HOME LITERACY ENVIRONMENTS AND EARLY READING SKILL LEVELS OF GRADE 1 LEARNERS: FOUNDATION FOR AN ENHANCED HOME LITERACY PROGRAM

Rovelyn Dalit Eclarinal

Dampay Elementary School, Palauig, Zambales, Philippines

Mondriaan Aura College, Subic Bay Freeport Zone, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Home literacy environments play a crucial role in enhancing the early reading skills of learners, as they provide the foundation for literacy development. These environments influence critical reading competencies such as phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and sight word recognition. This study aimed to determine the home literacy environments and early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners in Palauig District, Schools Division of Zambales, during the School Year 2024–2025. The study employed a quantitative-descriptive design, involving 129 home literacy facilitators and their corresponding Grade 1 learners. A universal sampling method was used across four public elementary schools, and data were collected using a validated researcher-made questionnaire. The home literacy facilitators were predominantly aged 20–29 years, female, married, had two children, belonged to families with a monthly income of P19,999 or below, were high school graduates, and spent less than an hour teaching literacy at home. Their environments were consistently rated as "always helpful" in terms of literacy motivation, materials, routines, and support. The Grade 1 learners exhibited advanced early reading skills in phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and sight word recognition. No significant differences were found between the facilitators' environments and their profiles. A positive moderate significant correlation was identified between the facilitators' environments and the learners' early reading skills. An enhanced home literacy program was developed to address these findings. The facilitators' demographic profiles and supportive environments significantly contributed to the learners' advanced early reading skills. The findings underscore the critical role of home literacy environments in improving the early reading skills of learners, informing strategies for home literacy program enhancement.

Keywords: Home Literacy Environments, Home Literacy Facilitators, Early Reading Skill Levels, Grade 1 Learners, Enhanced Home Literacy Program.

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of early reading skills is crucial for Grade 1 learners, as it lays the foundation for their academic success. A key factor influencing these skills is the home literacy environment, which includes parental support, availability of reading materials, and the frequency of reading activities. However, many young learners still struggle with reading due to limited literacy practices at home. This study aims to explore the relationship between home literacy environments and the early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners to provide insights for enhancing home-based literacy support programs.

The development of early reading skills is essential for Grade 1 learners as it forms the cornerstone of their academic journey. A substantial body of research has examined the role of the

home literacy environment in shaping these early reading capabilities. Volodina et al. (2024) demonstrated that both the quality of early home learning environments and preschool settings significantly affect language proficiency in primary school learners. Similarly, Yuan et al. (2023) highlighted the positive impact of digital home literacy environments in enhancing early literacy skills, especially when traditional literacy activities are limited. According to Dacles (2024), a well-structured home literacy environment positively influences the reading levels of learners, even beyond Grade 1, stressing the importance of early exposure to literacy practices. Additionally, Chen (2024) and Canonizado (2024) found that parents' positive reading attitudes are correlated with improved reading behaviors in children, indicating the powerful influence of parental engagement on early literacy development. The findings of Nag et al. (2024) further underscore this, revealing a strong association between home language practices and literacy skills, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.

Furthermore, literacy motivation has been identified as a critical factor influenced by the home literacy environment. Tanaka and Takeuchi (2024) found that parental involvement in home learning significantly boosts children's motivation to learn a second language, emphasizing the importance of engagement in literacy activities at home. Lee and Moussa (2024) observed that interactive reading practices, such as joint reading with parents or siblings, can enhance early reading skills, a finding echoed by Zakiah and Sukmandari (2024), who emphasized the need for fostering interest in reading through parental roles and accessible resources. Lutale et al. (2024) noted the influence of parental education, socioeconomic status, and availability of educational materials on literacy competencies, stressing the role of home resources in developing early reading skills. These studies collectively highlight the significant impact of an enriched home literacy environment on early reading development, pointing to the need for tailored home literacy programs that support young learners effectively.

Despite extensive studies on home literacy environments and their influence on early reading skills, there remained gaps in understanding specific elements that contributed most significantly to literacy outcomes among Grade 1 learners. Previous research focused primarily on broader aspects, such as parental involvement and access to reading materials, without deeply examining the distinct practices within diverse socioeconomic and cultural contexts. For instance, while Dacles (2024) identified a link between home literacy environments and reading levels in older learners, there was limited exploration of how these findings translated specifically to Grade 1 learners, who were at a critical stage of developing foundational reading skills. Furthermore, existing studies like those by Chen (2024), Canonizado (2024), and Nag et al. (2024) emphasized parental attitudes and language practices but did not thoroughly investigate how the quality and type of reading materials or structured literacy routines at home affected the early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners. This gap underscored the need for a comprehensive exploration of various dimensions of the home literacy environment to identify targeted strategies that could enhance early reading skills, thereby informing the development of an enhanced home literacy program tailored to the needs of Grade 1 learners.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study determined the home literacy environments and early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners in Palauig District, Schools Division of Zambales, during the School Year 2024-2025.

Specifically, it sought to answer these questions:

1. How may the profile of the home literacy facilitators be described in terms of:
    1.1. age;
    1.2. sex;
    1.3. civil status;
    1.4. number of children;
    1.5. monthly family income;
    1.6. highest educational attainment; and
    1.7. daily number of hours spent teaching literacy at home?

2. How may the home literacy facilitators' environments be described in terms of:
    2.1. literacy motivation;
    2.2. literacy materials;
    2.3. literacy routines; and
    2.4. literacy support?

3. How may the early reading skill levels of the Grade 1 learners be described in terms of:
    3.1. phonological awareness;
    3.2. phonemic awareness;
    3.3. letter knowledge; and
    3.4. sight word recognition?

