

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - II (March – April) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



LEVEL OF LEXICAL PROFICIENCY AND FUNCTIONAL COMPOSITION WRITING PERFORMANCE OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEARNERS: BASIS FOR AN INSTRUCTIONAL REMEDIAL PLAN

Harris Padron Campo

Cagayan State University – Aparri Campus Graduate School

| **Received:** 04.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 08.04.2026 | **Published:** 19.04.2026

*Corresponding author: Harris Padron Campo

Abstract

Language proficiency is essential for learners' academic and professional success, particularly in English, the primary medium of instruction in the Philippines. However, many Senior High School learners struggle to apply vocabulary effectively in writing, especially in technical-vocational tracks. Despite existing literacy studies, limited localized research examines how lexical proficiency influences writing performance in these contexts. This study addressed this gap by assessing the lexical proficiency of Grade 12 learners specializing in Electronic Products Assembly and Servicing (EPAS) and its relationship with their functional composition writing in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP).

Using a descriptive-analytical design, data from 40 respondents were gathered through a validated researcher-made instrument and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings revealed that learners had adequate basic vocabulary skills but limited higher-order lexical processing. While they could use words functionally, they struggled with contextual understanding and applying vocabulary in writing. Their writing showed partial competence, with organized ideas but weaknesses in grammar and lexical variation.

Results confirmed that lexical proficiency significantly influences writing performance, particularly in coherence, task completion, and lexical use, though not in grammatical accuracy. The study concludes that the issue lies in limited depth and application of vocabulary, emphasizing the need for integrated instruction linking vocabulary, comprehension, and writing to improve learners' proficiency.

Keywords: lexical proficiency, writing performance, vocabulary, EAPP, senior high school learners

INTRODUCTION

Language proficiency is essential for academic and professional success, particularly in the Philippines, where English is the primary medium of instruction. A key aspect of this proficiency is lexical competence, which involves not only knowing words but using them accurately and contextually, especially in writing. In subjects like English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP), vocabulary knowledge significantly influences clarity, coherence, and overall writing quality. However, studies and reports, such as the 2022 National Achievement Test (NAT) and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), show that Filipino learners continue to struggle with vocabulary and writing. Research by Perfetti and Stafura (2021), Nation (2020), and Crossley (2022) highlights that depth of lexical knowledge strongly predicts writing performance. Theories such as Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Cummins' Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) emphasize the importance of guided learning, interaction, and sustained exposure in developing academic language. Despite these findings, few localized studies examine how lexical proficiency affects functional composition writing among Senior High School learners, particularly in technical-vocational tracks in rural areas.

In response to this gap, the study assessed the lexical proficiency of Grade 12 learners specializing in Electronic Products Assembly and Servicing (EPAS) at Licerio Antiporda Sr. National High School – Sta. Isabel Extension, Buguey North District, for School Year 2025–2026 and determined its correlation with functional composition writing performance in EAPP.

More specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of the following variables?
 - 1.1 Personal Profile
 - a. Sex
 - b. Age
 - c. Average English grade in the previous quarter
 - d. Primary language spoken at home
 - e. Parents' Highest Educational Attainment.
 - 1.2 Technological Profile
 - a. Availability of reading materials
 - b. Access to electronic devices and internet connectivity
2. What is the lexical proficiency level of the Grade 12 EPAS learners in terms of the following:
 - a. Word Recognition
 - b. Word Usage
 - c. Contextual Understanding
3. What is the functional composition writing performance of the Grade 12 EPAS learners in terms of the following:
 - a. Coherence and Unity
 - b. Grammar and Mechanics
 - c. Lexical Richness
4. Is there a significant difference in learners' lexical proficiency and functional composition writing performance when grouped according to their profile variables?
5. Is there a significant relationship between lexical proficiency level and functional composition writing performance?

6. What instructional remedial plan can be derived from the findings of the study?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive–analytical design to examine the lexical proficiency of Grade 12 EPAS learners and its relationship to their functional composition writing performance in EAPP. Descriptive analysis presented data on learner profiles, lexical proficiency (word recognition, usage, contextual understanding), and writing performance (coherence, grammar, lexical richness). Analytical procedures explored patterns, differences, and associations, considering variables such as sex, age, English grades, primary language, reading materials, device access, and parents' education. This design allowed examination of naturally occurring data without manipulation, providing insights for instructional planning and remedial interventions to enhance learners' vocabulary and writing skills.

Participants/Respondents

The respondents were Grade 12 EPAS learners at Licerio Antiporda Sr. National High School – Sta. Isabel Extension, Buguey North District, School Year 2025–2026, chosen for their enrollment in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP), which directly develops the lexical proficiency and functional composition writing skills examined in this study.

Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-made instrument, “Lexical Proficiency and Functional Composition Writing Performance of Grade 12 EPAS Learners,” to gather quantitative data on learner profiles, lexical proficiency, and writing performance. It consisted of four parts: (1) personal and technological profiles—sex, age, English grade, primary language, parents' education, reading materials, and device/internet access; (2) a Lexical Proficiency Test with multiple-choice items on word recognition, usage, and contextual understanding; (3) a Comprehension Task assessing vocabulary, meaning, and idea interpretation from an EPAS-related passage; and (4) a Functional Composition Writing Task, where learners wrote a paragraph on an EPAS workplace scenario, evaluated for coherence, grammar, and lexical richness using a five-point rubric. All parts underwent expert validation and a pilot test with similar learners, with reliability measured using KR-20 for the lexical test and Cronbach's Alpha for the writing rubric, adopting 0.70 or higher as acceptable.

Data Gathering Procedure

The study followed a structured, ethical, and systematic data collection process. After securing approvals from university, Department of Education, and school authorities, the researcher coordinated with the school head and EAPP teacher to schedule the activity and orient Grade 12 EPAS learners, ensuring voluntary participation, confidentiality, and informed consent. Data were gathered using a researcher-made profile questionnaire on learners' personal and technological backgrounds, a Lexical Proficiency Test assessing word recognition and usage, a comprehension task measuring vocabulary and contextual understanding, and a Functional Composition Writing Task evaluated through an analytic rubric focusing on coherence, grammar, and lexical richness.

