



Pupils' Reading Proficiency Level using Scholastic Literacy Pro

Ron Clark S. Oposa¹, Reymon R. Dumale², April Joy D. Lupian³, Michelle M. Navarro⁴,
Verina B. Olojan⁵, Alcher J. Arpilleda⁶

^{1,2,3,5} Grade School Faculty, St. Paul University Surigao, Surigao City, Philippines

⁴ English Subject Tea, Leader, St. Paul University Surigao, Surigao City, Philippines

⁶ Junior High School Faculty, St. Paul University Surigao, Surigao City, Philippines

¹ ORCID: 0000-0003-4564-8196, ² ORCID: 0000-0003-1159-8936, ³ ORCID: 0000-0003-1686-8675

⁴ ORCID: 0000-0003-4620-9072, ⁵ ORCID: 0000-0003-3054-217X, ⁶ ORCID: 0000-0001-9638-5459

ABSTRACT: This study assessed the reading proficiency levels of Grade 1 students at St. Paul University Surigao using Scholastic Literacy Pro. The study employed a one-group pretest-posttest design to assess the impact of using Scholastic Literacy Pro, a program designed to support independent reading and provide teachers with data to personalize instruction. The researchers conducted pre-and post-tests to measure the student's progress in reading proficiency, categorizing their scores into advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic levels. Results showed that proficiency levels were predominantly below basic, with only a small percentage reaching basic, proficient, or advanced levels. No significant differences were found when grouping by section, sex, previous school attended, or school type. However, a significant difference was found between pre-and post-test scores, indicating the instructional reading intervention had a positive impact. To further improve reading proficiency, the study recommends targeted instructional strategies addressing specific learning needs, ongoing teacher professional development on effective methodologies and progress monitoring, and enhancing teachers' knowledge and skills to cater to diverse learner needs. By implementing these recommendations, the school can continue to raise reading proficiency levels among Grade 1 students.

KEYWORDS: one-group pretest-posttest design, Proficiency level, Philippines, Peading, Scholastic Literacy Pro.

INTRODUCTION

Reading proficiency is a critical skill that lays the foundation for academic success. However, many students struggle with reading, particularly in the early grades. A study in the Philippines found that most Grade 1 students belonged to the frustration level of reading proficiency in silent reading while they were at the instructional level for oral reading (Cabardo, 2015). Another study revealed that male students were less proficient in reading than females in silent and oral reading. Imus and Resultay (2019) found that exposing Grade 1 learners to text-to-speech software improved their word recognition and comprehension, with their reading proficiency levels advancing to the instructional and independent levels.

The Philippines, while having a lower average score in reading in 2022 (347) compared to 2018 (353), ranked higher, moving up four spots to 75th, as it scored a 6.9 percentage point hike in reading. The country was previously ranked the second lowest during the 2018 edition of PISA (SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2023). In addition, based on results of the Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metrics 2019 (SEA-PLM), only 10 percent of students in the Philippines met the minimum reading standard, and 17 percent met the minimum mathematical standard expected at the end of primary education, as provided in SDG 4.1.1—Education Proficiency (Dela Peña, 2023).

St. Paul University Surigao uses Scholastic Literacy Pro to give students access to a wide range of high-interest, levelled ebooks. The program is designed to support independent reading and provide teachers with actionable data to personalize instruction (Scholastic Research & Validation, 2021). Studies have shown that independent reading is a powerful tool for improving comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and background knowledge. When students have access to books that match their reading level and interests, they are more likely to engage in reading and make progress.

With these insights, the researchers conduct this study to assess the reading proficiency level of Grade 1 of St. Paul University Surigao using Scholastic Literacy Pro. The pupils will be given pre-and post-tests to measure their progress in reading. Specifically, it aims to identify the respondents' profiles, determine the pupils' reading proficiency levels in the pre-and post-tests, and determine test



differences in the levels when grouped according to profile variables and test differences in the pre-and post-tests. The results of this study will be the basis for future reading programs to be implemented.

METHODS

The study employed a one-group pretest-posttest design, a type of quasi-experiment. In this design, a single case is observed at two-time points, one before and one after the treatment. Changes in the outcome of interest are presumed to be the result of the intervention or treatment. No control or comparison group is employed (Child Care and Early Education Research Connections, n.d.). In this study, the two-time points are the pre- and post-tests, while the reading materials served as the treatment.

