Assessment of the Academic Performance of the University Grade School Preschoolers, 2012-2013
University of Bohol, Tagbilaran City

PETE ROSELYN L. GULAY
peteroselyn@ymail.com
ORCID ID NO: 0000-0001-8666-0947

LEAH WILFREDA ECHAVEZ-PILONGO
echavezleah@gmail.com
ORCID ID. NO: 0000-0001-6380-1831

ABSTRACT

Pre-elementary Education caters distinct educational program designed for ages three to six as preparation for formal primary education. This study aimed to assess on the school readiness of its current pre-elementary graders and validate how effective the implementation of its curriculum. The study is descriptive by nature as it sought to describe the present status of the incoming grade 1 pupils of UB, University Grade School. To ensure reliability and validity in the measurements, the researcher made use of the standard competencies for the school readiness assessment from the Department of Education and formulated questions based on those skills and competencies. One-sample t-test of significant difference – for comparing the 1st and 2nd readiness assessment of the respondents and Pearson Product-moment of Correlation as statistical treatments for testing possible correlation between the academic performance and the readiness assessment scores of the respondents. The results show higher percentage of respondents are under proficient and advanced levels of proficiency. Pearson r shows that the academic performance and school readiness assessment results were correlated and that that the first and second readiness assessment had no significant difference. It can be inferred that the assessment tool as well as the process of conducting the test were very reliable for it shows consistent results.
INTRODUCTION

Pre-elementary Education caters distinct educational program designed for ages three to six as preparation for formal primary education. The preschoolers are exposed to varied learning experiences as rudiments of reading, writing, pronouncing, classifying, and reasoning. Education has an immense impact in the society and sets the direction as an essential wheel that drives the economic and social development in all countries.

In line with this premise, the University Grade School offers Pre-elementary Education as part of its basic education curriculum. It aligns its program on the University of Bohol’s trinity of virtues, to name, scholarship, character and service. Through the years, it crafted its philosophy and objectives allied with the vision of the university on transforming lives for a great future. It aims to educate the child for life by developing his/her innate talents in different aspects of an intelligent and dynamic life. The Pre-elementary Level was formally opened last June 1967. It aims to develop readiness of preschoolers to enter elementary education with ease and confidence. Its profoundness needs to be further defined at present, all the more that there is a paradigm shift of the educational genre of the Philippines that needs to adopt the K to 12 to pace up with the rest of the countries in the world, thus, making the graduates be at par with the global standards. In this direction, the government pursued efforts that require public schools and private institutions align the programs and curriculum of pre-school education. This ensured grade 1 enrollees with the needed competencies in the competencies of reading, writing and other skills expected upon entry into elementary education.

As basis for quality and standards of instruction, it aligns subjects taught according to the competencies stressed in assessment among children who are entrants of Grade 1. The University Grade School should go beyond the minimum requirement set
by DepEd to make its curriculum sturdy and robust to be at par with the global standards.

The researchers saw the need to conduct a study on school readiness of its current pre-elementary graders and validate how effective the implementation of its curriculum in the hope that if there are problems within this area that will be identified, intervention program will be proposed.

**Theoretical Background**

Early childhood education has a strong theoretical foundation in educational and developmental psychology. The competencies that preschoolers need to undergo is heavily supported by some cognitive, constructivist and psychosocial development theories that made great number of references to education and teaching to early childhood education and preschool education. It sets the groundwork for forthcoming learning and understanding across all areas of the curriculum. Without this foundation, children will have a hard time in passing the minimum requirement in all academic areas.

Erik Erikson (1982) in his Theory of Psychosocial Development classifies preschool years between three to five years as Initiative vs. Guilt stage. On this stage, children start to characterize exploratory and investigative tendencies as an outcome of meeting and accepting challenges. Children begin and complete their own actions for a particular purpose in mind. When given the opportunity, they initiate activities with peers, thus, develop the sense of initiative, a foundation of leadership roles. The downside happens when adults are not encouraging children to initiate activities, through criticism and crippling control, the sense of guilt develops (Erikson, 2002).

As Piaget pointed out in his Cognitive Development Theory, ages 3-6, lack the concept of operation and they are egocentric and the reasoning process is perception bound. Children have the tendency to fail in coordinating information on states and transformations (Piaget, 1980).