Data Analysis

The data collected through the researcher-made instruments were encoded, organized, and analyzed using SPSS, applying both descriptive and inferential statistics. Respondents' profiles—sex, age, average English grade, primary language, parents' education, reading materials, and device/internet access—were examined using frequency counts and percentages. Lexical proficiency was analyzed through frequency distributions, percentages, mean, and standard deviation across word recognition, word usage, and contextual understanding, while functional composition writing performance was assessed via mean scores from the analytic rubric on coherence and unity, grammar and mechanics, and lexical richness. Significant differences in lexical proficiency and writing performance across profile variables were determined using independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA, with post hoc tests where applicable. The relationship between lexical proficiency and writing performance was evaluated using Pearson's *r* at a 0.05 significance level. Findings were presented in tabular and narrative forms to ensure clarity, accuracy, and meaningful interpretation in addressing the study's research questions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1a. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their personal profile

Variables	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Sex		
Male	19	47.5
Female	21	52.5
Age (in years)		
16 or below	2	5.0
17 to 18	37	92.5
19 or above	1	2.5
	<i>Mean= 17.40</i> <i>y/o</i>	<i>SD= 0.81</i>
Grade in English		
80 to 84	9	22.5
85 to 89	19	47.5
90 or above	12	30.0
	<i>Mean= 87.38</i>	<i>SD= 3.65</i>
Primary language spoken at home		
Ilocano	37	92.5
Filipino	3	7.5
Father's educational attainment		
Elementary level	7	17.5

Elementary graduate	9	22.5
High school level	7	17.5
High school graduate	10	25.0
Vocational	1	2.5
College level	4	10.0
College graduate	0	-
Advanced education	2	5.0
Mother's educational attainment		
Elementary level	12	30.0
Elementary graduate	4	10.0
High school level	5	12.5
High school graduate	14	35.0
Vocational	1	2.5
College level	1	2.5
College graduate	2	5.0
Advanced education	1	2.5

Table 1a presents the distribution of the respondents in terms of their personal profile, including sex, age, average English grade, primary language spoken at home, and parents' highest educational attainment.

The finding shows that in terms of sex, 21 or 52.5 percent of the respondents are female, while 19 or 47.5 percent are male. In terms of age, the highest proportion of respondents is 17 to 18 years old, with 37 or 92.5 percent, while the lowest proportions are 16 years old or below and 19 years old or above, with 5.0 percent and 2.5 percent, respectively.

In terms of average English grade in the previous quarter, the highest group is composed of learners with grades ranging from 85 to 89, with 19 or 47.5 percent, while the lowest group consists of those with grades from 80 to 84, with 9 or 22.5 percent. The respondents' home language profile shows that the highest proportion, 37 or 92.5 percent, speak Ilocano, while the lowest proportion, 3 or 7.5 percent, speak Filipino. Regarding father's educational attainment, the highest proportion is high school graduates, with 10 or 25.0 percent, while the lowest is vocational level, with 1 or 2.5 percent, and no respondents reported having fathers who are college graduates, while for mother's educational attainment, the highest proportion is high school graduates, with 14 or 35.0 percent, and the lowest is vocational attainment, with 1 or 2.5 percent.

Table 1b. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their technological profile

Variables	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Availability of reading materials at home		
None	5	12.5

Few	28	70.0
Moderate	7	17.5
Access to electronic devices		
Smartphone	38	95.0
Tablet	2	5.0
Internet connectivity at home		
No Internet	1	2.5
Mobile Data	20	50.0
Unstable Wi-Fi	5	12.5
Stable Wi-Fi	14	35.0

Table 1b presents the distribution of the respondents in terms of their technological profile, including availability of reading materials at home, access to electronic devices, and internet connectivity.

The finding shows that in terms of availability of reading materials at home, the highest proportion of respondents, 28 or 70.0 percent, reported having few reading materials, while 7 or 17.5 percent reported having a moderate number of materials, and 5 or 12.5 percent reported having no reading materials. In terms of access to electronic devices, the highest proportion, 38 or 95.0 percent, have access to smartphones, while 2 or 5.0 percent have access to tablets.

For internet connectivity at home, the highest proportion of respondents, 20 or 50.0 percent, rely on mobile data, while 14 or 35.0 percent have stable Wi-Fi, 5 or 12.5 percent experience unstable Wi-Fi connectivity, and 1 or 2.5 percent reported having no internet access.

Lexical Proficiency Level of the Respondents

Table 2a. Distribution of the respondents in terms of the lexical proficiency level along word recognition

Level of Proficiency	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (0 to 2)	0	-
Fair (3 to 5)	5	12.5
Satisfactory (6 to 8)	10	25.0
Very satisfactory (9 to 10)	25	62.5
Mean = 8.50 (Very satisfactory) SD = 1.72		

Table 2a presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the lexical proficiency level of the respondents in terms of word recognition. The overall mean score of 8.50, interpreted as very satisfactory, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners generally demonstrate a high level of word recognition ability. The finding means that the learners can recognize familiar and commonly used words encountered in academic and functional texts in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP), suggesting that they possess an adequate vocabulary base necessary for understanding written materials.

Specifically, the highest rated level is “Very Satisfactory (9 to 10),” with 25 or 62.5 percent of the respondents, indicating that most learners demonstrate a high level of word recognition ability. Specifically, the lowest rated level is “Poor (0 to 2),” with no respondents, followed by “Fair (3 to 5),” with 5 or 12.5 percent, indicating that only a small number of learners have trouble in recognizing words.

These findings are supported by Nation (2013), who emphasized that word recognition is essential for language comprehension and production, and by Schmitt (2008), who noted that vocabulary acquisition develops through repeated exposure and meaningful use of words, strengthening learners’ ability to recognize and utilize vocabulary in both reading and writing contexts.

Table 2b. Distribution of the respondents in terms of the lexical proficiency level along word usage

Level of Proficiency	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (0 to 2)	0	-
Fair (3 to 5)	2	5.0
Satisfactory (6 to 8)	9	22.5
Very satisfactory (9 to 10)	29	72.5
Mean= 8.93 (Very satisfactory) SD= 1.44		

Table 2b presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the lexical proficiency level of the respondents in terms of word usage. The overall mean score of 8.93, interpreted as Very Satisfactory, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners generally demonstrate a high level of ability in using words appropriately in various contexts. The highest rated level is “Very Satisfactory (9 to 10),” with 29 or 72.5 percent of the respondents, while the lowest rated level is “Poor (0 to 2),” with no respondents falling under this category, followed by “Fair (3 to 5),” with 2 or 5.0 percent.

