International Journal of Research Studies in Education
2026 Volume 15 Number 25, 83-94



Reading ability of Key Stage 1 learners in Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan District: Basis for the development of parent-teacher partnership reading program

Tubera, Carlota ✉
Osias Educational Foundation, Inc., Philippines (carlota.tubera@001@deped.gov.ph)

ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

Received: 5 November 2026 **Revised**: 18 November 2026 **Accepted**: 20 November 2026 OPEN ACCESS
Available Online: 21 November 2026 **DOI**: 10.5861/ijrse.2026.26480

Abstract

Reading proficiency is fundamental to learners' academic achievement and lifelong learning. This study assessed the reading ability of Key Stage 1 learners in Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan District, as a basis for developing a Parent-Teacher Partnership Reading Program. Specifically, it examined the profile of teacher and parent-respondents, the extent of parent-teacher collaboration, learners' reading abilities in terms of word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary, and the challenges encountered in collaborative efforts. The study employed a descriptive research design involving three kindergarten teachers and 30 parents/guardians. Data were gathered through a research questionnaire and analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistical tools. Findings revealed that all teacher-respondents were female and had earned master's degree units. Most had attended various levels of professional training. Meanwhile, the majority of parent-respondents were female, married, and aged 30–34. Parent-teacher collaboration practices were generally observed often to always, particularly in providing feedback, conducting conferences, organizing reading activities, and monitoring learners' progress. However, the provision of supplementary reading materials at home was practiced only sometimes. Learners demonstrated developing abilities in word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Strengths were observed in identifying characters' feelings and classifying words, while story sequencing, reading accuracy, and vocabulary development needed further improvement. Parents also reported considerable challenges in supporting collaborative reading efforts. The study concluded that sustained parent-teacher collaboration is essential in strengthening learners' reading abilities. It recommended developing a Parent-Teacher Partnership Reading Program to promote effective communication, parental involvement, guided home reading activities, and access to appropriate reading materials.

Keywords: reading ability, Key Stage 1 learners, parent-teacher collaboration, reading proficiency, partnership reading program

© The Author(s) / Attribution CC BY

Reading ability of Key Stage 1 learners in Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan District: Basis for the development of parent-teacher partnership reading program

1. Introduction

Reading proficiency is a critical foundation for academic success; however, many Filipino learners continue to struggle with reading, as reflected in international and national assessments. To address this concern, the Department of Education has implemented programs such as the National Learning Recovery Program, National Reading Program, and ARAL Program to strengthen literacy and address learning gaps. Despite these efforts, many early-grade learners still face difficulties in fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary development, often due to limited instructional support and literacy opportunities at home. Recognizing that effective reading development requires the combined efforts of schools and families, this study examined the impact of parent-teacher collaboration on the reading abilities of Key Stage 1 learners in Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan District. Specifically, it sought to determine how collaborative efforts between parents and teachers can help improve learners' reading skills and provide a basis for interventions that promote stronger literacy outcomes.

Statement of the Problem - This study sought to determine the level of parents and teachers' partnership on the reading ability of Key Stage 1 learners in Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan, La Union. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

- What is the profile of teachers in terms of (a) age, (b) sex, (c) civil status, and (d) educational attainment and training attended?
- What is the profile of parents in terms of (a) age, (b) sex, (c) civil status ?
- What is the level of parent-teacher partnership practices ?
- What is the level of reading ability of Key Stage 1 learners in terms of word recognition; reading fluency; reading comprehension and vocabulary development
- What is the level of challenges on parent-teacher partnership program towards the reading abilities of learners?
- Preparation of teacher-parent partnership reading program.
- Validity of the teacher-parent partnership reading program.

The Research Paradigm - This study employs the Input-Process-Output (IPO) Model of Research, as illustrated in Figure 1. The input variables include the survey results on the profile of teachers in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service, and training attended, as well as the level of reading ability of Key Stage 1 learners, the extent of parents and teachers' collaboration, and the challenges encountered in the collaborative process. The process variables involve the analysis and interpretation of these inputs, focusing on teachers' profiles, learners' reading abilities—measured in terms of word recognition, reading fluency, and reading comprehension—parents and teachers' collaboration in areas such as communication, involvement in school activities, and support for home reading practices, and the challenges experienced in enhancing learners' reading performance. The output of the study is a set of proposed parents and teachers' collaboration programs designed to strengthen and enrich the reading abilities of Key Stage 1 learners at Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan, La Union.