In this particular stage, the child has limitations in his/her thinking, identifying a number of mental tasks. Understandably, they are still unable to decenter, conserve, conceptualize seriation which is the inability to understand that objects can be organized into a logical series or order, and lastly, they cannot carry out inclusion tasks.

Most of the time, children almost always choose the scene showing their own view of the mountain scene. Piaget noted that children experienced this difficulty because they are unable to take on another person’s perspective. A limitation of Piaget’s stages of development at this stage mentioned on what children could not yet
do. Egocentrism and conservation are both highlighted on abilities that children have not yet developed. At this particular stage, they lack the understanding that things look different to other people and that objects can change in appearance while still maintaining the same properties (Piaget, 1980).

As Gagne (1972) posits the five major categories of learning outcomes: 1) Verbal information - stating previously learned facts, concepts and principles 2) intellectual – distinguishing objects, features and symbols 3) cognitive strategies - make use of personal way to guide thinking, feeling, acting 4) attitudes – choosing personal actions base on internal states of understanding and feeling and 5) motor skills - executing performance with the use of muscles

Related Literature

The Pre-school Program concretized the foundation of the School Readiness. Bloom (1956) looked on learning as a process – we build upon our former learning to develop more complex levels of understanding. It is in this theory that the assessment tool for School Readiness is designed. Thus, the tool was divided according to the three domains of learning: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. Another domain of learning as presented by Bloom (1956) is the Affective or Receptive or Expressive Skill. This domain is concerned with value issues: involves attitudes.

School Readiness Assessment. It was before year 1990 that school readiness was vastly accepted as apt term to identify the state of children who were not considered sufficiently mature to enter school (Shepard, 1997). The school readiness test attempts to assign labels, the ready or not ready. This notion was argued by the maturational theory. This theory disputed that certain biological, emotional, and cognitive behaviors were demonstrated by all typically-developing children and the species-typical, genetically-driven changes were demonstrated in observable and measurable milestones (Gesell, 1940; Saluja, et al., 2000). Milestones. It infers apparent level of development that must be achieved before reaching succeeding milestones. It serves as signpost that should be met first before proceeding to the next level of development. The school readiness testing and the use of standardized tests to assess readiness were the manifestation of the Maturational Theory. There were several debates about the appropriateness of the concept of readiness as evidenced by their mandating of readiness testing for school entry (Saluja, et al., 2000), it might be useful to take a look at what the tests really capture, or the test capture what is necessary in order to claim that a child is ready to enter school setting. There may be possibilities of lurking variable that standardized tests do not capture, variable that could be crucial in understanding a child’s adjustment to school environment (Darbonne, 2007).
A study on quality in early childhood education: Assessing early child development - a holistic approach for ages 3-6 years posits that a strong foundation for adulthood lies in early childhood. Both positive and negative experiences have long lasting effects. The study saw the need to record early childhood growth and development to measure holistic child development (Lasi et al, 2007).

Children ages four to five years old often develop at different speeds. That’s the reason why it is sometimes hard to know which kids are ready for school. Other kids at age 5 are already reading, but others can’t even count from 1 up to 10 or recognize the letters of the alphabet. Understanding what is expected of a child entering kindergarten or preschool can help teachers prepare the child for school and make sure he is ready. (Vincent Lannelli, M.D, 2007).

Heilman (1961) as stated in Anonat’s book mentioned that in one study wherein he conducted a readiness test for grade one students, it has been found out that the pupils who attended kindergarten got higher level of readiness compared to those who did not attend any preschool training.

A 2008 study confirms that children enter kindergarten with a range of skills, knowledge, behaviors and accomplishments (Minnesota School Readiness Study – 2009). Enhancing Children’s Health and Well-Being: According to this study, one of the strongest indicators of readiness is the health and well-being of the children. Most of those children who are identified healthy are most likely children who will not miss classes.

**Academic Performance.** The academic performance measures the accomplishment of the child in the core subject areas taught in school. This is significantly linked with factors such as academic competence and test competence. The University of Bohol, University Grade School, adopted the cumulative grading system. The children are identified as passed or failed in the grading period through the point grade system. Children with grades 75 above are considered **passed**, meanwhile children who got average grade of 74 and below are considered **failed**.