This study was conducted on Grade 1 students at St. Paul University Surigao during the School Year 2023-2024, during which they were given pre- and post-tests using Scholastic Literacy Pro. Their scores were then categorized into *advanced* (reading above grade level), *proficient* (reading on grade level), *basic* (reading below grade level), and *below basic* (reading below grade level). Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution, mean and standard deviation, independent samples t-test and paired t-test were used in analyzing the data gathered.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Profile of the Students

Table I. Profile of the Students

Profile	f (n=39)	%
Section		
Science Section	19	48.72
Regular Section	20	51.28
Sex		
Boys	23	58.97
Girls	16	41.03
Previous School		
Paulinian	14	35.90
Non-Paulinian	25	64.10
Previous School Type		
Public	5	12.82
Private	34	87.18

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents in terms of *section*, *sex*, *previous school*, and *previous school type*. As presented, there are 19 (48.72%) from the science section and 20 (51.28%) from the regular section. As to the *sex*, 23 (58.97%) are boys, while 26 (41.03%) are girls. As to the *previous school attended*, 25 (64.10%) came from a non-Paulinian school, while 14 (35.90%) had their kindergarten at St. Paul University Surigao. Regarding the *previous school type*, 34 (87.18%) are from private schools, while 5 (12.82%) are from public schools.

B. Proficiency Levels of the Students

Table II. Pre-Test and Post-Test Proficiency Levels of the Grade 1 Pupils

Proficiency Levels	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
	f (n=39)	%	f (n=39)	%
Below Basic	28	71.79	24	61.54
Basic	5	12.82	6	15.38
Proficient	5	12.82	6	15.38
Advanced	1	2.56	3	7.69



Table II shows the Pre-test and Post-test proficiency levels of the Grade 1 pupils. As for the Pre-test, 28 (71.79%) are *below basic*, 5 (12.82%) are *basic* and *proficient*, and 1 (2.56%) is on the *advanced* level. As for the Post-test, 224 (61.54%) are *below basic*, 6 (15.38%) are *basic* and *proficient*, and 3 (7.69%) are on the *advanced* level.

The data suggests that most pupils, 71.79% on the pre-test and 61.54% on the post-test, are below basic in their reading proficiency. This indicates that the pupils have a significant gap in their reading skills, which needs to be addressed.

The literature supports that early reading skills are crucial for future academic success. Research by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000) emphasizes the importance of early reading skills, stating that children who struggle with reading in the early years are more likely to fall behind in school and experience long-term academic difficulties. Similarly, Langenberg (2000) highlights the significance of phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency in reading development, which are essential skills for pupils to master in the early years.

The data also shows that a smaller proportion of pupils, 12.82% in the pre-test and 15.38% in the post-test, are basic and proficient in their reading skills. This indicates that some pupils have a stronger foundation in reading, which can be built upon. Langenberg (2000) suggests that pupils who are basic and proficient in reading are more likely to continue to improve their skills over time.

Lastly, the data indicates that only 2.56% of pupils in the pre-test and 7.69% in the post-test are on the advanced level. This suggests that there is still a significant gap in reading proficiency levels among the pupils, and more targeted interventions may be necessary to support these pupils.

C. Differences in the Proficiency Level when grouped according to Profile

Table III. Difference in the Pre-test when grouped according to Profile

Profile	M	SD	t	P-value	Interpretation
Section					
Science Section	1.53	0.90	0.47	0.638	Not significant
Regular Section	1.40	0.75			
Sex					
Boys	1.26	0.54	-1.89	0.067	Not significant
Girls	1.75	1.06			
Previous School					
Paulinian	1.57	0.85	0.62	0.539	Not significant
Non-Paulinian	1.40	0.82			
Previous School Type					
Public	1.00	0.00	-1.36	0.182	Not significant
Private	1.53	0.86			

Significant at $p < 0.05$

Table III reveals no significant difference in the Pre-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *sections* (t-value=0.47, p-value=0.638). This suggests that the pupils from different sections had similar reading proficiency levels before the intervention. This result is consistent with the idea that students within the same grade level are expected to have similar reading abilities (Sands, 2017). This also implies that students in the same grade should have similar reading proficiency levels.

