data.

III. RESULTS

The BOSY reading profile showed that only a minority of learners had already reached expected proficiency. Of the 80 Grade 1 learners assessed, **20 (25.00%)** were low emerging readers, **23 (28.75%)** were high emerging readers, **15 (18.75%)** were developing readers, **8**

(10.00%) were transitioning readers, and 14 (17.50%) were at grade level. Combined, 53.75% of the cohort fell within the low and high emerging categories, indicating that more than half of the learners were still in the foundational stage of reading development.

In the domain of **word recognition**, the most severe difficulties were difficulty recognizing common sight words (WM = 4.52), difficulty sounding out unfamiliar words (WM = 4.42), confusion of visually similar letters such as *b/d* and *p/q* (WM = 4.40), and omission, addition, or substitution of letters (WM = 4.34). Slow or hesitant reading was also observed (WM = 4.12). These results indicate that automaticity in basic decoding and visual discrimination had not yet been firmly established for many learners.

In **reading fluency**, the most prominent difficulty was reading in a monotone voice without proper phrasing (WM = 4.24, always observed). Difficulty reading sentences smoothly (WM = 3.02), reading word by word rather than in meaningful chunks (WM = 2.82), and frequent pausing or losing place while reading (WM = 2.68) were sometimes observed. These findings suggest that prosody and automatic connected-text reading were still underdeveloped.

In **reading comprehension**, the strongest difficulties were inability to recall main ideas or details after reading (WM = 4.72), difficulty understanding what was read (WM = 4.66), and the need for constant guidance to understand a story or passage (WM = 4.40). Difficulty making inferences from the text (WM = 3.82) was observed, while struggling to answer questions about the text (WM = 3.16) was sometimes observed. These results indicate that many learners were not yet reading independently for meaning.

The **behavioral dimension** also reflected reading vulnerability. Teachers reported that learners easily lost focus while reading (WM = 4.72) and avoided or showed reluctance toward reading activities (WM = 4.66). Lack of confidence in reading aloud was sometimes observed (WM = 3.16). These patterns suggest that the literacy challenge was both cognitive and affective.

Expert evaluation of the developed materials yielded highly positive results. The supplementary reading materials received an average weighted mean of **3.62** for **content**, **3.56** for **format**, and **3.53** for **presentation and organization**, all interpreted as **Very Satisfactory**. For

accuracy and up-to-datedness, the materials received a perfect score of **24/24**, indicating the absence of conceptual, factual, grammatical, computational, obsolete, or typographical errors.

The ANOVA results showed statistically significant differences among expert groups for **content** ($p = .036$), **presentation and organization** ($p = .038$), **accuracy and up-to-datedness** ($p = .021$), and the **overall weighted mean** ($p = .031$). By contrast, differences in **format** were not statistically significant ($p = .056$), indicating broader agreement across expert groups on layout and readability. Overall, the materials were judged highly acceptable for classroom use, subject to minor revisions.

IV. DISCUSSION

The large proportion of low and high emerging readers in the BOSY profile confirms the urgency of early, targeted literacy support. This result is consistent with the broader reading science literature, which emphasizes that novice readers require systematic support in phonics, decoding, and text access if they are to move toward fluent and meaningful reading. The current findings also align with meta-analytic evidence showing that decodable texts and structured supplemental reading interventions can improve foundational reading performance when they are developmentally appropriate and consistently implemented.

The word-recognition findings are especially important. Difficulty with sight words, unfamiliar word decoding, and letter confusions points to weak orthographic mapping and unstable grapheme-phoneme knowledge. Castles, Rastle, and Nation argue that early reading instruction must build accurate decoding alongside practice in meaningful text, while Odo's meta-analysis indicates that decodable texts produce meaningful benefits for decoding and smaller but still positive effects on word reading. In this study, the design emphasis on phonics, sight words, and structured print support appears justified by the profile of need.

The fluency and comprehension results also reveal an important instructional relationship. Cadime et al. found that reading fluency mediates the relationship between word reading and comprehension, while Sáez et al. highlight prosody as a useful window into how well word recognition and comprehension are coming together. In the present study, monotone reading and

weak phrasing suggest that learners were not yet reading with sufficient automaticity to free cognitive resources for meaning-making. This interpretation is reinforced by the high means for recall difficulty, limited understanding, and the need for constant guidance.

The behavioral findings likewise deserve serious attention. Reading reluctance and distractibility are not minor classroom behaviors; they often reflect repeated encounters with failure, weak self-efficacy, or low task value. Toste et al.'s meta-analysis found a moderate relation between reading motivation and reading achievement, and Kavanagh reported that intrinsic motivation and reading activity are positively associated with reading performance. For Grade 1 learners, this means that effective materials must not only teach skills but also invite participation, confidence, and persistence. The developed materials' emphasis on attractive visuals, scaffolded tasks, and developmentally appropriate activities is therefore pedagogically defensible.