4. Is there a significant difference between the home literacy facilitators' environments and their profile when grouped accordingly?

5. Is there a significant correlation between the home literacy facilitators' environment and the early reading skill levels of their Grade 1 learners?

6. What enhanced home literacy program can be developed to improve the home literacy environments and early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners?

3. METHODS AND MATERIALS

This study determined the home literacy environments and early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners in Palauig District, Schools Division of Zambales, during the School Year 2024-2025. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, with data collected, classified, summarized, and analyzed using percentages and means. The study involved 129 home literacy facilitators and 129 Grade 1 learners, utilizing total population sampling to involve all home literacy facilitators and Grade 1 learners on four public elementary schools in Palauig District, Schools Division of Zambales. A researcher-designed questionnaire served as the primary data collection tool, targeting dimensions of the home literacy environments and early reading skills of Grade 1 learners. The instrument demonstrated excellent and acceptable reliability, as confirmed by Cronbach's Alpha values for home literacy environments of facilitators ($\alpha = 0.92$) and early reading skill levels ($\alpha = 0.72$). Statistical analyses, including the Kruskal-Wallis Test and Spearman Rho Correlation, were used to test the study's hypotheses.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
4.1. Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators
4.1.1. Age

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
19 years old and below	10	7.75
20-29 years old	85	65.89
30-39 years old	57	44.19
40-49 years old	5	3.88
50-59 years old	1	0.78
60 years old and above	1	0.78
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 1 illustrates the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on their age. The majority of facilitators (65.89%) fell within the 20-29 age group, followed by the 30-39 age group with 44.19%. The 19 years old and below group represented 7.75%, while those in the 40-49, 50-59, and 60 years old and above categories each accounted for less than 5% of the total.

These findings suggested that home literacy facilitation was predominantly carried out by younger individuals. This potentially indicated a higher engagement from younger generations in supporting literacy initiatives. The results highlighted the significant role that younger facilitators played in educational settings.

In relation to the study of Weldemariam (2022), both studies highlighted the significant involvement of younger adults in educational support roles, reinforcing the trend of younger generations taking active roles in enhancing literacy development. However, the present study offered more specific data on the age distribution, which provided a clearer picture of age-related trends in home literacy facilitation. The comparison underscored the ongoing importance of younger facilitators in educational settings.

4.1.2. Sex

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	19	14.73
Female	110	85.27
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on sex. A significant majority of the facilitators were female, comprising 85.27% of the total, while male facilitators represented only 14.73%.

This indicated a clear gender disparity, with women being the predominant group involved in home literacy facilitation. The findings highlighted the need for strategies to address this imbalance. The results suggested that efforts to engage more male facilitators could be beneficial.

The finding aligned with the results of the previous study by Annisa t al. (2024), which also reported a higher involvement of females in educational support roles. The present study, however, provided more specific data that highlighted the strong representation of women in this

context, which could imply a gendered trend in the availability and participation of home literacy facilitators. This comparison further emphasized the need for more inclusive strategies to engage male facilitators in literacy development activities.

4.1.3. Civil Status
Table 3

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	24	18.60
Married	62	48.06
Cohabitant	38	29.46
Separated	4	3.10
Widow/Widower	1	0.78
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 3 exhibits the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on their civil status. The largest group of facilitators was married, comprising 48.06%, followed by cohabitants at 29.46%. Single facilitators accounted for 18.60%, while separated and widow/widower facilitators made up a smaller proportion, at 3.10% and 0.78%, respectively.

This distribution suggested that home literacy facilitation was most commonly carried out by individuals who were married or in cohabiting relationships. This pointed to a potential correlation between marital status and involvement in home literacy facilitation. The results emphasized the role of social dynamics in influencing facilitators' participation.

The findings of this study were consistent with those of Howell (2022), which also noted a higher proportion of married or cohabiting individuals among literacy facilitators. The present study, however, offered a clearer understanding of civil status variations, which may have reflected different social dynamics and responsibilities influencing participation in literacy programs. This reinforced the need to consider the diverse civil statuses of facilitators in developing targeted strategies for home literacy support.

4.1.4. Number of Children
Table 4

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Number of Children

Number of Children	Frequency	Percentage
No child	21	16.28
1 Child	36	27.91
2 Children	55	42.64
3 Children	16	12.40
6 children and above	1	0.78
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 4 depicts the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on the number of children. The majority of facilitators had 2 children, making up 42.64% of the total, followed by those with 1 child at 27.91%. Facilitators with no children represented

16.28%, while those with 3 children accounted for 12.40%. A very small percentage, 0.78%, had 6 or more children.

This suggested that most home literacy facilitators had fewer children, with a notable proportion having two children. The findings indicated that facilitators with smaller family sizes might have more time and resources to engage in literacy facilitation. This pointed to a potential link between family size and a facilitator's ability to participate in literacy activities.

In comparison to the study of Huda and Haenilah (2024), the present study provided specific insights into the family dynamics of literacy facilitators. Both studies indicated that facilitators with fewer children were more likely to engage in literacy facilitation, which could have been due to the manageable responsibilities at home. This further emphasized the potential influence of family size on a facilitator's capacity and involvement in literacy activities.

4.1.5. Monthly Family Income
Table 5

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Monthly Family Income

Monthly Family Income	Frequency	Percentage
P19,000 and below	100	77.52
P20,000 to P39,999	25	19.38
P40,000 to P59,999	2	1.55
P60,000 to P79,999	1	0.78
P120,000 and above	1	0.78
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 5 summarizes the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on monthly family income. The majority of facilitators, 77.52%, had a monthly family income of P19,000 and below, while 19.38% fell within the P20,000 to P39,999 range. A small proportion of facilitators earned higher incomes, with 1.55% in the P40,000 to P59,999 range, and only 1 facilitator each in the P60,000 to P79,999 and P120,000 and above categories.