K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum. As per Department of Education Order No. 31 series 2012 on Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of Grades 1 to 10 of the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) effective school year 2012-2013 has ordered that public schools shall implement the curriculum and private schools are enjoined to do the same. It uses a performance assessment using levels of proficiency based on numerical value after getting the sum of the results of the children’s performance on the different levels of assessment. The numerical values are as follows:
Table 1

| LEVELS OF PROFICIENCY     | EQUIVALENT NUMERICAL VALUE |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Advanced                  | 90% and above             |
| Proficient                | 85% - 89%                 |
| Approaching Proficiency   | 80% - 84%                 |
| Developing                | 75% - 79%                 |
| Beginning                 | 74% and below             |

Statement of the Problem

The main purpose of this study is to analyze the performance of preschoolers, SY 2012-2013 in terms of the categories of their academic performance and result of their School Readiness Assessment. The outcome will serve as bases for analysis in formulating a proposed program that will cater the school readiness needs of pre-elementary graders of UB – University Grade School.

Specifically, it seeks to answer the following objectives:

1. To determine the academic performance of the preschoolers.
2. To describe the School Readiness Assessment result of the pupils in terms of:
   2.1 Motor Skills
   2.2 Receptive/Expressive Skills
   2.3 Cognitive Skills
3. To find the significant degree of correlation on the academic performance and school readiness assessment result.
4. To find the significant degree of difference in the school readiness assessment as to the first and second assessment results.
5. To design an intervention program could be proposed for the preschoolers of the UB – University Grade School.

Significance of the Study

When a child is given activities and assessments that fit to the level of his intellectual, physical, emotional, and psychological maturity or level of readiness, the child would feel responsible and confident of getting a positive result since he/
she would be intrinsically motivated that he/she is supposed to get a satisfactory rate. It is therefore, in this context that this research paper may be of a significant value.

When teachers would identify the level of readiness of a child entering in a certain grade level, it would lead to the understanding of how a child behaves and what is the reason of that child for behaving in such manner. In addition, the strategies and activities can easily be designed by the teacher to suit with the needs and the level of each child in every classroom. This would ensure that the activities are practically geared towards a holistic development of the child.

This study would also give the parents an idea on how to motivate their children in performing well at school. Since parents would then know the level of readiness of their children, they would have a guide on how they shall raise their children in such a way that they could perform the tasks that is fitted to their chronological age. It is also very important for the parents to prepare their child in entering school since they serve as the first teachers. Furthermore, parents could also find ways on how to cooperate with the teachers and the school in achieving the goals that are set for every child.

Additionally, the University of Bohol – University Grade School and even other schools would also be benefitted by the outcome of this study since this would guide them in designing a program that will cater the individual needs of the pupils.

In general, the findings and recommendations of this study may help realize the goal of education to develop every child according to their level of school preparedness for their future lives.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study is descriptive by nature as it sought to describe the present status of the incoming grade 1 pupils of UB, University Grade School. In order to ensure reliability and validity in the measurements, the researcher made use of the standard competencies for assessing school readiness assessment from the Department of Education and formulated questions based on those skills and competencies. The instrument consists of 45 items with three domains, namely, cognitive, receptive and motor skills. Each domain has five items except for cognitive domain that has 30 items broken down into five (5) sub-domains. The researcher-made tool was pretested from a set of preschoolers other than the respondents to ensure that the questionnaires are understood at the preschooler level. After which, it was administered at the preschoolers/respondents of the study. Two sets of questionnaires were conducted at different periods. Such processes were conducted to ensure validity and reliability.
Statistical Treatment

Considering that the study utilizes quantitative measures to describe the necessary data to be studied, it is congruent that appropriate statistical treatments being used to give meaning and interpretation to these data. After organizing raw data through tables and graphs, the researcher made use of the

a. **One-sample t-test of significant difference** – for comparing the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} readiness assessment of the respondents.

b. **Pearson Product-moment of Correlation** – for testing possible correlation between the academic performance and the readiness assessment scores of the respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To achieve the investigation of this particular study, the academic performance of the preschoolers of the University Grade School for the third grading period, School Year 2012-2013 was being obtained.