It implies that strong word usage skills contribute significantly to effective functional composition writing performance. When learners can use words appropriately, they are able to produce clear, precise, and coherent written outputs, which enhances the overall quality of their compositions. It implies that learners can apply vocabulary effectively in writing tasks, although a minimal number still need improvement in selecting and applying appropriate vocabulary.

The finding means that the learners can apply vocabulary accurately in constructing sentences and expressing ideas in written form in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). This suggests that they possess not only knowledge of words but also the ability to use them correctly in meaningful communication. These findings are supported by Richards (2020), who emphasized that vocabulary use is a central component of communicative competence, and by Coxhead (2020), who noted that academic writing requires precise and context-appropriate vocabulary to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall writing quality.

Table 2c. Distribution of the respondents in terms of the lexical proficiency level along contextual understanding

Level of Proficiency	Frequency	Percentage
----------------------	-----------	------------

	(n=40)	
Poor (0 to 2)	0	-
Fair (3 to 5)	8	20.0
Satisfactory (6 to 8)	19	47.5
Very satisfactory (9 to 10)	13	32.5
Mean = 7.28 (Satisfactory)		SD= 1.97

Table 2c presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the lexical proficiency level of the respondents in terms of contextual understanding. The overall mean score of 7.28, interpreted as Satisfactory, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a moderate level of ability in understanding words based on context. The highest rated level is "Satisfactory (6 to 8)," with 19 or 47.5 percent of the respondents, followed by "Very Satisfactory (9 to 10)," with 13 or 32.5 percent, while the lowest rated level is "Poor (0 to 2)," with no respondents, followed by "Fair (3 to 5)," with 8 or 20.0 percent.

It implies that contextual understanding, although present, still needs to be strengthened to support higher levels of lexical proficiency and functional composition writing performance. When learners have limited ability to infer meaning from context, their comprehension and ability to use appropriate vocabulary in writing may also be affected. It implies that learners have a developing ability to interpret meaning from context, but some still require guided instruction to achieve higher proficiency.

The finding means that the learners can interpret the meaning of words using surrounding information in sentences or passages, but their ability is not yet highly developed. This suggests that while learners can derive meaning from context, they may still encounter difficulty when dealing with unfamiliar or complex vocabulary in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP).

This finding is supported by Nation (2022), who emphasized that contextualized vocabulary learning plays a crucial role in developing deeper lexical knowledge, as learners acquire meaning more effectively when words are encountered in meaningful contexts. Nation further explained that the ability to infer meaning from context is a key component of vocabulary acquisition and directly supports language comprehension and productive skills such as writing. This affirms that strengthening contextual understanding is essential in enhancing learners' lexical proficiency and functional composition writing performance.

Table 2d. Distribution of the respondents in terms of the lexical proficiency level along comprehension task

Level of Proficiency	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (0)	0	-
Fair (1 to 2)	8	20.0
Satisfactory (3 to 4)	17	42.5
Very satisfactory (5)	15	37.5
Mean= 3.28 (Satisfactory)		SD= 1.06

Table 2d presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the lexical proficiency level of the respondents in terms of comprehension task. The overall mean score of 3.28, interpreted as Satisfactory, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a moderate level of performance in comprehension tasks. The highest rated level is "Satisfactory (3 to 4)," with 17 or 42.5 percent of the respondents, followed by "Very Satisfactory (5)," with 15 or 37.5 percent, while the lowest rated level is "Poor (0)," with no respondents, followed by "Fair (1 to 2)," with 8 or 20.0 percent.

It implies that comprehension ability is closely linked to lexical proficiency, particularly in understanding vocabulary within context. When learners have limited vocabulary knowledge or contextual understanding, their ability to comprehend texts and produce effective written compositions may also be affected. It implies that learners possess basic comprehension skills but still require further development to achieve higher levels of understanding necessary for effective academic writing.

The finding means that the learners can understand and process information from texts, but their comprehension ability is not yet fully developed. This suggests that while learners can grasp general ideas, they may still have trouble in deeper interpretation and application of meaning in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). These findings are supported by Fitriani and Jannah (2022), who emphasized that vocabulary knowledge and contextual understanding significantly influence reading comprehension and writing performance.

Table 2e. Summary of the lexical proficiency level of the respondents

Dimension	Mean±SD	Description
Word recognition (10)	8.50 ± 1.72	Very satisfactory
Word usage (10)	8.93 ± 1.44	Very satisfactory
Contextual understanding (10)	7.28 ± 1.97	Satisfactory
Comprehension task (5)	3.28 ± 1.06	Satisfactory
Overall (35)	27.98 ± 4.31	Satisfactory

Table 2e presents the summary of the lexical proficiency level of the respondents across the four dimensions, namely word recognition, word usage, contextual understanding, and comprehension task. The overall mean score of 27.98, interpreted as Satisfactory, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a moderate level of lexical proficiency. The highest mean score is observed in word usage (M = 8.93), followed by word recognition (M = 8.50), both interpreted as Very Satisfactory, while the lowest mean score is observed in the comprehension task (M = 3.28), followed by contextual understanding (M = 7.28), both interpreted as Satisfactory.

It implies that lexical proficiency is uneven across different dimensions, where learners perform strongly in basic vocabulary skills but show relatively lower performance in higher-order skills such as contextual understanding and comprehension. This imbalance may affect their ability to produce well-developed and meaningful written compositions. It implies that learners have developed functional vocabulary skills in recognition and usage but

still have trouble in deeper vocabulary processing and contextual application.

The finding means that the learners possess adequate vocabulary knowledge and skills; however, their overall lexical proficiency is not yet at a highly advanced level. While they can recognize and use words effectively, their ability to fully understand and apply vocabulary in more complex contexts still requires improvement in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). These findings are supported by Li and Kirby (2021), who emphasized that lexical proficiency is multidimensional, who noted that vocabulary depth and contextual understanding significantly influence comprehension and writing performance.

Functional Composition Writing Performance of the Respondents

Table 3a. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their functional composition writing performance along coherence and unity

Performance	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (1)	11	27.5
Fair (2)	18	45.0
Satisfactory (3)	10	25.0
Very satisfactory (4)	1	2.5
Mean= 2.03 (Fair)		SD= 0.80

Table 3a presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the functional composition writing performance of the respondents in terms of coherence and unity. The overall mean score of 2.03, interpreted as Fair, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a low to moderate level of ability in organizing ideas coherently and maintaining unity in their written compositions. The highest rated level is "Fair (2)," with 18 or 45.0 percent of the respondents, followed by "Satisfactory (3)," with 10 or 25.0 percent, while the lowest rated level is "Very Satisfactory (4)," with only 1 or 2.5 percent, and 11 or 27.5 percent fall under "Poor (1)."