The expert-validation findings further strengthen the instructional promise of the materials. Very satisfactory ratings across content, format, and presentation suggest that the materials are well aligned with learner needs and classroom realities. The perfect score on accuracy and up-to-datedness is especially important in beginning literacy materials, where even minor linguistic or typographical errors can undermine learning. The significant differences among expert groups in some domains should not be interpreted as rejection; rather, they suggest that different evaluators brought distinct professional lenses to the review process. That nuance is not unusual in material validation. Implementation research shows that literacy intervention success often depends not only on sound design but on iterative refinement, contextual fit, and sustained school-level use.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the developed supplementary reading materials are strongest as a **targeted instructional support**, not yet as proof of causal effectiveness. The study successfully established need, designed a materials response, and validated that response through expert review. The next logical step is classroom implementation with pretest-posttest or quasi-experimental evaluation to determine actual gains in reading performance.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study established that Grade 1 learners at Magtaking Elementary School began the school year with substantial literacy vulnerability, with most learners classified as low or high emerging readers and with pronounced difficulties in word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and reading engagement.

In response to these needs, the researcher developed supplementary Filipino reading materials grounded in the learners' assessed weaknesses. Expert evaluation showed that the materials were very satisfactory in content, format, and presentation, and fully acceptable in accuracy and up-to-datedness. These results indicate that the materials are instructionally sound, developmentally appropriate, and suitable for classroom use.

However, the present study should be interpreted as a **developmental-validation study**, not as a full effectiveness trial. The findings support the usability and acceptability of the materials, but they do not yet establish direct causal improvement in learner reading outcomes after implementation. For that reason, the materials should be viewed as a promising and evidence-informed resource that now requires field testing under authentic classroom conditions.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers should use the validated supplementary reading materials to support early-grade reading instruction, particularly in phonics, sight-word practice, guided reading, fluency work, and scaffolded comprehension. Because many learners were still at the emerging stages, materials should be delivered through differentiated instruction and small-group support.

School administrators should integrate the materials into school-based reading recovery efforts and continue expert review using the LRMS framework to maintain instructional quality. Implementation should be accompanied by teacher orientation, routine monitoring, and alignment with beginning-reading assessment results.

Future researchers should conduct quasi-experimental or experimental studies to test the actual effects of the enhanced materials on reading accuracy, fluency, comprehension, and learner

motivation over time. Such work would extend the present study from validation to effectiveness and strengthen its suitability for higher-impact publication outlets.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(1), 5–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271>
- [2.] Cadime, I., Freitas, T., Martín-Aragoneses, M. T., & Ribeiro, I. (2024). Does reading fluency mediate the relationship between cognitive-linguistic skills and reading comprehension? A study in European Portuguese. *Cognitive Development*, 71, 101490. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2024.101490>
- [3.] Jones, B. T., Erchul, W. P., & Geraghty, C. A. (2021). Supplemental reading interventions implemented by paraprofessionals: A meta-analysis. *Psychology in the Schools*, 58(4), 723–741. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22427>
- [4.] Kavanagh, L. (2019). Relations between children’s reading motivation, activity and performance at the end of primary school. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 42(3), 562–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12284>
- [5.] Kim, W., Linan-Thompson, S., & Misquitta, R. (2012). Critical factors in reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities: A research synthesis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 27(2), 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2012.00352.x>
- [6.] Odo, D. M. (2024). The use of decodable texts in the teaching of reading in children without reading disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Literacy*, 58(2), 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12368>
- [7.] Sáez, L., Whitney, M., Nese, J. F. T., Alonzo, J., & Nese, R. N. T. (2025). Reading prosody: A listening guide for teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 78(4), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2368>
- [8.] Telesman, A. O., Konrad, M., Cartledge, G., Gardner, R., & Council, M. (2019). Preventing reading failure for first-grade students in an urban school. *The Journal of Special Education*, 53(2), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466918806494>

- [9.] Toste, J. R., Didion, L., Peng, P., Filderman, M. J., & McClelland, A. M. (2020). A meta-analytic review of the relations between motivation and reading achievement for K–12 students. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(3), 420–456. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320919352>
- [10.] van der Weijden, F. A., van den Boer, M., Zijlstra, B. J. H., & de Jong, P. F. (2025). Implementation takes time: Reduction of literacy problems in schools implementing an early-literacy intervention. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 18(4), 918–950. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2024.2384365>
- [11.] Young, C., Lagrone, S., & McCauley, J. (2020). Read like me: An intervention for struggling readers. *Education Sciences*, 10(3), 57. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10030057>