Distribution of Respondents

Figure 1 shows the total of twenty-four preschoolers/respondents of the University Grade School with an equal representation of male and female.

Figure 1: Distribution of Population  
N=24
1. Preschoolers’ Academic Performance

Table 2. Respondents’ Academic Performance in all subjects
N=24

| Learner No. | FIL. | READ. | LANG. | MATH | Sensory Perceptual | Music & Arts | GMRC | Total | General Average | Levels of Proficiency |
|-------------|------|-------|-------|------|--------------------|-------------|------|-------|----------------|-----------------------|
| 1           | 85   | 85    | 86    | 81   | 88                 | 88          | 82   | 595   | 85             | P                     |
| 2           | 82   | 79    | 80    | 80   | 84                 | 84          | 84   | 573   | 82             | AP                    |
| 3           | 79   | 80    | 81    | 79   | 87                 | 87          | 81   | 574   | 82             | AP                    |
| 4           | 82   | 84    | 83    | 81   | 87                 | 87          | 84   | 588   | 84             | AP                    |
| 5           | 89   | 90    | 88    | 91   | 91                 | 91          | 90   | 630   | 90             | A                     |
| 6           | 76   | 75    | 80    | 76   | 83                 | 83          | 78   | 551   | 79             | D                     |
| 7           | 83   | 87    | 86    | 81   | 86                 | 86          | 86   | 595   | 85             | P                     |
| 8           | 74   | 73    | 76    | 76   | 77                 | 77          | 78   | 531   | 76             | D                     |
| 9           | 85   | 86    | 88    | 84   | 92                 | 92          | 89   | 616   | 88             | P                     |
| 10          | 85   | 84    | 84    | 84   | 87                 | 87          | 86   | 597   | 85             | P                     |
| 11          | 87   | 87    | 88    | 87   | 85                 | 85          | 87   | 606   | 87             | P                     |
| 12          | 82   | 84    | 81    | 80   | 86                 | 86          | 85   | 584   | 83             | AP                    |
| 13          | 88   | 89    | 85    | 83   | 92                 | 92          | 91   | 620   | 89             | P                     |
| 14          | 91   | 93    | 93    | 92   | 93                 | 93          | 93   | 648   | 93             | A                     |
| 15          | 91   | 90    | 90    | 89   | 91                 | 91          | 92   | 634   | 91             | A                     |
| 16          | 91   | 93    | 92    | 90   | 92                 | 92          | 92   | 642   | 92             | A                     |
| 17          | 92   | 93    | 91    | 91   | 93                 | 93          | 91   | 644   | 92             | A                     |
| 18          | 91   | 93    | 91    | 89   | 93                 | 93          | 90   | 640   | 91             | A                     |
| 19          | 84   | 81    | 85    | 82   | 89                 | 89          | 88   | 598   | 85             | P                     |
| 20          | 93   | 82    | 82    | 91   | 93                 | 93          | 92   | 626   | 89             | P                     |
| 21          | 91   | 94    | 92    | 90   | 89                 | 89          | 92   | 637   | 91             | A                     |
| 22          | 81   | 81    | 80    | 80   | 85                 | 85          | 86   | 578   | 83             | AP                    |
| 23          | 88   | 88    | 87    | 92   | 92                 | 92          | 90   | 627   | 90             | A                     |
| 24          | 90   | 91    | 90    | 91   | 92                 | 92          | 91   | 637   | 91             | A                     |

Legend:
Advanced (A) – (90 and above)
Developing (D) – (75%-79%)
Proficient (P) – (85-89%)
Beginning (B) – (74% and below)
Approaching Proficiency (AP) – (80-84%)
The academic performance of the twenty-four (24) preschoolers/respondents in the University Grade School of this School Year 2012-2013 reflects the cumulative grades presented on the report cards for the third grading period all the ratings in seven subjects with the corresponding General Average and descriptions as shown on Table 2.