Study Design - This study employed a descriptive research design, which is primarily concerned with describing the current status of phenomena without manipulating variables. According to Creswell (2012),

descriptive research is appropriate when the goal is to provide a detailed account of existing conditions or practices as they naturally occur. In this study, the focus was on the current level of parents and teachers' partnership towards reading ability of key stage 1 learners in Caagraoan elementary school, San Juan district, basis for the development of parent-teacher partnership reading program. of Key Stage 1 learners. The collaboration was examined in terms of (a) communication, (b) involvement in school activities, and (c) support for home reading practice. As Best and Kahn (2021) emphasize, descriptive research is valuable for investigating educational problems by collecting data that describe events and conditions as they exist.

The primary tool for data collection was a structured questionnaire, which was administered to both teachers and parents. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2019) highlight that questionnaires are widely used in descriptive studies since they allow researchers to collect standardized information efficiently from a large number of respondents. The questionnaire was designed to capture the perceptions and experiences of parents and teachers regarding their collaboration in supporting the reading abilities of learners. Through this design, the study aimed to provide a comprehensive description of how parents and teachers partner and how such partnership supports the reading abilities of Key Stage 1 learners in Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan, La Union.

Participants - The participants of this study include all three (3) Key Stage 1 teachers and thirty (30) parents of learners enrolled in Grades 1 to 3 at Caagraoan Elementary School. Specifically, the distribution of participants is as follows: Grade 1 has 1 teacher and 11 parents, Grade 2 has 1 teacher and 11 parents, and Grade 3 has 1 teacher and 8 parents. The inclusion of both teachers and parents ensures that the study captures perspectives from the two primary stakeholders directly engaged in the development of learners' reading abilities. Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from both the parent or guardian participants and the teacher advisers to guarantee participation and uphold ethical research practices. By involving both teachers and parents across all levels of Key Stage 1, the study provided a comprehensive description of parent–teacher collaboration in enhancing the reading abilities of learners.

Study Size and Setting - This study was conducted at Caagraoan Elementary School, located in San Juan, La Union, during the School Year 2025–2026. The study utilized the total enumeration of the 3 teachers and 30 parents of the learners under the key stage. According to Creswell (2022), total enumeration sampling ensures that the entire population is represented, eliminating sampling bias and providing a more comprehensive dataset. The inclusion of the entire population is deemed appropriate given the manageable size of the participants and the focus of the study. This approach strengthens the validity of the findings by capturing the complete perspectives of both teachers and parents within the school's Key Stage 1 population. Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents, the key stage 1 learners and advisers of Caagraoan Elementary School, San Juan, La Union.

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents by Grade Level

Name of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Parents
Grade 1	1	11
Grade 2	1	11
Grade 3	1	8
TOTAL	3	30

Investigative Materials and Instruments - The study employed a researcher-designed questionnaire tailored to Key Stage 1 learners (Grades 1–3). Part I was focused on teachers' demographic profiles, including age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, length of service, and related training. It also includes the profile of parents as to their age, sex, and civil status. These variables were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and ranking methods. For Sub-Problem 2 on learners' reading abilities, Sub-Problem 3 on the extent of parent-teacher collaboration, and Sub-Problem 4 on challenges encountered, quantitative responses were summarized using mean scores and frequency counts. Furthermore, several questionnaire items—particularly those addressing reading practices, collaboration dynamics, and instructional approaches. Content validity was ensured by aligning the items with established constructs and frameworks in reading instruction and parent-teacher collaboration studies.

Data Collection Procedures - Before the administration of the questionnaire, the researcher asked permission from the Schools Division Superintendent, with the endorsement of the Dean of the Graduate School, the teacher questionnaires were personally administered to ensure that normal class schedules remain unaffected. Questionnaires were used to ensure completeness.

Data Processing - The data gathered shall be organized, tallied, and presented in tables to ensure accuracy and order, and for systematic analysis of the processed data. To effectively analyze and interpret the data gathered for this study, several statistical tools will be employed, including frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and ranking methods. These techniques will ensure that the analysis is both valid and reliable. The personal profile of teachers, in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, length of service, and number of trainings and seminars related to reading, will be analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and ranking methods. This approach will facilitate a clear interpretation by providing insights into the distribution and prevalence of various characteristics among the participants.