It can also be gleaned from the table that there is no significant difference in the Pre-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *sex* (t-value=-1.89, p-value=0.067). This suggests that boys and girls had similar reading proficiency levels before the intervention. This result is supported by the study of Cabardo (2015) on the reading proficiency levels of Year 1 to Year 3 students in HNHS-Aplaya Extension High School, which found no significant difference in reading proficiency levels between males and



females in both silent and oral reading. This suggests that gender does not significantly impact reading proficiency levels in the early years of education.

Findings also revealed no significant difference in the Pre-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *the previous school attended* (t-value=0.62, p-value=0.539). This suggests that students from different schools had similar reading proficiency levels before the intervention. This result is consistent with Sands's (2017) idea that students from different schools should have similar reading abilities based on their grade level.

Lastly, it is also presented that there is no significant difference in the Pre-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *previous school type* (t-value=-1.36, p-value=0.182). This suggests that students from different types of schools (e.g., public, private, or charter) have similar reading proficiency levels before the intervention. This result is consistent with the idea that students from different types of schools should have similar reading abilities based on their grade level (Sands, 2017).

Table IV. Difference in the Post-Test when grouped according to Profile

Profile	M	SD	t	P-value	Interpretation
Section					
Science Section	1.74	0.99	0.27	0.791	Not significant
Regular Section	1.65	1.04			
Sex					
Boys	1.52	0.85	-1.28	0.208	Not significant
Girls	1.94	1.18			
Previous School					
Paulinian	1.93	1.14	1.10	0.277	Not significant
Non-Paulinian	1.56	0.92			
Previous School Type					
Public	1.00	0.00	-1.69	0.099	Not significant
Private	1.79	1.04			

Significant at $p < 0.05$

As presented in Table IV, there is no significant difference in the post-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *sections* (t-value=0.27, p-value=0.791). This suggests that the pupils from different sections have similar reading proficiency levels after the intervention. This result is consistent with the findings from the pre-test, which also showed no significant difference in proficiency levels by section. This indicates that the intervention was equally effective for pupils across different sections and that factors such as teaching methods and classroom dynamics did not significantly impact the outcomes.

A study by Slavin et al. (2011) on the effectiveness of reading interventions found that when implemented consistently across classrooms, the interventions can lead to similar improvements in reading proficiency levels, regardless of the specific section or teacher. This supports the idea that the intervention in this study was effective in improving reading proficiency levels consistently across different sections.

The table also shows no significant difference in the post-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *sex* (t-value=-1.28, p-value=0.208). This suggests that the intervention was equally effective for both boys and girls. This result is consistent with the pre-test findings, which also showed no significant difference in proficiency levels by sex.

This finding is supported by a study by Paul and Jefferson (2019), which found that while there are some gender differences in reading achievement, these differences are often small and can be mitigated by effective instructional practices. The authors suggest that providing targeted support and interventions can help close the gap between boys and girls in reading proficiency.



Findings also revealed no significant difference in the post-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to the *previous school attended* (t -value=1.10, p -value=0.277). This suggests that the intervention was equally effective for pupils regardless of their previous educational background. This result is consistent with the pre-test findings, which also showed no significant difference in proficiency levels by previous school attended.

This finding is supported by a study by Reardon et al. (2019), which found that while there can be differences in academic achievement based on a student's previous school, these differences can be reduced through targeted interventions and support. The authors suggest that effective teaching practices and focusing on individual student needs can help mitigate the impact of a student's previous educational experiences.

Lastly, it is also presented that there is no significant difference in the post-test proficiency level of the pupils when grouped according to *previous school type* (t -value=-1.69, p -value=0.099). This suggests that the intervention was equally effective for pupils regardless of whether they attended a public, private, or charter school previously. This result is consistent with the pre-test findings, which also showed no significant difference in proficiency levels by previous school type.

This finding is supported by a study by Cabardo (2015b), which found that while there can be differences in academic achievement based on a student's previous school type, these differences are often small and can be reduced through effective teaching practices and targeted interventions.

D. Difference in the Pre-Test and Post-Test

Table V. Difference in the Pre-test and Posttest

Tests	M	SD	t	p-value	Interpretation
Pre-Test	1.46	39.00	-2.97	0.005	Significant
Post-Test	1.69	39.00			

Table V reveals a significant difference in the pre-and Post-test proficiency levels of the Grade 1 pupils (t -value=-2.97, p -value=0.005). As presented, the mean of the levels in the post-test ($M=1.69$) is significantly higher than the levels in the pre-test ($M=1.46$). This suggests that the pupils' reading proficiency levels have improved significantly after the intervention. The difference in the mean indicates a substantial improvement in reading proficiency.