This indicated that most home literacy facilitators came from lower-income families. The findings suggested that financial constraints might play a role in the availability of facilitators for literacy programs. This also pointed to the need for support and resources to encourage participation from individuals in lower-income groups.

This finding was consistent with the study by Ndou (2023), which also highlighted that a significant number of literacy facilitators belonged to lower-income groups. The present study provided more detailed income brackets, reflecting the financial context in which facilitators operated. The comparison suggested that economic factors may have influenced the availability and participation of individuals in home literacy facilitation programs, particularly for those from lower-income backgrounds.

4.1.6. Highest Educational Attainment

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Did Not Attend Schooling	1	0.78
Elementary Undergraduate	2	1.55
Elementary Graduate	7	5.43
High School Graduate	70	54.26
College Graduate	46	35.66
MA Graduate	3	2.33
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 6 highlights the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on their highest educational attainment. The largest group of facilitators, 54.26%, were high school graduates, followed by college graduates at 35.66%. Elementary graduates represented 5.43%, while 2.33% held a Master's degree. A small number of facilitators had not attended school (0.78%) or were elementary undergraduates (1.55%).

This indicated that most home literacy facilitators had completed at least high school education, with a significant proportion having college education. The findings suggested that educational attainment played an important role in the ability of individuals to engage in and support home literacy initiatives.

The findings of this study aligned with those of Wirza et al. (2023), which also indicated that a majority of facilitators had completed secondary or higher education. The present study provided a more detailed breakdown of educational attainment, showing a notable number of facilitators with higher education levels. This suggested that educational background contributed significantly to the capacity of individuals to participate in and support home literacy initiatives.

4.1.7. Daily Number of Hours Spent Teaching Literacy at Home
Table 7

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Profile of Home Literacy Facilitators in terms of Daily Number of Hours Spent Teaching Literacy at Home

Daily Number of Hours Spent Teaching Literacy at Home	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1.0 hour	105	81.40
1.0 to 1.9 hours	15	11.63
2.0 to 2.9 hours	5	3.88
3.0 to 3.9 hours	4	3.10
Total	**129**	**100.00**

Table 7 outlines the frequency and percentage distribution of home literacy facilitators based on the daily number of hours spent teaching literacy at home. The majority of facilitators, 81.40%, spent less than 1 hour per day on literacy activities, while 11.63% spent between 1.0 to 1.9 hours. A smaller percentage, 3.88%, spent 2.0 to 2.9 hours, and only 3.10% of facilitators dedicated 3.0 to 3.9 hours per day.

This suggested that most home literacy facilitators allocated limited time for literacy activities on a daily basis. The findings pointed to time constraints as a significant factor affecting

the amount of time facilitators could dedicate to literacy instruction. This highlighted the need to maximize the impact of the limited time available for literacy activities.

The findings were consistent with those of Wright et al. (2023), which also observed limited time commitment among facilitators in terms of daily hours spent on literacy instruction. The present study provided a clearer view of the time distribution, reinforcing the notion that while facilitators may have been committed to literacy development, the time available for such activities was often constrained. This comparison highlighted the importance of optimizing the limited time spent on literacy activities for more effective outcomes.

4.2. Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments
4.2.1. Literacy Motivation
Table 8

Mean Rating and Interpretations of Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments in terms of Literacy Motivation

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	*I read stories to my learner every night to keep their interest in reading.*	3.60	Always Helpful
2	*I give praise when my learner reads well to make them enjoy reading.*	3.69	Always Helpful
3	*I help my learner choose books they want to read.*	3.57	Always Helpful
4	*I ask my learner questions about what they are reading to boost their interest.*	3.64	Always Helpful
5	*I take time to talk about their favorite books and stories.*	3.57	Always Helpful
6	*I give new books as gifts to encourage my learner to read.*	3.57	Always Helpful
7	*I encourage my learner to read with their siblings or friends to make reading more enjoyable.*	3.68	Always Helpful
8	*I help my learner when they struggle with difficult words in their reading.*	3.64	Always Helpful
9	*I reward my learner when they finish reading a book to motivate them to read more.*	3.71	Always Helpful
10	*I share stories from my own experiences to make my learner more interested in reading.*	3.67	Always Helpful
	General Mean Rating	**3.63**	**Always Helpful**

The findings in Table 8 detail the mean ratings and interpretations of home literacy facilitators' environments in terms of literacy motivation. The ratings ranged from 3.57 to 3.71, with all indicators falling under the "Always Helpful" interpretation. The general mean rating of 3.63 affirmed that the overall support provided by the facilitators was consistently viewed as highly beneficial in fostering literacy motivation. This suggested that the home literacy environment,

characterized by active engagement and encouragement from the facilitators, had a positive and impactful role in motivating learners to engage in reading activities.

Among the various indicators, the item "I rewarded my learner when they finished reading a book to motivate them to read more" received the highest mean rating of 3.71. This indicated that the use of rewards was perceived as particularly effective in motivating learners to continue their reading activities. This finding suggested that home literacy facilitators found positive reinforcement, such as rewards, to be a powerful tool in maintaining the learner's interest and enthusiasm for reading. It implied that the strategy of rewarding learners for completing a reading task contributed to sustaining their motivation over time.

The present study aligned with the findings of Lima and Barreira (2022), which emphasized the importance of external motivators in literacy development. Both studies highlighted how rewards and praise influenced learners' attitudes toward reading. The current study's results supported Lima and Barreira's (2022) conclusions, underscoring the role of positive reinforcement in enhancing reading motivation.