It implies that limited coherence and unity in writing may affect the clarity and overall quality of learners' compositions. When ideas are not logically arranged or well-connected, readers may find it difficult to understand the intended message, which weakens the effectiveness of written communication. It implies that learners have basic writing skills but still need improvement in organizing ideas, maintaining focus, and ensuring logical sequencing in their compositions.

The finding means that the learners have trouble in presenting ideas in a logical sequence and in maintaining a clear focus throughout their written outputs in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). This suggests that while learners can generate ideas, they may struggle in connecting these ideas effectively to form a unified and coherent composition. These findings are supported by Abbas and Herdi (2021), and Fareed, Ashraf, and Bilal (2021), who emphasized that coherence and unity are essential components of effective writing, as they ensure logical connection of ideas, clarity, and improved readability.

Table 3b. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their functional composition writing performance along grammar and mechanics

Performance	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (1)	20	50.0
Fair (2)	14	35.0
Satisfactory (3)	6	15.0
Very satisfactory (4)	0	-
Mean= 1.65 (Fair)		SD= 0.74

Table 3b presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the functional composition writing performance of the respondents in terms of grammar and mechanics. The overall mean score of 1.65, interpreted as Fair, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a low level of proficiency in applying correct grammar and mechanics in their written compositions. The highest rated level is "Poor (1)," with 20 or 50.0 percent of the respondents, followed by "Fair (2)," with 14 or 35.0 percent, while the lowest rated level is "Very Satisfactory (4)," with no respondents, followed by "Satisfactory (3)," with only 6 or 15.0 percent.

It implies that weaknesses in grammar and mechanics significantly affect the clarity, correctness, and overall effectiveness of written communication. When learners are unable to apply grammatical rules accurately, their ideas may become unclear or misinterpreted, which negatively impacts their functional composition writing performance. It implies that learners require substantial improvement and targeted instruction in basic grammar rules and writing conventions.

The finding means that the learners have trouble in constructing grammatically correct sentences and in observing proper writing conventions such as punctuation, capitalization, and sentence structure in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). This suggests that learners have limited control over language rules, which affects the accuracy of their written outputs. These findings are supported by Sari and Putri (2022), who emphasized that grammatical competence is essential for clarity, accuracy, and coherence in writing, and that mastery of grammar and mechanics is necessary for producing effective and academically acceptable texts.

Table 3c. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their functional composition writing performance along lexical richness

Performance	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (1)	16	40.0
Fair (2)	17	42.5
Satisfactory (3)	5	12.5
Very satisfactory (4)	2	5.0
Mean= 1.83 (Fair)		SD= 0.84

Table 3c presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the functional composition writing performance of the respondents in terms of lexical richness. The overall mean score of

1.83, interpreted as Fair, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a low level of proficiency in using a wide range of vocabulary in their written compositions. The highest rated level is “Fair (2),” with 17 or 42.5 percent of the respondents, followed by “Poor (1),” with 16 or 40.0 percent, while the lowest rated level is “Very Satisfactory (4),” with only 2 or 5.0 percent, followed by “Satisfactory (3),” with 5 or 12.5 percent.

It implies that limited lexical richness affects the quality, depth, and effectiveness of written compositions. When learners use a narrow range of vocabulary, their writing may lack clarity, precision, and sophistication, which reduces the overall impact of their communication. It implies that learners need improvement in expanding their vocabulary and in applying varied word choices in their writing.

The finding means that the learners have limited ability to use varied and appropriate vocabulary when expressing ideas in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). This suggests that learners tend to rely on simple, repetitive, or familiar words rather than utilizing diverse and more precise vocabulary in writing. These findings are supported by Uçar and Yükselir (2021), who emphasized that lexical richness is a key indicator of writing proficiency and that vocabulary diversity significantly enhances clarity, precision, and overall writing quality.

Table 3d. Distribution of the respondents in terms of their functional composition writing performance along task completion

Performance	Frequency (n=40)	Percentage
Poor (1)	10	25.0
Fair (2)	21	52.5
Satisfactory (3)	5	12.5
Very satisfactory (4)	4	10.0
Mean= 2.08 (Fair)		SD= 0.89

Table 3d presents the weighted mean and descriptive interpretation of the functional composition writing performance of the respondents in terms of task completion. The overall mean score of 2.08, interpreted as Fair, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a low to moderate level of ability in completing writing tasks according to given instructions and requirements. The highest rated level is “Fair (2),” with 21 or 52.5 percent of the respondents, followed by “Poor (1),” with 10 or 25.0 percent, while the lowest rated level is “Very Satisfactory (4),” with only 4 or 10.0 percent, followed by “Satisfactory (3),” with 5 or 12.5 percent.

It implies that limited task completion skills affect the overall effectiveness and quality of written compositions. When learners fail to fully address the requirements of a writing task, their outputs may be incomplete or lack clarity, which weakens their ability to communicate ideas effectively. It implies that learners require further guidance in understanding task requirements, organizing ideas, and developing complete responses.

The finding means that the learners can partially respond to writing tasks in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP), but their outputs may lack completeness, sufficient detail, or full adherence to the given instructions. This suggests that while learners can attempt the task, they may not fully develop or

elaborate their ideas to meet expected writing standards. These findings are supported by Rahimi and Zhang (2021), who emphasized that task completion reflects learners’ ability to interpret instructions and produce appropriate responses, and that effective writing requires both language proficiency and the ability to fully address task requirements.

Table 3e. Summary of the functional composition writing performance of the respondents

Dimension	Mean±SD	Description
Coherence and unity (5)	2.03 ± 0.80	Fair
Grammar and mechanics (5)	1.65 ± 0.74	Fair
Lexical richness (5)	1.83 ± 0.84	Fair
Task completion (5)	2.08 ± 0.89	Fair
Overall (20)	7.58 ± 3.04	Fair

Table 3e presents the summary of the functional composition writing performance of the respondents across the four dimensions, namely coherence and unity, grammar and mechanics, lexical richness, and task completion. The overall mean score of 7.58, interpreted as Fair, indicates that the Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate a low to moderate level of writing performance in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). The highest mean score is observed in task completion (M = 2.08), followed closely by coherence and unity (M = 2.03), both interpreted as Fair, while the lowest mean score is observed in grammar and mechanics (M = 1.65), followed by lexical richness (M = 1.83), both interpreted as Fair.