The level of reading ability will be assessed through numerical values and descriptive ratings (DR). The scale for this assessment is as follows: 5 for Always (4.21-5.00), 4 for Often Observed (3.31-4.20), 3 for Sometimes (2.61-3.40), 2 for Rarely (1.81-2.60), and 1 for Never (1.00-1.80). The extent of collaboration between parents and teachers, along with the challenges encountered in enhancing reading abilities, will be analyzed using a numerical scale: 5 for Always (4.21-5.00), 4 for Often Observed (3.41-4.20), 3 for Sometimes (2.61-3.40), 2 for Rarely (1.81-2.60), and 1 for Never (1.00-1.80). The challenges faced in the collaboration between parents and teachers will be evaluated using another numerical scale: 5 for Very High Challenge (VHC) (4.22-5.00), 4 for High Challenge (HC) (3.41-4.20), 3 for Moderately Challenging (MC) (2.61-3.40), 2 for Slightly Challenged (SC) (1.81-2.60), and 1 for Not Challenged (NC) (1.00-1.80). All statistical computations for this study will be carried out using the MegaStat Analysis Tool Pack 2013 to ensure accuracy and consistency in data analysis.

2. Results and Discussion

Profile of teachers and parents - In this study, the first problem asked for the profile of the key stage 1 teachers, particularly the teachers of Caagraoan elementary school, in terms of their 1) age; 2) sex; 3) civil status, 4) educational attainment, and 5) relevant training. Likewise, Table 1 presents the profile of parents in terms of age, sex, and civil status.

Table 1
Profile of Teachers (N=3)

AGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
60 years old and above	0	0%
55 years old – 59 years old	0	0%
50 years old – 54 years old	0	0%
45 years old – 49 years old	0	0%
40 years old – 44 years old	0	0%
35 years old – 39 years old	1	33.33%
30 years old – 34 years old	2	66.67%
25 years old – 29 years old	0	0%
20 years old – 24 years old	0	0%
19 below	0	0%
Total	3	100%
SEX		
Male	0	0%
Female	3	100%
Total	3	100%
CIVIL STATUS		
Single	2	66.67%
Married	1	33.33%
Separated	0	0%
Widow	0	0%
Total	3	100%

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT		
EDD/PhD Graduate	0	0%
Completed EDD/PhD Academic Requirement	0	0%
With EDD/PhD units	0	0%
MAED Graduate	0	0%
Completed MAED Academic Requirement	0	0%
With MAED units	3	100%
BEED/BSED Graduate	0	0%
Total	3	100%
LEVEL OF RELEVANT TRAINING		
International	0	0%
National	0	0%
Regional	2	66.67%
Division	3	100%
District	3	100%
School	3	100%

Profile of Parents (N=30)

AGE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
60 years old and above	0	0%
55 years old – 59 years old	0	0%
50 years old – 54 years old	0	0%
45 years old – 49 years old	0	0%
40 years old – 44 years old	5	16.67%
35 years old – 39 years old	8	26.67%
30 years old – 34 years old	11	36.67%
25 years old – 29 years old	6	20.00%
20 years old – 24 years old	0	0%
19 below	0	0%
Total	30	100%
SEX (Parent/Guardian)		
Male	5	16.67%
Female	25	83.33%
Total	30	100%
CIVIL STATUS		
Single	0	0%
Married	30	100%
Separated	0	0%
Widow	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The table reveals that 33.33% or 1 teacher is between 35 and 39 years old. 66.67% or 2 teachers are between 30 and 34 years old. No teachers are teaching younger than 29 years old, most of the teachers are in their mid of 35's, suggesting a group of educators who are "experienced" but still in their mid-career stage. Their age group implies a balance of enthusiasm and professional maturity. As to sex, 3 or 100% are female, reflecting a common trend in basic education where women dominate the teaching profession, especially in early grades. With regards to civil status, 2 teachers or 66.67% are single, 1 or 33.33% is married, and none are separated or widowed. This would mean that the majority of the teachers are single, which may suggest more flexibility in attending professional development activities. Along with educational attainment, 3 teachers or 100% have MAEd units. No one has completed a full doctorate or master's degree during the time of the study. The results imply that teachers have a strong commitment to professional growth. Although none of them have finished their master's degree yet, their academic engagement indicates a high level of qualification and dedication to continuing education.

The same table reveals the level of relevant training: 2 teachers or 66.67% attended regional training, while all of them attended division, district, and school level. The data shows that the majority of parents (36.67%) are within the 30-34-year-old age group. This indicates that most parents are in their mid-30's, a period typically associated with stability in family and career life. The next largest group is those aged 35-39 years old (26.67), followed by 25-29 years old (20.00%), and there were 5 parents (16.67%) who belong to the 40-44 years old age group. There are no respondents who belong to those who are above 45 years old or below 20 years old.

With regards to sex, the majority of the respondents are female parents/guardians (83.33%) while only 16.67% are male. This implies that mothers are more often the primary respondents or are more involved in school-related activities and communications than fathers. As to civil status, all respondents are married, or 100%. This indicates that learners generally come from two-parent households, which means a potentially stable family environment that can support the child's education and active involvement in their child's schooling.