4.2.2. Literacy Materials
Table 9

Mean Rating and Interpretations of Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments in terms of Literacy Materials

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	*I provide books with pictures to help my learner read.*	3.63	Always Helpful
2	*I place colorful educational materials at home to make learning enjoyable for my learner.*	3.63	Always Helpful
3	*I make sure there are different types of books at home, such as stories, myths, and educational books.*	3.60	Always Helpful
4	*I offer practice materials to help my learner develop reading skills.*	3.69	Always Helpful
5	*I show flashcards to improve my learner's knowledge of words and letters.*	3.60	Always Helpful
6	*I collect books and educational toys at home to foster interest in reading.*	3.62	Always Helpful
7	*I display materials with large letters to help my learner recognize letters.*	3.60	Always Helpful
8	*I work with my learner to organize reading materials, such as books and pictures.*	3.62	Always Helpful
9	*I provide lightweight and easy-to-handle materials for my learner to be comfortable while reading.*	3.65	Always Helpful
10	*I rotate new books and materials at home to keep reading fresh and interesting for my learner.*	3.55	Always Helpful
	General Mean Rating	**3.62**	**Always Helpful**

The findings in Table 9 provide the mean ratings and interpretations of home literacy facilitators' environments in terms of literacy materials. The ratings ranged from 3.55 to 3.69, with all indicators falling under the "Always Helpful" interpretation. The general mean rating of 3.62 suggested that the home literacy materials provided by the facilitators were consistently viewed as beneficial in supporting learners' reading development, emphasizing the positive impact of various types of reading materials in fostering literacy.

The item "I offer practice materials to help my learner develop reading skills" received the highest mean rating of 3.69. This indicated that the use of practice materials was considered particularly effective in supporting the development of reading skills. This finding suggested that home literacy facilitators found focused and purposeful practice materials to be essential in helping learners improve their reading abilities, highlighting the importance of targeted resources in enhancing literacy.

The present study aligned with the findings of Ginting et al. (2021), which emphasized the role of diverse literacy materials in supporting reading development. Both studies highlighted the importance of using a variety of materials, such as books, flashcards, and educational toys, to engage learners. The current study's results reinforced Ginting et al.'s (2021) conclusions, underscoring the significance of providing an array of literacy materials to stimulate and sustain learners' interest in reading.

4.2.3. Literacy Routines
Table 10

Mean Rating and Interpretations of Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments in terms of Literacy Routines

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I set aside time to read with my learner every day.	3.67	Always Helpful
2	I provide age-appropriate books for my learner to read.	3.63	Always Helpful
3	I read stories before bedtime to engage my learner.	3.63	Always Helpful
4	I ask questions about the story to deepen my learner's understanding.	3.67	Always Helpful
5	I incorporate reading activities, such as coloring pictures and saying words, while we read.	3.68	Always Helpful
6	I place books in visible areas to encourage my learner's interest in reading.	3.64	Always Helpful
7	I give praise and encouragement whenever I see my learner reading or practicing new words.	3.74	Always Helpful
8	I have regular conversations about books and stories to expand my learner's vocabulary.	3.59	Always Helpful
9	I use simple word games or exercises from the story to make learning easier for my learner.	3.68	Always Helpful

| 10 | I make sure that our reading time is fun and interactive to keep my learner interested in reading. | 3.70 | Always Helpful |
| | **General Mean Rating** | **3.66** | **Always Helpful** |

The findings in Table 10 feature the mean ratings and interpretations of home literacy facilitators' environments in terms of literacy routines. The ratings ranged from 3.59 to 3.74, with all indicators falling under the "Always Helpful" interpretation. The general mean rating of 3.66 suggested that the literacy routines established by the facilitators were consistently viewed as highly beneficial in supporting the development of reading habits, emphasizing the significance of daily engagement in reading activities.

The item "I give praise and encouragement whenever I see my learner reading or practicing new words" received the highest mean rating of 3.74. This indicated that providing praise and encouragement was seen as particularly effective in motivating learners to engage in reading and language practice. This finding suggested that home literacy facilitators found positive reinforcement to be a powerful strategy in maintaining learners' interest in reading, highlighting the role of emotional support in fostering reading motivation.

The present study aligned with the findings of Ren et al. (2022), which emphasized the importance of consistent routines and reinforcement in developing reading skills. Both studies highlighted the value of praise, encouragement, and structured reading time as essential elements in fostering a strong reading habit. The current study's results reinforced Ren et al.'s (2022) conclusions, underscoring the significance of regular literacy routines in creating an environment conducive to sustained reading development.

4.2.4. Literacy Support
Table 11

Mean Rating and Interpretations of Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments in terms of Literacy Support

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I help my learner read new words from their textbooks.	3.67	Always Helpful
2	I provide extra time for my learner to practice reading every day.	3.66	Always Helpful
3	I read stories aloud to help my learner understand the correct pronunciation of words.	3.62	Always Helpful
4	I assist my learner in finding simple books that they can read independently.	3.66	Always Helpful
5	I provide support when my learner struggles to understand what they are reading.	3.64	Always Helpful
6	I write simple words or sentences for my learner to read and repeat.	3.57	Always Helpful
7	I listen and give positive feedback whenever my learner reads.	3.66	Always Helpful

8	I teach my learner the proper way to track words with their finger while reading.	3.61	Always Helpful
9	I encourage my learner to ask questions if there are words or parts of the story they do not understand.	3.64	Always Helpful
10	I teach spelling and pronunciation skills of new words to expand my learner's knowledge.	3.67	Always Helpful
	General Mean Rating	**3.64**	**Always Helpful**

The findings in Table 11 analyze the mean ratings and interpretations of home literacy facilitators' environments in terms of literacy support. The ratings ranged from 3.57 to 3.67, with all indicators falling under the "Always Helpful" interpretation. The general mean rating of 3.64 suggested that the support provided by the facilitators was consistently viewed as highly beneficial in assisting learners with their reading development, underscoring the importance of continuous guidance and assistance in fostering literacy skills.