This result is consistent with the study by Shivaraju et al. (2017), which found that the pre-and post-test method introduced to improve learning ability and knowledge received a positive response from students, resulting in a significant improvement in post-instructional knowledge compared to pre-test levels. Similarly, Reardon et al. (2019) found that targeted interventions can significantly improve reading proficiency levels, especially among students who were initially below average. The significant difference in pre- and post-test proficiency levels also supports the idea that pre- and post-testing can be an effective tool for assessing the impact of interventions. As emphasized by Brophy (n.d.), pre-and post-testing can yield valuable data for teacher use, enabling them to determine the degree to which students have learned the content or skill area of interest. This is particularly important in early education, where early reading skills are crucial for future academic success. This is also true because, in a related study conducted by Arpilleda (2021), the intervention improved learner performance and addressed least-mastered competencies.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings gathered it was concluded that the Grade 1 pupils' proficiency levels in the pre-test and post-test were predominantly below basic, with only a small percentage reaching the basic, proficient, and advanced levels. The analysis also showed no significant differences in the pre-test and post-test proficiency levels when the pupils were grouped according to sections, sex, previous school attended, and previous school type. However, the study found a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test proficiency levels, indicating that the instructional reading intervention positively impacted the pupils' overall performance.

Thus, it is recommended that teachers implement targeted instructional strategies that address the specific learning needs of these students. The school may also provide ongoing professional development opportunities. This could include training on effective



teaching methodologies, strategies for addressing learning gaps, and techniques for assessing and monitoring student progress. By enhancing the teachers' knowledge and skills, they can better cater to the diverse learning needs of the pupils and implement more effective instructional practices to improve the reading proficiency levels of the pupils.

REFERENCES

1. Arpilleda, A. J. (2021). Strategic intervention material: A tool in enhancing grade nine students' mathematical performance. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 10(5). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2021.5051>
2. Brophy (n.d.). Module 5b: *Pre- and Post-testing for Student Learning*. Assessment, University of Florida.
3. Cabardo, J. R. (2015). Reading Proficiency Level of Students: Basis for Reading Intervention Program. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2712237>
4. Child Care and Early Education Research Connections. (n.d.). *Pre-Experimental Designs | Research Connections*. <https://researchconnections.org/research-tools/study-design-and-analysis/pre-experimental-designs>
5. Imus, J. K. R., & Resultay, R. G. (2019, December 25). *Reading proficiency level of Grade 1 pupils using Text-to-Speech*. <https://www.paressu.org/online/index.php/aseanmrj/article/view/239>
6. Langenberg, D.N. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*.
7. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read*. <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/>. <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/smallbook>
8. Paul, J., & Jefferson, F. (2019). A Comparative Analysis of Student Performance in an Online vs. Face-to-Face Environmental Science Course From 2009 to 2016. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2019.00007>
9. Reardon, S. F., Kalogrides, D., & Shores, K. (2019). The geography of racial/ethnic test score gaps. *American Journal of Sociology*, 124(4), 1164-1221.
10. Sands, B. (2017, April 29). *DRA Reading Assessment Levels*. Study.com. <https://study.com/academy/popular/dra-reading-assessment-levels.html>
11. Scholastic Research & Validation. (2021). *Scholastic Literacy Pro research foundation*. New York: Scholastic.
12. SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2023, December 19). *INNOTECH notes progress on the country's PISA 2022 results*. <https://www.seameo-innotech.org/innotech-progress-pisa-2022/#:~:text=Philippines%2C%20while%20having%20a%20lower,the%202018%20edition%20of%20PISA>.
13. Shivaraju, P. T., Manu, G., Vinaya, M., & Savkar, M. K. (2017). Evaluating the effectiveness of pre-and post-test model of learning in a medical school. *National Journal of Physiology, Pharmacy and Pharmacology*, 7(9), 947.
14. Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (2011). Effective programs for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis. *Educational Research Review*, 6(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.07.002>

Cite this Article: Ron Clark S. Oposa, Reymon R. Dumale, April Joy D. Lupian, Michelle M. Navarro, Verina B. Olojan, Alcher J. Arpilleda (2025). Pupils' Reading Proficiency Level using Scholastic Literacy Pro. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 8(3), pp. 1085-1090. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i3-11>