The next table presents the extent of collaboration between parents and teachers in supporting learners' reading progress as perceived by both teachers and parents. The overall mean ratings from both groups indicate that parent-teacher collaboration practices are generally observed "often" to "always".

Table 2
Parent- Teacher Partnership Practices

	Mean Teachers	DER	Rank	Mean Parents	DER	Rank
1. Parents and teachers regularly discuss learners' reading progress.	4.21	Always	9.5	3.45	Often	13
2. Teachers provide feedback to parents regarding strengths and weaknesses in reading.	4.21	Often	9.5	4.21	Always	4.5
3. Parents communicate concerns about their child's reading to teachers.	4.00	Often	15	4.11	Often	11.5
4. Parent-teacher conferences are conducted to address reading difficulties.	4.30	Always	5.5	4.20	Always	10
5. Parents supervise reading assignments given by teachers.	4.20	Often	11.5	4.11	Often	11.5
6. Parents allot specific time at home for reading activities.	3.41	Often	14	3.49	Often	15
7. Parents provide supplementary reading material at home.	3.00	Sometimes	16	2.90	Sometimes	16
8. Parents encourage learners to practice reading aloud.	3.45	Often	12	3.50	Often	14
9. Teachers give home-based reading activities that parents can facilitate.	4.20	Often	11.5	4.00	Often	8.5
10. Teachers provide parents with guidelines on how to assist in reading.	4.25	Always	7.5	4.00	Always	8.5
11. Teachers recommend reading materials suitable for learners' level.	4.30	Always	5.5	4.00	Always	8.5
12. Teachers acknowledge and appreciate parental support in reading.	4.30	Always	5.5	4.00	Always	8.5
13. Parents and teachers organize reading-related programs. (storytelling, book fairs, etc.)	4.40	Always	2	4.21	Always	4.5
14. Parents are invited to participate in classroom reading activities.	4.50	Always	1	4.40	Always	1
15. Parent-teacher collaboration is evident in monitoring reading logs or journals.	4.30	Always	4.5	4.21	Always	4.5
16. Both parents and teachers cooperate in motivating learners to love reading.	4.25	Always	7.5	4.29	Always	2

Note: The Descriptive Ratings (DR) are categorized as follows: A score of 5 (4.21-5.00) corresponds to "Always," a score of 4 (3.31-4.20) corresponds to "Often Observed," a score of 3 (2.61-3.40) corresponds to "Sometimes," a score of 2 (1.81-2.60) corresponds to "Rarely," and a score of 1 (1.00-1.30) corresponds to "Never."

Specifically, both teachers and parents consistently reported high engagement in activities related to reading skills. "Regular discussion on learners' reading progress" obtained mean scores of 4.21 (teachers) and 3.45

(parents), interpreted as "always" and "often" respectively. This would mean that the reading ability of learners is frequently discussed between parents and teachers, reflecting strong collaboration and mutual concern for learners' reading ability. "Teachers provide feedback to parents regarding strengths and weaknesses in reading garnered a mean rating of 4.21 (teachers) and 4.21 (parents), both interpreted as "always". This demonstrates that feedback mechanisms are firmly established and actively practiced. "Parents communicate concerns about their child's reading concerns showed a mean of 4.00 (teachers) and 4.11 (parents), both "often", this shows open line communication regarding learners' challenges in reading.

"Parent-teacher conferences are conducted to address reading difficulties" 4.30 (teachers) and 4.20 (parents), both interpreted as always. "Parents supervise reading assignments given to teachers was rated 4.20 (teachers) and 4.11 (parents), both interpreted as "often"; parents appear actively involved in monitoring learners assigned reading tasks. "Parents allot specific time at home for reading activities" yielded mean scores of 3.81 (teachers) and 3.49 (parents), both interpreted as often. This implies that while home reading encourages consistency among parents varies. "Parents provide supplementary reading materials at home, obtained 3.00 (teachers) and 2.90 (parents), both "sometimes". This reflects occasional parental support through additional resources. "Parents encourage learners to practice reading aloud" 3.45 (teachers) and 3.50 (parents), both described as "often". This implies that reading aloud is a common literacy practice supported by both teachers and parents. "Teachers give home-based reading activities that parents can facilitate" had 4.20 (teachers) and 4.11 (parents), interpreted as "often". This shows teachers' initiative to extend reading beyond the classroom with parental involvement. "Teachers provide guidelines on how to assist in reading" gained 4.25 from teachers and 4.00 from parents, both of whom described it as always. This reflects a strong support structure that helps parents engage effectively in reading instruction at home.