Table 3. Academic performance of the preschooler boys
N=12

| Boys          | Fil. | Read. | Lang. | Math | Sensory Perception | Music Arts | GMRC | Average |
|---------------|------|-------|-------|------|--------------------|------------|------|---------|
| Grades        | f    | f     | f     | f    | f                  | f          | f    | %       | Rank    |
| 90 – 95       | 0    | 1     | 0     | 1    | 2                  | 2          | 1    | 1       | 8.33    | 4       |
| Advanced (A)  |      |       |       |       |                    |            |      |         |         |
| 85 – 89       | 5    | 4     | 5     | 1    | 7                  | 7          | 5    | 5       | 41.67   | 1       |
| Proficient (P)|      |       |       |       |                    |            |      |         |         |
| 80 – 84       | 4    | 4     | 6     | 7    | 2                  | 2          | 4    | 4       | 33.33   | 2       |
| Approaching  |      |       |       |       |                    |            |      |         |         |
| Proficiency (AP)| |       |       |       |                    |            |      |         |         |
| 75 – 79       | 2    | 2     | 1     | 3    | 1                  | 1          | 2    | 2       | 16.67   | 3       |
| Developing (D)|      |       |       |       |                    |            |      |         |         |
| 70 – 74       | 1    | 1     | 0     | 0    | 0                  | 0          | 0    | 0       | 0.00    | 5       |
| Beginning (B) |      |       |       |       |                    |            |      |         |         |
| Sum           | 989  | 994   | 1001  | 980  | 1033               | 1033       | 1010 | 1005.71 |         |         |
| Mean          | 82.42| 82.83 | 83.42 | 81.67| 86.08              | 86.08      | 84.17| 83.81   | AP      |         |

Table 3 depicts that there are more than a third (37.5%) of the respondents who were “Advanced” in their academic performance while a third (33.3%) was at the “Proficient” level. Furthermore, approximately a fifth (20.8%) was under “Developing” level; less than a tenth (8.3%) belonged to the “Developing” level; and none of the respondents belonged to the “Beginning” level. Since majority of the respondents (70.8%) were at the upper two academic levels, this implies that the respondents academically performed well.

On the academic performance among preschooler boys, less than half (41.67%) belongs to the “Proficient” level; one-third (33.33%) among the respondents got the grades ranging from 80 – 84 (Approaching Proficiency); Less than a fifth (16.67%) among the male respondents belongs to the “Developing” level; only one (8.33%) falls under the “Advanced” level; while there are no male respondents that fall under the “Beginning” level. The mean of the grades of the male respondents is 83.81 which
falls under the “Approaching Proficiency” level.

Table 4: Academic Performance of the Preschooler girls

| GIRLS | N=12 |
|-------|------|
| Boys  | Fil. Read. Lang. Math Sensory Perceptual Music $ Arts GMRC Average |
| Grades | f f f f f f f f % Rank |
| 90 – 95 Advanced (A) | 8 8 7 6 9 9 10 8 66.67 1 |
| 85 – 89 Proficient (P) | 2 1 3 3 3 3 2 3 25.00 2 |
| 80 – 84 Approaching Proficiency (AP) | 2 3 2 3 0 0 0 1 8.33 3 |
| 75 – 79 Developing (D) | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.00 4.5 |
| 70 – 74 Beginning (B) | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.00 4.5 |
| Sum | 1071 1070 1059 1055 1094 1094 1088 1075.86 |
| Mean | 89.25 89.17 88.25 87.92 91.17 91.17 90.67 89.65= A |

Table 4 illustrates that among the preschooler girls’ academic performance, two-thirds (66.67%) of them falls under the “Advanced” level; one fourth (25.00%) among the female respondents got grades from 85-89 (Proficient); one (8.33%) of the female respondents belongs to the “Approaching Proficiency” level; while none of the respondents fall under the “Developing” and “Beginning” levels. The mean of the female respondents’ grades is 89.65 belonging to “Proficient” level, which therefore implies that most of the female respondents performed well in their academics. The average academic performance among the girls belongs to Advanced level.

Table 5: Average academic performance of the boys and girl

| Sum of Scores | Fil. Read. Lang. Math Sensory Perceptual Music $ Arts GMRC Average |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Boys          | 989 994 1001 980 1033 1033 1010 | 1005.71 |
| Girls         | 1071 1070 1059 1055 1094 1094 1088 | 1075.86 |
| Total Scores  | 2060 2064 2060 2035 2127 2127 2098 | 2081.57 |
| Average       | 85.83 86.00 85.83 84.79 88.63 88.63 87.42 | 86.73 |
Table 5 shows the overall academic performance of the respondents illustrates that the mean grade is 86.73 which means that generally, they belong to the “Proficient” level. This implies that, the respondents are academically competent.