The item "I help my learner read new words from their textbooks" received the highest mean rating of 3.67. This indicated that direct assistance with reading new words was considered particularly effective in supporting learners' reading abilities. This finding suggested that home literacy facilitators found providing hands-on support with reading textbooks to be essential in improving learners' understanding of new words and enhancing their overall literacy skills.

The present study aligned with the findings of Denessen (2023), which emphasized the critical role of supportive interventions in literacy development. Both studies highlighted the importance of active assistance, such as providing time for practice and offering help with reading comprehension, in enhancing learners' reading abilities. The current study's results reinforced Denessen's (2023) conclusions, emphasizing that consistent and focused literacy support from facilitators was key to improving learners' reading proficiency.

4.3. Early Reading Skill Levels of the Grade 1 Learners
Table 12

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Early Reading Skill Levels of the Grade 1 Learners

Early Reading Skill Levels	Mean	Interpretation
Phonological Awareness	3.56	Advanced Early Reading Skills
Phonemic Awareness	3.56	Advanced Early Reading Skills
Letter Knowledge	3.62	Advanced Early Reading Skills
Sight Word Recognition	3.44	Advanced Early Reading Skills
General Mean Rating	**3.54**	**Advanced Early Reading Skills**

Table 12 examines the mean and interpretations of the early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners. The table showed that the learners demonstrated advanced early reading skills in all areas assessed, with phonological awareness and phonemic awareness each having a mean of 3.56, letter knowledge at 3.62, and sight word recognition at 3.44. The general mean rating for all skills combined was 3.54, indicating that the learners performed at an advanced level in early reading skills.

The findings suggested that Grade 1 learners exhibited strong early reading skills across various dimensions. This implied that the learners were well-prepared in foundational areas such

as phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and sight word recognition. The advanced skill levels indicated that early interventions and literacy support had been effective, leading to the development of these essential skills at an early stage in their academic journey. The results also highlighted the importance of fostering these early skills, which were critical for future reading success.

In relation to the study by Talwar et al. (2022), the present study aligned with the finding that early reading skill development played a vital role in the academic performance of young learners. Both studies underscored the significance of developing phonological and phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and sight word recognition at an early age. The present study, however, provided more specific data on the advanced skill levels of Grade 1 learners, offering a clearer picture of the learners' readiness for more complex reading tasks. This comparison reinforced the value of early literacy programs in supporting the academic growth of young learners.

4.4. Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile
4.4.1. Age
Table 13

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Age

Groups	H	df	p	Decision
19 years old and below	5.14	5	.399	Accept H_{01}
20-29 years old				(Not Significant)
30-39 years old				
40-49 years old				
50-59 years old				
60 years old and above				

The data in Table 13 explore the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their age.

The test statistic (H) was 5.14, with 5 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of .399. Since the p-value exceeded the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments among the different age groups.

The results suggested that the age of the home literacy facilitators did not have a significant impact on the quality of the home literacy environment. Whether the facilitator was 19 years old and below, 20-29 years old, 30-39 years old, 40-49 years old, 50-59 years old, or 60 years old and above, the literacy environments provided were not significantly different.

These findings were consistent with Skwarchuk et al. (2022), who similarly found no significant differences in home literacy environments based on the age of the facilitators. Skwarchuk et al. (2022) emphasized that factors such as the facilitator's level of commitment, knowledge, and available resources had a more considerable impact on the literacy environment than the facilitator's age, a conclusion mirrored by the current study.

4.4.2. Sex
Table 14

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Sex

Groups	H	df	p	Decision
Male	.50	1	.479	Accept H_{01}
Female				(Not Significant)

The data in Table 14 delineate the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their sex.

The test statistic (H) was 0.50, with 1 degree of freedom (df) and a p-value of .479. Since the p-value exceeded the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments between male and female facilitators.

The results suggested that the sex of the facilitator did not significantly influence the quality of the home literacy environment. Whether the facilitator was male or female, the overall support provided in the home literacy environment appeared to be similar.

The findings were in line with Van Steensel et al. (2022), who similarly found no significant differences in home literacy environments based on the sex of the facilitator. Van Steensel et al. (2022) emphasized that factors such as the facilitator's level of engagement and consistency in providing literacy activities were more influential than sex in determining the effectiveness of the home literacy environment, a conclusion supported by the present study.

4.4.3. Civil Status

Table 14

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Civil Status

Groups	H	df	p	Decision
Single	2.02	4	.733	Accept H_{01}
Married				(Not Significant)
Cohabitant				
Separated				
Widow/Widower				

The data in Table 14 outline the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their civil status.

The test statistic (H) was 2.02, with 4 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of .733. Since the p-value exceeded the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments among the groups based on their civil status.

The results suggested that the quality of the home literacy environment did not vary significantly among facilitators who were single, married, cohabitant, separated, or

widow/widower. This finding implied that civil status was not a determining factor in the ability of home literacy facilitators to provide a conducive literacy environment for learners.

The findings were consistent with Sonnenschein et al. (2021), who found no significant differences in home literacy environments based on civil status. Sonnenschein et al. (2021) highlighted those factors such as the commitment to literacy and the availability of resources for engaging in literacy activities had a greater impact on the quality of the home literacy environment than the civil status of the facilitator, a conclusion supported by the present study.

4.4.4. Number of Children
Table 15

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Number of Children

Groups	H	df	P	Decision
No child	2.25	4	.690	Accept H_{01}
1 Child				(Not Significant)
2 Children				
3 Children				
6 children and above				

The data in Table 15 interpret the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their number of children.