It implies that writing performance is not yet fully developed across all dimensions, particularly in grammar and mechanics, which appears to be the most challenging area. Limitations in writing skills may affect learners’ ability to communicate ideas effectively in academic and professional contexts. It implies that while learners can attempt tasks and organize ideas to some extent, weaknesses in language accuracy and vocabulary range limit the effectiveness and quality of their written compositions.

The finding means that the learners possess basic writing skills; however, their ability to produce well-organized, grammatically correct, and meaningful compositions is still limited. This suggests that while learners can generate written outputs, these may lack clarity, accuracy, and depth. These findings are supported by Ngo and Tran (2021), who emphasized that writing performance requires the integration of grammar, vocabulary, organization, and task fulfillment, and that weaknesses in grammar and vocabulary significantly affect the quality and clarity of written communication.

Difference in the Lexical Proficiency Level of the Respondents by Profile

Table 4a. Comparison statistics in the lexical proficiency level of the respondents when grouped by profile

Grouping Variables	F- or t-value	Probability	Inference
Lexical proficiency level			

Sex	0.387	0.538	Not significant
Age	1.833	0.184	Not significant
English grade	2.790	0.074	Not significant
Primary language used at home	0.931	0.341	Not significant
Father's educational attainment	2.567	0.055	Not significant
Mother's educational attainment	0.792	0.538	Not significant
Reading materials at home	0.485	0.620	Not significant
Availability of electronic devices	0.259	0.614	Not significant
Internet connectivity at home	0.478	0.700	Not significant

**tested at 0.05 level of significance; see appendix for post-hoc analysis*

Table 4a presents the comparison statistics in the lexical proficiency level of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables. The table shows the computed F-values and corresponding probability values tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

The findings show that sex ($p = 0.538$), age ($p = 0.184$), English grade ($p = 0.074$), primary language used at home ($p = 0.341$), father's educational attainment ($p = 0.055$), mother's educational attainment ($p = 0.538$), reading materials at home ($p = 0.620$), availability of electronic devices ($p = 0.614$), and internet connectivity at home ($p = 0.700$) all obtained probability values greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the lexical proficiency level of the Grade 12 EPAS learners when grouped according to their profile variables; thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The finding means that learners demonstrate relatively similar levels of lexical proficiency regardless of their demographic and home-related characteristics.

Notably, English grade ($p = 0.074$) and father's educational attainment ($p = 0.055$) are closest to significance. The finding means that these variables may have a potential influence on learners' lexical proficiency, although not strong enough to establish statistically significant differences. It implies that academic performance in English and paternal educational background may contribute to vocabulary development to some extent, but instructional exposure and classroom learning experiences remain more consistent factors. These findings are supported by Nation, Schmitt, and Zhang (2021), who emphasized that vocabulary development is primarily influenced by meaningful

exposure and instructional practices rather than demographic variables.

Difference in the Functional Composition Writing Performance of the

Respondents by Profile

Table 4a. Comparison statistics in the lexical proficiency level of the respondents when grouped by profile

Grouping Variables	F- or t-value	Probability	Inference
Functional composition writing performance			
Sex	8.757	0.005	Significant
Age	0.074	0.788	Not significant
English grade	4.017	0.026	Significant
Primary language used at home	0.198	0.659	Not significant
Father's educational attainment	1.010	0.416	Not significant
Mother's educational attainment	2.474	0.062	Not significant
Reading materials at home	0.750	0.480	Not significant
Availability of electronic devices	6.286	0.017	Significant
Internet connectivity at home	0.668	0.577	Not significant

**tested at 0.05 level of significance; see appendix for post-hoc analysis*

Table 4b presents the comparison statistics in the functional composition writing performance of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables. The table shows the computed F-values and corresponding probability values tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

The results reveal that sex ($p = 0.005$), English grade ($p = 0.026$), and availability of electronic devices ($p = 0.017$) significantly influence learners' functional composition writing performance; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected for these variables.

In terms of sex, the findings show that female learners performed significantly better than male learners. The finding means that female learners demonstrate stronger writing performance across the components of functional composition writing. It implies that differences in language engagement and learning behaviors may influence writing outcomes. Female learners are often more engaged in reading and writing activities and show greater attention to detail in grammar and mechanics. This is supported by Reilly et al. (2019), who found that females generally outperform males in language-related tasks due to higher verbal engagement.

As to their English grades, the results show that learners with higher English grades performed significantly better than those with lower grades. The finding means that learners with strong linguistic foundations in grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension are more capable of producing well-developed compositions. It implies that writing proficiency is influenced by prior language competence and requires continuous development. This is supported by Kim and Graham (2022), who emphasized that writing quality is strongly linked to language proficiency.

On the Availability of Electronic Device, the findings indicate that learners using tablets performed better than those using smartphones. The finding means that the type of device influences writing outcomes. It implies that devices with better functionality support writing tasks such as drafting and revising more effectively. This is supported by Neumann (2018), who found that appropriate digital tools enhance writing performance and engagement.

On the other hand, age ($p = 0.788$), primary language used at home ($p = 0.659$), father's educational attainment ($p = 0.416$), mother's educational attainment ($p = 0.062$), availability of reading materials ($p = 0.480$), and internet connectivity ($p = 0.577$) showed no significant differences. The finding means that these variables do not significantly affect learners' writing performance. It implies that writing competence is more influenced by instructional practices and individual language proficiency than by demographic and environmental factors. This is supported by Hyland (2019) and Graham (2019), who emphasized that writing development is driven by instruction, feedback, and practice.