"Teachers recommend reading materials suitable for learners' level, 4.25 rated by the teacher and 4.00 rated by parents, both described as always. This means that both groups recognize the importance of suitable reading materials. "Teachers acknowledge and appreciate parental support in reading 4.30 from teachers and 4.00 from parents, both described as always. This would mean and highlight mutual appreciation in the reading partnership. "Parents and teachers organized reading-related programs" gained a 4.40 rating by teachers and a 4.21 rating by parents. The respondents described it as always, which means that such activities strengthen collaboration and promote literacy culture. "Parents are invited to participate in classroom reading activities, earning 4.50 from teachers and 4.40 from parents. This would mean that teachers were open to participation in their children's activities, along with reading. "Parent-teacher collaboration is evident in monitoring reading logs and journals, 4.30 rated by teachers and 4.21 rated by parents. This implies that joint accountability is in tracking reading development. "Both parents and teachers' cooperation in motivating learners to love reading" was rated 4.25 by teachers and 4.29 by parents, described as "always". This would mean that both groups share a unified goal of nurturing learners for reading.

Table 3

Level of Reading Ability of Learners

Word Recognition	WMV	DER	Rank
1. The learner can recognize and read familiar sight words.	3.40	Sometimes	6.5
2. The learner can read simple cvc words	3.45	Often observed	3.45
3. The learner can identify words using picture clues.	3.42	Often observed	5
4. The learner can distinguish similar-looking words (e.g., "hat-hot")	4.00	Often observed	2
5. The learner applies phonics in reading unfamiliar words.	3.40	Sometimes	6.5
6. The learner can blend letter sounds to form a simple word.	3.47	Often observed	8
7. The learner can separate sounds in words (segmenting).	4.11	Often observed	1
8. The learner notices when a word is read incorrectly.	3.28	Sometimes	9
9. The learner can match spoken words and self-corrects.	3.10	Sometimes	10
10. The learner can decode unfamiliar words.	3.45	Often observed	3.5
	3.51	Often observed	
Fluency			
1. The learner reads aloud with proper pacing.	3.28	Sometimes	10
2. The learner reads with correct pronunciation.	3.40	Sometimes	6.5

3. The learner uses appropriate intonation while reading.	3.39	Sometimes	8.5
4. The learner can read a short passage smoothly without frequent pauses.	3.40	Sometimes	6.5
5. The learner shows confidence when reading in front of others.	3.41	Often observed	3
6. The learner reads at a steady and appropriate pace (not too fast, not too slow)	3.40	Sometimes	6.5
7. The learner can read grade-level passages within the expected time frame.	3.39	Sometimes	8.5
8. The learner reads aloud with correct phrasing.	3.40	Sometimes	6.5
9. The learner uses appropriate intonation that reflects punctuation marks.	3.45	Often observed	2
10. The learner varies tones to show excitement, question, or emphasis in the text.	3.49	Often observed	1
Comprehension			
1. The learner can recall important details from a text.	3.20	Sometimes	8
2. The learner can answer “who, what, where, when” questions about the story.	3.41	Often observed	4
3. The learner can retell a story in sequence.	3.00	Sometimes	10
4. The learner can infer the meaning of unfamiliar words from context.	3.40	Sometimes	5.5
5. The learner can express opinions or feelings about the story read.	3.42	Often observed	3
6. The learner can predict what might happen next in the story.	3.40	Sometimes	5.5
7. The learner can infer the feeling of a character based on actions or words.	4.00	Often observed	1
8. The learner can guess the meaning of unfamiliar words using context clues.	3.30	Sometimes	7
9. The learner can distinguish fact from opinion in simple text.	3.28	Sometimes	9
10. The learner can identify the moral lesson of the story.	3.45	Often observed	2
Total	3.38	Sometimes	
Vocabulary Development			
1. The learner demonstrates understanding of new words learned in reading.	3.45	Often observed	4
2. The learner can match words with correct pictures/objects.	4.00	Often observed	3
3. The learner can use new words in simple sentences.	3.41	Often observed	5
4. The learner can identify opposites (antonyms) and similar words (synonyms).	3.30	Sometimes	9
5. The learner shows improvement in the word bank or reading vocabulary over time.	3.35	Sometimes	8
6. The learner can group words into categories (e.g., animal, colors, fruits)	4.19	Often observed	1
7. The learner uses a variety of words when speaking/writing.	3.35	Sometimes	10
8. The learners apply newly learned words in conversation or written works.	4.12	Often observed	2
9. The learner understands the meaning of common everyday words.	3.40	Sometimes	6
10. The learner learns words quickly.	3.38	Sometimes	7
Total	3.59	Often observed	

Notes. The Descriptive Ratings (DR) are categorized as follows: A score of 5 (4.21-5.00) corresponds to "Always," a score of 4 (3.41-4.20) corresponds to "Often Observed," a score of 3 (2.61-3.40) corresponds to "Sometimes," a score of 2 (1.81-2.60) corresponds to "Rarely," and a score of 1 (1.00-1.80) corresponds to "Never."