The test statistic (H) was 2.25, with 4 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of .690. Since the p-value exceeded the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments among the groups based on their number of children.

The results suggested that the quality of the home literacy environment did not vary significantly whether facilitators had no child, 1 child, 2 children, 3 children, or 6 children and above. This finding implied that the number of children did not have a considerable impact on the facilitators' ability to create supportive literacy environments at home.

The findings aligned with Ranzato et al. (2022), who similarly found no significant differences in literacy environments when analyzed by family size. Ranzato et al. (2022) emphasized that the commitment to literacy practices and the allocation of time for individual learners were more critical factors in shaping the home literacy environment than the number of children, a conclusion supported by the present study.

4.4.5. Monthly Family Income
Table 16

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Monthly Family Income

Groups	H	df	p	Decision
P19,000 and below	8.41	4	.078	Accept H_{01}
P20,000 to P39,999				(Not Significant)
P40,000 to P59,999				
P60,000 to P79,999				
P120,000 and above				

The data in Table 16 display the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their monthly family income.

The test statistic (H) was 8.41, with 4 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of .078. Since the p-value exceeded the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments among the groups based on their monthly family income.

The findings suggested that the quality of home literacy environments was not significantly influenced by the facilitators' monthly family income, whether they earned P19,000 and below, P20,000 to P39,999, P40,000 to P59,999, P60,000 to P79,999, or P120,000 and above. This result implied that regardless of income level, facilitators provided relatively comparable literacy environments to support learners.

The findings were consistent with Goodrich et al. (2021), who found no significant differences in literacy environments based on family income levels. Goodrich et al. (2021) highlighted that intrinsic factors, such as parental engagement and the prioritization of literacy activities, had a more substantial impact on the quality of home literacy environments than economic status, a conclusion mirrored by the present study.

4.4.6. Highest Educational Attainment
Table 17

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Groups	H	df	P	Decision
Did Not Attend Schooling	4.49	5	.482	Accept H_{01} (Not Significant)
Elementary Undergraduate				
Elementary Graduate				
High School Graduate				
College Graduate				
MA Graduate				

The data in Table 17 illustrate the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their highest educational attainment.

The test statistic (H) was 4.49, with 5 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of .482. Since the p-value was greater than the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments among the groups based on their highest educational attainment.

The results suggested that the highest level of educational attainment, whether it was "Did Not Attend Schooling," "Elementary Undergraduate," "Elementary Graduate," "High School Graduate," "College Graduate," or "MA Graduate," did not significantly impact the quality of the home literacy environment. The facilitators across all educational levels provided relatively comparable literacy environments.

The findings aligned with those of Elliott et al. (2021), who similarly reported no significant differences in home literacy environments when analyzed by educational attainment. Elliott et al. (2021) emphasized that other factors, such as motivation and involvement in literacy practices, played a more critical role than formal education in shaping the literacy environment, a conclusion supported by the current study.

4.4.7. Daily Number of Hours Spent Teaching Literacy at Home
Table 18

Difference Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and Their Profile in terms of Daily Number of Hours Spent Teaching Literacy at Home

Groups	H	df	P	Decision
Less than 1.0 hour	3.45	3	.328	Accept H_{01}
1.0 to 1.9 hours				(Not Significant)
2.0 to 2.9 hours				
3.0 to 3.9 hours				

The data in Table 18 show the results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test, which was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments based on their daily number of hours spent teaching literacy at home.

The test statistic (H) was 3.45, with 3 degrees of freedom (df) and a p-value of .328. Since the p-value exceeded the significance threshold of .05, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was accepted. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the home literacy facilitators' environments among the groups based on their daily number of hours spent teaching literacy at home.

The results suggested that the amount of time spent teaching literacy at home did not significantly impact the overall quality of the home literacy environment. Regardless of whether facilitators spent less than 1.0 hour or up to 3.9 hours daily on literacy instruction, their environments appeared to provide similar levels of support.

These findings aligned with those of Turco et al. (2022), who also found no significant variations in home literacy environments based on the time spent by facilitators on literacy-related activities. Turco et al. (2022) emphasized that other factors, such as the quality of interaction and available resources, played a more pivotal role in influencing the literacy environment, a conclusion consistent with the present study.

4.5. Correlation Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and the Early Reading Skill Levels of Grade 1 Learners
Table 19

Correlation Between Home Literacy Facilitators' Environments and the Early Reading Skill Levels of Grade 1 Learners

Dependent Variables	r	p	Interpretation		Decision
Phonological Awareness	.57	.000	Positive Correlation	Moderate	Reject H_{02} (Significant)
Phonemic Awareness	.57	.000	Positive Correlation	Moderate	Reject H_{02} (Significant)

Letter Knowledge	.58	.000	Positive Correlation	Moderate	Reject H_{02} (Significant)
Sight Word Recognition	.55	.000	Positive Correlation	Moderate	Reject H_{02} (Significant)
Overall	**.59**	**.000**	**Positive Correlation**	**Moderate**	**Reject H_{02} (Significant)**

The data in Table 19 highlight the correlation between home literacy facilitators' environments and the early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners, using Spearman's Rho Correlation Coefficient to analyze the relationships.

The correlation coefficient (r) values indicated a positive moderate correlation across all dependent variables: phonological awareness (r = .57, p = .000), phonemic awareness (r = .57, p = .000), letter knowledge (r = .58, p = .000), and sight word recognition (r = .55, p = .000). These results implied that as the quality of home literacy facilitators' environments improved, there was a moderate increase in learners' corresponding reading skill levels. The p-values for all variables were less than .05, confirming statistical significance. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_{02}), which posited no significant relationship between these variables, was rejected.