Relationship between the Lexical Proficiency Level and the Functional

Composition Writing Performance of the Respondents

Table 5. Correlation statistics between the lexical proficiency level and the functional composition writing performance of the respondents

	Lexical Proficiency Level				
	Word Recognition	Word Usage	Contextual Understanding	Compre Task	Overall Lexical
Functional composition writing performance					
Coherence and unity	0.288	0.336*	0.304	0.293	0.439*
Grammar and mechanics	0.141	0.193	0.174	0.225	0.256
Lexical richness	0.150	0.179	0.137	0.313*	0.260
Task completion	0.315*	0.185	0.193	0.304	0.349
Overall FCW performance	0.242	0.239	0.217	0.317*	0.352*

*significant at 0.05 level of significance; see appendix for detailed statistics

Table 5 presents the correlation statistics between the lexical proficiency level and the functional composition writing performance of the respondents. The results indicate that selected components of lexical proficiency have significant relationships with specific dimensions of writing performance at the 0.05 level of significance. This implies that vocabulary-related skills contribute meaningfully to aspects of learners' writing ability.

In terms of Coherence and Unity and Word Usage, the findings reveal that coherence and unity are significantly correlated with word usage ($r = 0.336$). This means that learners who are more proficient in using words appropriately in context are better able to organize their ideas logically and maintain a clear and unified flow in their compositions. This is high because effective word usage allows learners to connect ideas smoothly, use appropriate transitions, and express relationships between concepts clearly, which directly enhances coherence and unity. This is supported by Hyland (2019), who emphasized that lexical choice is central to organizing ideas and improving writing quality.

On Lexical Richness and Comprehension Task, the results show that lexical richness is significantly correlated with comprehension task ($r = 0.313$). This means that learners who demonstrate stronger comprehension abilities tend to use a wider and more varied range of vocabulary in their writing. This is high because comprehension exposes learners to diverse vocabulary in context, enabling them to

acquire and apply new words effectively, which enhances lexical richness. This is supported by Nation (2017), who explained that vocabulary growth is strongly linked to meaningful comprehension and exposure.

Furthermore, in terms of Task Completion and Word Recognition, the findings further reveal that task completion is significantly correlated with word recognition ($r = 0.315$). This means that learners who can easily recognize and understand words are more capable of completing writing tasks effectively. This is high because strong word recognition enables learners to understand instructions, prompts, and task requirements accurately, allowing them to respond completely and appropriately. This is supported by Grabe and Stoller (2020), who highlighted that word recognition is essential for comprehension and task execution.

Meanwhile, on the overall Writing Performance with Comprehension Task and Overall Lexical Proficiency, the results show that the same is significantly correlated with comprehension task ($r = 0.317$) and overall lexical proficiency ($r = 0.352$). This is high because comprehension and overall lexical knowledge provide the foundation for idea generation, organization, and expression, which are all essential components of effective writing. When learners understand texts well and possess sufficient vocabulary, they can produce clearer, more organized, and meaningful compositions. This is supported by Kim and Graham (2022), who emphasized that vocabulary and comprehension are key predictors of writing quality.

On the other hand, the remaining correlations were not significant, particularly those related to grammar and mechanics. This means that lexical proficiency has limited direct influence on grammatical accuracy. This occurs because grammar and mechanics are rule-based skills that require explicit instruction and practice, rather than being developed solely through vocabulary knowledge. This is supported by Biber et al. (2016) and, who explained that grammar develops through different learning processes than vocabulary.

Proposed Instructional Remedial Plan

PROJECT **L.E.A.P.**
(**L**exical **E**nhancement and **A**cademic Writing **P**roficiency Program)

I. Rationale

The study found that Grade 12 EPAS learners demonstrate satisfactory basic lexical proficiency, particularly in word recognition and usage, but struggle with higher-order skills such as contextual understanding and comprehension, indicating a largely surface-level vocabulary development. In writing, learners show only fair competence, with evident weaknesses in grammar and mechanics, lexical richness, coherence, and task completion, suggesting difficulty in effectively applying vocabulary in meaningful compositions. While lexical proficiency is significantly related to aspects of writing such as coherence, task completion, and lexical use, it does not significantly influence grammar and mechanics, highlighting that writing competence is multidimensional and requires more than vocabulary knowledge alone. Additionally, lexical proficiency does not vary significantly across profile variables, but writing performance is influenced by factors such as English academic achievement and access to digital resources. These findings underscore the need for an integrated instructional approach and led to the proposal of PROJECT

L.E.A.P. (Lexical Enhancement and Academic Writing Proficiency Program), a structured, process-based, and technology-supported intervention aimed at enhancing higher-order lexical skills and improving overall writing performance through contextualized practice and continuous feedback.

II. Objectives

This Remedial Plan generally seeks to enhance the higher-order lexical proficiency and functional composition writing performance of Grade 12 EPAS learners through a structured and integrative instructional remedial program.

Specifically, this proposed plan aims:

1. To enhance learners’ contextual understanding and comprehension skills for effective interpretation of texts.
2. To improve learners’ grammar and mechanics in written communication.
3. To develop learners’ lexical richness through varied and appropriate vocabulary use.
4. To strengthen learners’ coherence and unity in composing organized and logically sequenced texts.
5. To improve learners’ task completion skills in responding effectively to writing prompts.
6. To promote the functional application of vocabulary knowledge in academic writing tasks.
7. To utilize technology-supported writing tools to enhance drafting, revising, and editing skills.

III. Participants

The participants of the program are the Grade 12 learners specializing in Electronic Products Assembly and Servicing (EPAS) enrolled in English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP).

IV. Activity Matrix

Specific Learning Objective	Activities	Time Frame	Persons Involved	Budgetary Requirements	Materials/Resources Needed	Expected Outcome/Output
Improve contextual understanding and comprehension	Context clue exercises, word mapping, vocabulary journals using EPAS texts	2 weeks	EAPP Teacher, SHS English Teachers, Students	₱1,500 (printing of worksheets, vocabulary journals)	EPAS reading materials, worksheets, vocabulary lists	Improved ability to infer meaning and understand texts
Strengthen coherence and unity	Guided writing sessions (brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revising) with focus on transitions and paragraph organization	3 weeks	EAPP Teacher, English Teachers, Students	₱1,500 (printing of writing guides, sample essays, graphic organizers)	Writing guides, sample essays, graphic organizers	Organized and logically structured compositions
Enhance grammar and mechanics	Grammar mini-lessons, sentence combining, error correction, peer editing	3 weeks	EAPP Teacher, English Teachers, Students	₱1,200 (printing of grammar modules and worksheets)	Grammar modules, worksheets, editing checklists	Improved grammatical accuracy and writing conventions
Develop lexical richness	Word substitution, paraphrasing, sentence expansion, academic word exposure	2 weeks	EAPP Teacher, English Teachers, Students	₱1,000 (printing of vocabulary materials and activity sheets)	Vocabulary lists, activity sheets, reference materials	Increased vocabulary variety and precise word usage
Improve task	Writing tasks based	2 weeks	EAPP	₱1,000 (printing	Writing prompts,	Complete and well-