The table presents the assessment of learners’ ability, focusing on four components: word recognition, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary development. The weighted mean and descriptive ratings were used to determine the frequency of learners’ performance for each indicator. Table 2 shows the reading ability of learners with respect to word recognition. The computed weighted mean ranges from 2.61 to 3.40, which corresponds to the descriptive ratings of “sometimes”. The result reveals that learners are generally able to “recognize and read familiar sight words” 3.40, “the learner applies phonics in reading unfamiliar words” 3.40, “the learner notices when a word is read incorrectly” 3.28, and “the learner can decode unfamiliar words” 3.45. The findings imply that learners still face challenges in reading, along with word recognition.

The highest mean value, 4.11, described as often was obtained in the indicator “the learner can separate sounds in words (segmenting)” signifying that most learners demonstrate phonemic awareness and are able to break down words into smaller sound units. Followed by “the learner can distinguish similar looking words (ex. Hot-hat) 4.00, the learner can read simple cvc words 3.45, the learner can identify words using picture clues 3.42, the learner can decode unfamiliar words 3.45. These would imply that learners demonstrate a developing ability in word recognition, showing consistent performance in recognizing, decoding, and differentiating familiar and unfamiliar words. However, there remains a need to strengthen their phonological awareness and self-monitoring strategies to enhance reading accuracy.

In terms of reading fluency, the table reveals that the weighted mean value range 3.28 to 3.49, with corresponding descriptive ratings of “sometimes” and “often”. The indicator with the highest mean value of 3.49

was "the learner varies tone to show excitement, question, or emphasis in the text. The learner uses appropriate intonation that reflects punctuation marks 3.45, and the learner shows confidence when reading in front of others. This indicates that learners are generally confident and able to maintain proper phrasing while reading aloud, reflecting a positive attitude toward oral reading. A closer looked in the table reveals that the lowest mean score of 3.28, described as sometimes, was found in the indicator "the learners read aloud with proper pacing". This means that learners occasionally struggle to maintain appropriate pacing while reading, which affects fluency. The data obtained implies that the learners' reading fluency is emerging but not yet fully developed. They often demonstrate correct pronunciation and expression, but sometimes lack consistency in pacing and intonation.

Along comprehension indicators, the highest mean score (4.00) was "the learner can explain the feelings of a character based on the story," which was rated as "often." This implies that learners are generally capable of understanding emotional aspects and character motivation when listening to or reading stories. Similarly high mean scores were noted "the learner can express opinion or feelings about the story read 3.42, "the learner can answer who, what, where, when questions about the story" and "the learner can identify the moral lesson of the story" described as "often", these findings suggest that the learners are actively engaged in understanding key details and forming personal interpretations of the text. However, the lowest mean score (3.00) which falls under "sometimes" was obtained for the indicator "the learner can retell a story in sequence, this imply that some learners struggle to recall and organize story events in proper order, similarly indicators such as the learner can recall important details from a text 3.20, the learner can infer the meaning of unfamiliar words from context 3.40, the learner can predict what might happen next 3.40, the learner can guess the meaning of unfamiliar words using context clues 3.30 and the learner can distinguish fact from opinion in simple text 3.28. These findings show that inferential and predictive comprehension skills are areas where learners still need improvement.

The same table reveals the learner's performance in vocabulary development when it has a weighted mean value ranging from 3.30 to 4.19, corresponding to the descriptive ratings "sometimes" and "often". The highest mean score of 4.19 was obtained for "the learner can group words into categories (e.g., animals, colors, fruits). It implies that learners frequently display the ability to classify and organize vocabulary according to meaning and category. Similarly, learners "apply newly learned words in conversations" (4.12), "the learner can match words with correct pictures/objects" (4.00), and the learner can use new words in simple sentences" (3.41). However, some indicators received lower mean ratings such as "the learner understand the meaning of common everyday words" (3.40), "the learner learns words quickly" (3.38), "the learner use variety of words when speaking/writing" (3.35), "the learner shows improvement in word bank or reading vocabulary over time" (3.35) and "the learner can identify opposites (antonyms) and similar words (synonyms) (3.35). This implies that while learners are able to recognize and use words in isolation, their ability to expand vocabulary and apply it in various contexts still requires reinforcement.