The overall correlation (r = .59, p = .000) reinforced these findings, demonstrating that improvements in the home literacy environment were moderately associated with enhancements in early reading skill levels. Spearman's Rho Correlation Coefficient highlighted the consistency of this relationship, emphasizing the significant role of home literacy facilitators in shaping early literacy development.

These findings aligned with Georgiou et al. (2021), who utilized similar methods and concluded that supportive home literacy environments significantly influenced foundational reading skills. The current study affirmed and extended Georgiou et al.'s (2021) findings, emphasizing the necessity of fostering comprehensive home literacy practices to advance early reading outcomes.

4.6. An Enhanced Home Literacy Program to Improve the Home Literacy Environments and Early Reading Skill Levels of Grade 1 Learners

Enhanced home literacy programs are essential for developing learners' foundational skills, yet challenges such as limited diversity, insufficient resources, and repetitive routines hinder their effectiveness. This study proposes solutions like inclusive recruitment, innovative teaching strategies, and tailored interventions to empower facilitators and promote equitable learning opportunities. Addressing gender imbalances, financial limitations, and time constraints through targeted support—such as stipends, flexible schedules, and specialized training—enhances facilitators' teaching capacity. Additionally, structured schedules, capacity-building sessions, and diverse literacy kits foster engaging learning environments while accommodating learners' varied needs. Strengthening community partnerships and providing ongoing training ensure the long-term success and sustainability of enhanced home literacy programs.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. The home literacy facilitators were in the age bracket of 20–29 years old, predominantly female, married, had two children, came from families with a monthly income of P19,999 or below, were high school graduates, and spent less than an hour teaching literacy at home.

2. The home literacy facilitators' environments consistently provided support in terms of literacy motivation, literacy materials, literacy routines, and literacy assistance.

3. The Grade 1 learners demonstrated advanced early reading skills in phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and sight word recognition.

4. There was no significant difference between the home literacy facilitators' environments and their profiles in terms of age, sex, civil status, number of children, monthly family income, highest educational attainment, and daily hours spent teaching literacy at home.

5. A positive moderate significant correlation was found between home literacy facilitators' environments and the early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners in terms of phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, letter knowledge, and sight word recognition. The p-values were less than the 0.05 significance level, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

6. An enhanced home literacy program was developed to improve the home literacy environments and early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The home literacy facilitators should be provided with additional training and support to enhance their teaching effectiveness, particularly for those spending less than an hour teaching literacy at home.

2. The home literacy facilitators should continue to be supported with literacy materials, routines, and motivation, with efforts to expand these environments to encourage more active and diverse literacy activities.

3. The Grade 1 learners should be continuously monitored and provided with advanced literacy challenges to further build on their already strong early reading skills.

4. It should be explored whether other factors, beyond those currently studied, may influence the home literacy environments, with tailored support based on relevant characteristics such as teaching experience or cultural background.

5. Since a significant correlation was found, it is recommended that more emphasis be placed on enhancing home literacy environments to improve early reading skills.

6. The enhanced home literacy program should be implemented and regularly evaluated to assess its effectiveness in improving both the home literacy environment and the early reading skill levels of Grade 1 learners.

7. Further studies on the long-term impact of home literacy environments on the reading skills of Grade 1 learners should be conducted, exploring the influence of additional variables like parental involvement and digital literacy tools.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

instrumental in shaping the direction of this research. Special thanks are extended to John Harries L. Rillon, EdD, Master Teacher I of San Felipe Elementary School (East); Rica F. Sanchez, EdD, Master Teacher I of Sagpat Elementary School; and Quencess Honeyshaine A. De Jesus, EdD, and Shiela Mae F. Fuñe, PhD, both Teacher III at Sto. Niño Elementary School in the San Felipe District, Schools Division of Zambales, for their invaluable assistance in validating the research questionnaire. Recognition is also due to Isagani C. Canonizado, PhD, School Principal IV of Sto. Niño Elementary School, San Felipe District, Schools Division of Zambales, for graciously allowing the pilot testing of the research questionnaire. The unyielding support and constant assistance of the researcher's family, including Rodrigo G. Dalit, Merlina F. Dalit, Liezl D. Guzman, Rodrigo F. Dalit Jr., and Leny D. Romero, have been indispensable throughout this academic endeavor. Special gratitude is expressed to the researcher's supportive husband, Joseph B. Eclarinal, and son, Carl Levi D. Eclarinal, for their unwavering encouragement and support.

REFERENCES

Annisa, F. A., Nisa, S., & Suriani, A. (2024). Analysis of Parental Support and Role in Elementary School Age Literacy Learning. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Science and Technology*, *3*(2), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.55927/nurture.v3i2.9479

Canonizado, I. C. (2024). Reading instruction practices of intermediate teachers and comprehension levels of learners: Basis for an enhanced reading instruction program. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, *07*(06), 649–671. https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2024.0869

Canonizado, M. J. S. (2024). Learning support at home and learning outcomes of primary grade learners in private schools. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, *07*(06), 421–444. https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2024.0856

Chen, Q. (2024). The importance of home literacy environments in terms of children's reading attitudes: A study of Chinese Grade 5 students. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, *8*(1), 144–151. https://doi.org/10.54097/fyfse108

Dacles, N. N. (2024). Home learning environments and reading levels of grade 4 learners: Bases for enhanced home-based reading program. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, *07*(03), 344–371. https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2024.0720

Denessen, E. (2023). Perspectives on parents' contribution to their children's early literacy development in multicultural western societies. *International Journal About Parents in Education*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.54195/ijpe.18272

Elliott, L., Zheng, P., & Libertus, M. (2021). Individual differences in parental support for numeracy and literacy in early childhood. *Education Sciences*, *11*(9), 541. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11090541