completion skills	on EPAS workplace scenarios with guided instructions		Teacher, Subject Teachers (EPAS), Students	of writing prompts, rubrics, task sheets)	rubrics, task sheets	developed written outputs
Utilize technology in writing	Use of tablets/apps for drafting, revising, and vocabulary access	Continuous	School Head, ICT Coordinator, EAPP Teacher, Students	₱5,000 (maintenance, internet load, app subscriptions)	Tablets, writing apps, internet resources	Enhanced writing efficiency and engagement
Provide differentiated instruction	Group-based remediation and enrichment activities based on proficiency levels	Continuous	EAPP Teacher, English Teachers, Students	₱800 (printing of differentiated materials and assessments)	Instructional materials, assessment tools	Improved performance across different learner levels
Monitor progress and provide feedback	Formative assessments, rubric-based evaluation, peer and teacher feedback	Continuous	EAPP Teacher, English Teachers, Students	₱500 (printing of rubrics and assessment forms)	Rubrics, assessment tools	Continuous improvement in writing skills

V. Sustainability Plan

The implementation of the instructional remedial plan will be sustained through continuous integration of vocabulary and writing activities in the EAPP curriculum. Teachers will regularly incorporate guided writing, vocabulary enrichment, and grammar-focused instruction in their lessons. Periodic assessment and monitoring will be conducted to evaluate learners' progress and adjust instructional strategies accordingly. Collaboration among teachers will also be encouraged to share best practices and ensure consistency in implementation. Additionally, the use of technology and contextualized materials will be maintained to support learners' engagement and long-term development of lexical proficiency and writing skills.

Conclusion

The study determined that Grade 12 EPAS learners possess high lexical proficiency in terms of word recognition and word usage, but moderate to low proficiency in contextual understanding and comprehension tasks. Their functional composition writing performance is generally low to moderate, with relatively higher performance in task completion and coherence and unity, and lower performance in grammar and mechanics and lexical richness. In terms of difference, no significant variation was found in lexical proficiency across profile variables, while functional composition writing performance significantly differed based on sex, English grade, and availability of electronic devices, where female learners, those with higher English grades, and those using tablets demonstrated better writing performance. In terms of relationship, selected components of lexical proficiency were found to have significant correlations with specific dimensions of functional composition writing performance, indicating that vocabulary-related skills contribute meaningfully to learners' writing performance.

Recommendations

In light of the study's findings, it is recommended that the Department of Education strengthen the EAPP curriculum by integrating higher-order lexical and writing skills, while school heads provide supportive digital resources. Teachers should

enhance learners' comprehension, grammar, lexical richness, coherence, and task completion through explicit instruction, structured activities, and guided practice. Students are encouraged to actively engage in reading and writing, and parents to support these practices at home. Future research may focus on intervention-based approaches to further improve grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension skills.

DECLARATION OF NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author hereby declares that this article is his original work and there is no conflict of interest in the conduct and publication of this study

REFERENCES

- Adhe, K. R. (2023). *Difficulty of visual recognition: Identifying the direction confusion of reading letters in young children*. *Lamdik Education Studies*. <https://lamdik.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Difficulty-of-Visual-Recognition-Identifying-the-Direction-Confusion-of-Reading-Letters-in-Young-Children.pdf>
- Alotaibi, M. S., et al. (2024). *Game-based learning in early childhood education: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11018941/>
- Alsubaie, A. S. (2024). Play-based learning and its effect on children's cognitive and language development in Saudi kindergarten classrooms. *Early Child Development and Care*, 194(6), 843–858. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2023.2246810>
- Austria, M. B. (2024). Lived experiences of international teachers in integrating play-based learning toward an action plan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education and Learning Research*, 3(2), 44–57. <https://pcu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/017-MELVIN-AUSTRIA-LIVED-EXPERIENCES-OF-INTERNATIONAL-TEACHERS-IN-INTEGRATING-PLAY-BASED-LEARNING-TOWARDS-THE-DEVELOPMENT-OF-ACTION-PLAN.pdf>