2.1 Challenges of Parent-Teacher Collaboration Towards Enhancing Reading Abilities of Key Stage 1 Learners

The table presents summary results from teachers and parents regarding the challenges they experience in collaborating to enhance the reading abilities of key stage 1 learners. The findings are organized according to the specific statements about challenges of parents/teachers' collaboration. Both teachers and parents generally agreed that there is a lack of regular communication between parents and teachers regarding learners' reading progress, with a rating of 3.45 and 3.25, respectively. Limited access to communication platforms (e.g., mobile phones, internet) hinders collaboration, which was also recognized as a prevalent challenge with a rating of 3.30 and 3.40 described as neutral. The same table reveals that misunderstandings occur due to unclear communication about learners' reading needs, with a rating of 3.40 and 3.20 described as neutral. Moreover, parents have limited knowledge of effective reading strategies to support their children, and learners who show low motivation or interest in reading activities at home were both described as neutral.

The following indicators receive a rating between 3.30 and 4.20 as perceived by both teachers and parents. Training opportunities for teachers in strengthening parent collaboration on reading are limited, Parents find it

difficult to balance home responsibilities with supporting their child's reading development, Time constraints prevent effective communication between parents and teachers, Some parents are unable to attend school activities related in reading due to work or personal responsibilities, Parents find it difficult to balance home responsibilities with supporting their child reading development, Learners are distracted by gadgets or other non- academic activities affecting reading practice and Some learners need more intensive support than what parents and teachers can provide together. These indicators are described as agree. Finally, only one received a rating of 2.60 and 2.50, respectively, described as disagree, and that teachers lack sufficient resources to sustain effective home-school reading collaboration.

The findings indicate that both teachers and parents acknowledge several significant barriers to effective collaboration in supporting key stage 1 learners' reading ability. The consistent agreement across both groups suggests that communication gaps, scheduling conflicts, and resource limitations are widespread and mutually recognized. These findings highlight the need for targeted interventions to improve information sharing, scheduling flexibility, parental engagement, and technology support to strengthen collaboration efforts in education. The parallel findings between teachers and parents highlight a shared recognition of the seriousness of the challenges. Suggesting that the difficulties in collaboration are one-sided but systemic in nature. The high number of indicators rated as highly challenging by both groups implies a gap in communication, coordination, and mutual understanding of roles in supporting learners' reading development. The overall data underscore the need for a structured and sustainable parent-teacher partnership program, such as regular reading orientations, clear communication channels, and capacity-building initiatives for parents. Strengthening collaboration is essential to ensure consistent support for learners' reading abilities both at school and at home.

Table 4

Challenges in Parent-Teacher Collaboration Towards Enhancing Reading Abilities of Key Stage 1 Learners

Items	Teachers		Parents	
1. There is a lack of regular communication between parents and teachers regarding learners' reading progress.	3.45	HC	3.25	MC
2. Limited access to communication platforms (e.g., mobile phones, internet) hinders collaboration.	3.30	MC	3.40	MC
3. Misunderstandings occur due to unclear communication about learners' reading needs.	3.40	MC	3.20	MC
4. Time constraints prevent effective communication between parents and teachers.	4.20	HC	4.00	HC
5. Some parents are unable to attend school activities related to reading due to work or personal responsibilities.	3.41	HC	4.00	HC
6. Parents lack confidence in guiding their children's reading at home.	3.40	MC	4.11	HC
7. Parents have limited knowledge of effective reading strategies to support their children.	3.32	MC	3.40	MC
8. Parents find it difficult to balance home responsibilities with supporting their child's reading development.	3.50	HC	3.50	HC
9. Teachers have limited time to provide individualized guidance to parents regarding reading support.	3.59	HC	4.00	HC
10. Teachers lack sufficient resources to sustain effective home-school reading collaboration.	2.60	LC	2.50	LC
11. Training opportunities for teachers in strengthening parent collaboration on reading are limited.	3.30	MC	3.41	HC
12. Learners show low motivation or interest in reading activities at home.	3.45	HC	3.40	MC
13. Learners are distracted by gadgets or other non- academic activities, affecting reading practice.	4.20	HC	4.15	HC
14. Some learners need more intensive support than what parents and teachers can provide together.	3.47	HC	4.11	HC

Notes: 4.1-5.00-very high challenge, 3.41-4.20- highly challenge, 2.61-3.40-moderately challenge, 1.81-2.60-low challenge, 1.oo-1.80- very low challenge.