Georgiou, G. K., Inoue, T., & Parrila, R. (2021). Developmental relations between home literacy environment, reading interest, and reading skills: evidence from a 3-Year longitudinal study. *Child Development*, *92*(5), 2053–2068. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13589

Ginting, M. M. B., Solin, M., & Hadi, W. (2021). Development of children's literature reading materials to support SDN 028228 Binjai student literacy activities. *Britain International of Linguistics Arts and Education (BIoLAE) Journal*, *3*(1), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v3i1.415

Goodrich, J. M., Lonigan, C. J., Phillips, B. M., Farver, J. M., & Wilson, K. D. (2021). Influences of the home language and literacy environment on Spanish and English vocabulary growth

among dual language learners. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *57*, 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.05.002

Howell, K. (2022). The learning support coordinator's role in supporting inclusive literacy practice. *Kairaranga*, *23*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.54322/kairaranga.v23i1.280

Huda, T. A., & Haenilah, E. Y. (2024). The positive role of parents and family in home-based literacy: An Integrative Review. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research*, *2*(2), 42–59. https://doi.org/10.31004/ijim.v2i2.79

Lee, J., & Moussa, W. (2024). The role of home environments in children's literacy skills in Ghana: Parents, siblings, and books. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *107*, 103037. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.103037

Lima, A. A., & Barreira, M. M. L. (2022). Motivation in Jerome Bruner's Theory of Instruction and Early Childhood Literacy. *Revista FSA, 19*(5), 160–181. https://doi.org/10.12819/2022.19.5.9

Lutale, A., Mubiru, F., Nkumbi, J., & Mugimu, C. (2024). Home-based Factors Associated with Competencies in Literacy Among Learners in Primary Three and Four in Uganda. *Journal of Education and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/15-5-08

Nag, S., Vagh, S. B., Dulay, K. M., Snowling, M., Donolato, E., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2024). Home learning environments and children's language and literacy skills: A meta-analytic review of studies conducted in low- and middle-income countries. *Psychological Bulletin*, *150*(2), 132–153. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000417

Ndou, A. (2023). The moderator effect of socioeconomic status on the relationship between parental financial teaching and financial literacy. *International Journal of Applied Economics Finance and Accounting*, *17*(2), 219–227. https://doi.org/10.33094/ijaefa.v17i2.1110

Ranzato, E., Tolmie, A., & Van Herwegen, J. (2021). The Home Learning Environment of Primary School Children with Down Syndrome and Those with Williams Syndrome. *Brain Sciences*, *11*(6), 733. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci11060733

Ren, L., Boise, C., & Cheung, R. Y. (2022). Consistent routines matter: Child routines mediated the association between interparental functioning and school readiness. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *61*, 145–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2022.07.002

Skwarchuk, S., Douglas, H., Cahoon, A., LeFevre, J., Xu, C., Roy, E., Simms, V., Wylie, J., Maloney, E. A., Osana, H. P., & Susperreguy, M. I. (2022). Relations between the Home Learning Environment and the Literacy and Mathematics Skills of Eight-Year-Old Canadian Children. *Education Sciences*, *12*(8), 513. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12080513

Sonnenschein, S., Stites, M., & Ross, A. (2021). Home learning environments for young children in the U.S. during COVID-19. *Early Education and Development*, *32*(6), 794–811. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2021.1943282

Talwar, A., Magliano, J. P., Higgs, K., Santuzzi, A., Tonks, S., O'Reilly, T., & Sabatini, J. (2022). Early academic success in college: examining the contributions of reading literacy skills, metacognitive reading strategies, and reading motivation. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *53*(1), 58–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2022.2137069

Tanaka, S., & Takeuchi, O. (2024). Sociocultural influences on young Japanese English learners: The impact of parents' beliefs on learning motivation. *Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning*, *6*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.52598/jpll/6/1/3

Turco, R. G., Lesaux, N. K., & Jones, S. M. (2022). Home literacy in the digital era: The role of mobile screen media frequency in a U.S. state. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(2), 513–533. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13259

Van Steensel, R., Gouw, B., Liefers, S., & Van Aspert, T. (2022). Cognitively challenging talk during shared reading: Effects of parent gender, child gender and relations with story comprehension. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *24*(4), 839–861. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984221082240

Volodina, A., Lehrl, S., & Weinert, S. (2024). The impact of early home learning environment and preschool quality on School-Relevant Language Proficiency in Primary School. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *38*(3), 502–525. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2023.2301102

Weldemariam, K. (2022). The home literacy environment as a venue for fostering bilingualism and biliteracy: The case of an Ethio-Norwegian bilingual family in oslo, Norway. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 146879842211094. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984221109415

Wirza, Y., Gunawan, W., Setyaningsih, A. T., Ramdani, S. A., Hanipah, H., Aufa, F. L., & Edelweis, S. L. (2023). Improving under-resourced secondary school teachers' literacy instruction: An interventional ethnographic study. *International Journal of Education*, *16*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v16i1.42074

Wright, T. S., Bruner, L., Cummings, A., & Strunk, K. O. (2023). Understanding K-3 teachers' literacy instructional practices during the Pandemic-Impacted 2020–2021 school Year. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *59*(1), 124–146. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.523

Yuan, H., Kleemans, T., & Segers, E. (2023). The role of the traditional and digital home literacy environment in Chinese Kindergartners' language and early literacy. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *67*, 67–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2023.11.009

Zakiah, H. M., & Sukmandari, Y. (2024). The Problems of Reading Literacy Skills of Elementary School Students. *TSAQOFAH*, *4*(2), 1246–1257. https://doi.org/10.58578/tsaqofah.v4i2.2680