5. Bacani, C. G., & Olalia, A. M. (2024). Impact of play-based reading instruction on emergent literacy skills among kindergarten pupils. *International Journal of Research Publications and Reviews*, 5(5), 299–308. <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V5ISSUE5/IJRPR27614.pdf>
6. Basri, M., & Yusuf, R. (2023). Effects of digital play on the development of early reading skills in preschoolers. *Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, 9(4), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234589>
7. Caballo, J. T. T., Castor, H. A. C., Lazatin, H. M. C., Tabafa, L. J. C., & Escarlos, G. S. (2025). Enhancing kindergarten letter recognition through play-based learning. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(5), 2597–2621. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25may1755>
8. Caven, M. (2025). *Press play on play-based learning*. NAESP. <https://www.naesp.org/resource/press-play-on-play-based-learning>
9. Cheung, A., Keung, C., & Tam, W. (2022). Developing kindergarten teacher capacity for play-based curriculum: A mediation analysis. *Teachers and Teaching*, 28(5), 618–632. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2022.2075016>
10. Chin, A. R., et al. (2024). Interactive games in enhancing kindergarteners' level of letter recognition. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(12), 634–647. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i12.030>
11. Cruz, A. L., & Bautista, R. E. (2024). The effectiveness of play-based learning on kindergarten learners' literacy performance in the Philippines. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research in Education*, 6(1), 78–90. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/1310>
12. Dean, S. N. (2025). *Patterns and representation in play-based learning: A systematic meta-synthesis of empirical studies in K-13+ settings*. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/educ.2025.1557001/full>
13. de Chambrier, A. F. (2021). Play-based interventions in early numeracy: Experimental evidence from kindergarten classrooms. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 210, 105235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2021.105235>
14. DeLuca, C., Pyle, A., Valiquette, A., & LaPointe-McEwan, D. (2020). Embedding assessment in play-based learning. *Elementary School Journal*, 120(3), 455–479. <https://doi.org/10.1086/707106>
15. Dela Cruz, L. M., & Ramos, J. R. (2025). Play-based instruction and phonics mastery among early graders in urban public schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Development*, 12(2), 103–116. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=24953>
16. Department of Education [DepEd]. (2023). *Basic Education Report 2023*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
17. Department of Education [DepEd]. (2023). *MATATAG K to 10 Curriculum Guide: Kindergarten*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
18. Department of Education Region II. (2023). *Regional Education Performance Report*. Department of Education – Region II.
19. Dobles, E. B., & Marquez, M. F. (2025). The effect of play-based learning on phonemic awareness of kindergarteners in teacher's perspective. *Journal of Education, Learning, and Management*, 2(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.69739/jelm.v2i1.228>
20. Escarlos, G. S., et al. (2025). Enhancing kindergarten letter recognition through play-based learning: The Letter Jump Game. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(7), 122–134. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392276339>
21. Espinosa, L. M., Monterola, S. L., & Punzalan, J. (2021). Addressing resource gaps in Philippine kindergarten classrooms. *Philippine Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 5(2), 87–101.
22. Fokides, E., et al. (2025). Digital game-based phonological awareness programs in kindergarten education: A comparative study. *Applied Sciences*, 15(5), 2252. <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/15/5/2252>
23. Fulgencio, M. L. (2024). Play-based learning in teaching literacy and numeracy among kindergarten learners. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 8(4), 132–142. https://ijebmr.com/uploads/pdf/archivepdf/2024/IJEBMR_1335.pdf
24. Fyffe, L. (2024). Investing in early childhood education as human capital: Evidence from global policy perspectives. *Public Management Review*, 26(4), 622–639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2246815>
25. Ghosh, S., & Mehta, N. (2023). Role of play-based digital tools in developing reading fluency in early learners. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(5), 4413–4432. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11492-4>
26. Göle, E., & Temel, A. B. (2024). Effectiveness of digital game-supported phonological awareness programs in preschool education. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1415463.pdf>
27. Han, S., & Neuharth-Pritchett, S. (2020). The effects of play-based learning on kindergarten mathematics readiness. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 48(2), 251–260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-019-00984-y>
28. Hechanova, H. A., Rollo, C. R., Libdan Jr., I. E., & Disca, B. Y. (2025). Learning through playing: Improving phonemic awareness in kindergarten learners. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 37(4), 407–416. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.370409>
29. Institute of Education Sciences [IES]. (2025). *The importance of play-based learning in early education*. <https://ies.ed.gov/learn/blog/prioritizing-play-importance-play-based-learning-early-education>
30. Jamian, N. H. A. (2025). Enhancing preschoolers' letter recognition through the audio-visual mnemonic (AVM) approach. *Lifestyle Journal*. <https://sdgsreview.org/LifestyleJournal/article/view/4713>
31. Klemme, C. (2024). Incorporating play-based learning in early childhood: Effects on engagement. [Master's thesis, NW Iowa University]. NWCommons. https://nwcommons.nwciova.edu/education_masters/626
32. Liwag, B. S., & Marquez, M. F. (2025). Play-based instruction and literacy readiness among Filipino kindergarten learners. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(1), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epral2345>

33. Mahampang, J. D., & Castro, R. F. (2023). Mahampang Kita: Play-friendly classroom practices of kindergarten teachers. *IIARI International Journal of Educational Research*, 11(2), 211–225. https://iiari.org/conference_article/mahampang-kita-play-friendly-classroom-practices-of-kindergarten-teachers
34. Malab, N. M. (2024). Alphabet Hop play-based activity: A kindergarten intervention for letter-sound recognition. *Philippine Journal of Language and Literacy Studies*, 3(2), 56–67. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/381376021>
35. Mendoza, E. A., & Villanueva, R. P. (2025). Enhancing alphabet recognition in preschoolers through technology-based games. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 10(1), 98–107. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394629208>
36. Monje, A. G., & Rivera, F. D. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of play-based learning in rural Philippine schools. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 5(3), 120–132. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v5i3.492>
37. Nesbitt, K. T., Farran, D. C., & Lipsey, M. W. (2025). Feasibility of active playful learning interventions in kindergarten classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 23(2), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X24123456>
38. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2023). *Early childhood education and care policy review*. OECD Publishing. <https://www.oecd.org/education>
39. Padillo, G. G. (2024). Play-based learning strategies in modular distance education: Effects on literacy and numeracy readiness. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 8(4), 111–125. <https://ijebmr.com>
40. Parker, R. (2022). Learning through play at school: A framework for policy. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 751801. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.751801>
41. Potier Watkins, C., et al. (2024). Early phonics interventions via game-based learning: Evidence from randomized classroom trials. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 92(3), 456–478. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00220973.2023.2173129>
42. Rahayu, N., Nugroho, D., & Ngatmini, N. (2025). An analysis of letter recognition skills through the letter card box game in children aged 4–5 years. *Asian Journal of Early Childhood Education*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392416918>
43. Reyes, M. C., & Torres, J. A. (2023). Implementation of play-based pedagogy in Philippine kindergarten classrooms. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 99(2), 112–126.
44. Rojas, M. E., & Zamora, T. G. (2023). Playful literacy: Developing phonemic awareness through structured games in kindergarten. *International Journal of Child Education Studies*, 9(3), 233–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijces.2023.03.007>
45. Santos, V. L., & Cruz, K. J. (2024). Kindergarten teachers' challenges in implementing play-based instruction in Northern Luzon. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 11(1), 55–67.
46. Sood, S., & Patel, R. (2023). Professional development in play-based learning methodologies improves classroom practices. *Journal of Teacher Education and Practice*, 34(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2023.300178>
47. Tadiboyina, K., et al. (2024). Gesture-based alphabet learning using motion-sensor games. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(3), 2149–2163. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1007/s10639-023-12399-9>
48. Tacleon, I. B. (2024). Sound blending and play-based teaching approach towards learning performance of kindergarten pupils. *International Journal of Research Publications and Reviews*, 5(5), 277–288. <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V5ISSUE5/IJRPR27614.pdf>
49. Valenzuela, M. P. (2025). Teachers' understanding of play-based learning implementation in Gasabo District. *International Journal of Early Childhood Education Studies*, 15(2), 1–14. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=24953>
50. Zulueta, M. T., & Villar, J. P. (2024). Play-based strategies and reading readiness among Filipino kindergartners: A quasi-experimental analysis. *Philippine Journal of Basic Education*, 8(1), 65–80.