3. Conclusions

In relation to the above-cited findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

- Learners' reading abilities are still below the expected level, which affects their performance.
- Teachers and Parents display collaboration for the improvement of the reading ability of the learners.
- Some of the indicators, along with the reading ability of the learners in key stage 1, need to be enhanced.
- The proposed teachers- parents partnership reading program is timely for the key stage 1 learners to enhance their reading ability.

Recommendations - Based on the conclusions drawn, the following are recommended:

- Teachers should establish structured teacher–parent partnership programs that involve regular communication and collaboration. Activities such as parent-teacher conferences, reading workshops, and home-based reading guidance should be conducted regularly to ensure that parents are well-informed and equipped to support their children's reading development.
- The school should organize orientation sessions and training programs for parents to teach them effective reading strategies that can be applied at home.
- Parents are encouraged to create a reading-friendly environment at home by setting a daily reading schedule. Parents should also be reminded to monitor their children's reading progress and provide positive feedback to build their confidence.
- Teachers should be provided with continuous professional development opportunities focused on early reading instruction and strategies. Reading programs in differentiated instruction and assessment tools will enable teachers to better address the reading needs of learners.
- The parents-teachers partnership reading program for key stage 1 learners of Caagraoan, San Juan district, Division of La Union. must be implemented.
- A study to determine the effectiveness of the partnership reading program must be undertaken.
- A parallel study with a different local or at the elementary level must be undertaken.

4. References

Akyol, H. (2015). *Türkçe İlk Okuma Yazma Öğretimi*. Pegem Akademi.

Akyol, H., & Çakıroğlu, A. (2007). *Okuduğunu anlama ve geliştirme stratejileri*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Akyol, H., & Ketenoğlu Kayabaşı, Z. (2018). Improving the reading skills of a student with reading difficulties: An action research. *Education and Science*, 43(193), 143–158. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2018.7240

Akyol, H., & Sural, Ü. Ç. (2020). Developing reading, reading comprehension and motivation: An action research study. *Education and Science*, 46(205), 69–92. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2020.8977

Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In K. W. Spence & J. T. Spence (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 2, pp. 89–195). Academic Press.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Department of Education (DepEd). (2023). DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2023: Adoption of the National Learning Recovery Program. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/03/08/do-013-s-2023

Ergül, C., Bahap, Z., Ökcün Akçamuş, M., Akoğlu, G., Demir, E., & Tülü, B. K. (2022). Double-Deficit Hypothesis and reading difficulties: A longitudinal analysis of reading and reading comprehension performance of groups formed according to this hypothesis. *Education and Science*, 48(213), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2022.11002

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed.). Pearson.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Gedik, O., & Akyol, H. (2022). Reading difficulty and development of fluent reading skills: An action research. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 18(1), 22–41. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2022.426.2

Guzmán, J., & Zambrano, N. (forthcoming). Split-attention effect and collaborative learning in multimedia environments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*.

Hiebert, E. H., & Morris, A. K. (2012). Principles of effective reading instruction: Research-based models. *Journal Title*.

Hurlbut, A. R., Young, J., Boggs, C., & Young, J. (2023). Response to Intervention in Reading: A literature review and critical synthesis. *International Journal of Literacy, Culture, and Language Education*, 4, 64–81.

Joyce, B., & Cartwright, N. (2020). Translating literacy research into classroom practice: Challenges and strategies. *Educational Researcher*, 49(8), 1037–1047.

Knight, E. J., Galletly, S., Morris, A., & Gargett, L. (2018). Balancing decoding and language development in first-year reading instruction. *Literacy Journal*.

Knight, E. J., & Galletly, S. (2020). Teacher expertise in interpreting research-based reading models for diverse learners. *Reading Research Quarterly*.

McGuinness, D., et al. (2014). Emotionally supportive environments and literacy outcomes in primary classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.

Piaget, J. (1976). *Piaget's theory* (P. Mussen, Ed.). Prentice Hall.

Rasinski, T. V. (1999). The fluent reader: Oral reading strategies for building word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. Scholastic Professional Books.

Samuels, S. J. (1997). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, 50(5), 376–381.

Schroeder, N. L., & Cenkci, A. T. (2021). Analysing the relationship between mental load or mental effort with academic success. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 648319. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.648319

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Stanovich, K. E. (2005). The future of a mistake: Will discrepancy be eliminated? *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 28(2), 103–106.

Turna, G., & Güldenoglu, B. N. (2019). Öğrencilerin okuma hızlarının gelişimi üzerine bir çalışma. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 15(1), 57–72.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Young, C., & Rasinski, T. (2009). Implementing readers theatre as an approach to classroom fluency instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(1), 4–13.