These findings validate the study on the effect of pre-school education on academic performance in primary school: a case study of grade one pupils in Botswana. The paper concluded that preschool education equips children with pre-requisite skills which make learning in grade one easier and faster for children so exposed as conducted by Taiwo (2002).

2. Preschoolers’ school readiness assessment result.

Table 6. School readiness assessment result

A. Motor skills

| Scores | First Assessment | Second Assessment |
|--------|-----------------|------------------|
|        | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 9 to 10| 11   | 12    | 23     | 11   | 12    | 23     |
| 7 to 8 | 0    | 0     | 0      | 0    | 0     | 0      |
| 5 to 6 | 0    | 0     | 0      | 1    | 0     | 1      |
| 3 to 4 | 1    | 0     | 1      | 0    | 0     | 0      |
| 1 to 2 | 0    | 0     | 0      | 0    | 0     | 0      |
| Mean   | 9.5  | 10    | 9.75   | 9.58 | 10    | 9.79   |
| %MP    | 95   | 100   | 97.5   | 95.8 | 100   | 97.9   |

Table 6 indicates that in the first assessment of the school readiness assessment result on motor skills among the respondents in the motor skills domain, the first assessment indicates huge majority (95.83%) respondents got scores ranging from 9-10; one (4.17%) got a score of 3 - 4; while there were no respondents who got scores ranging from, 1-2, 5-6, and 7-8.

In congruence with the above result of the first assessment, the second assessment of the school readiness on motor skills among the respondents similarly shows that a bulk (95.83%) of respondents got scores ranging from 9-10; while only one (4.17%) respondent got score ranging from 5-6.
These results are validated by the theory of Erikson (2002) that children at preschool age try their power and control over the world through play and other forms of social interaction. This explains why motor skills domain is higher because they play as they explore and interact with their environment.

The results of the first and second assessment in the motor skills domain portray similar result with 97.5% and 97.9% respectively as average for each assessment. Thus, it means that the result of the said assessments is reliable.

Table 7. School Readiness assessment result

| B. Receptive/Expressive skills First Assessment | Second Assessment |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Scores | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 5-Jan   | f    | f     | N     | f    | 11    | N     |
| 4       | 7    | 11    | 18    | 8    | 0     | 8     |
| 3       | 3    | 0     | 3     | 2    | 0     | 2     |
| 2       | 1    | 0     | 1     | 1    | 0     | 1     |
| 1       | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0    | 1     | 1     |
| 0       | 1    | 1     | 2     | 0    | 0     | 0     |
| Mean    | 4.25 | 4.67  | 4.46  | 4.25 | 4.75  | 4.5   |
|         | 85   | 93.4  | 89.2  | 85   | 95    | 90    |

Table 7 depicts that the first assessment on receptive skills has three-fourths (75%) among the respondents who got a score of five; three (12.50%) respondents scored four; two (8.33%) respondents achieved only one has this score; only one (4.17%) respondent got a score of three; while there were no respondents got scores of zero and two. During the second assessment, nineteen (79.17%) respondents got a perfect score of five; there are now only two (8.33%) respondents with scores of four; and scores of one preschooler got the scores of three, two, and zero, respectively (4.17); and no respondent got a score of 1.

The results on school readiness (receptive skills) of the first assessment with mean, 4.46 and second assessment with a mean of 4.5 shows an insignificant difference, thus, making these results reliable.
Table 8. School Readiness Assessment Result

| Scores | First Assessment | Second Assessment |
|--------|------------------|-------------------|
|        | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 26-30  | 7    | 10    | 17    | 7    | 10    | 17    |
| 21-25  | 4    | 12    | 16    | 4    | 2     | 6     |
| 16-20  | 1    | 0     | 1     | 1    | 0     | 1     |
| Mean   | 25.67| 28.5  | 27.09 | 25.92| 28.42 | 27.17 |
|        | 85.56667 | 95 | 90.2833 | 86.4 | 94.73333 | 90.56667 |

Table 8 shows that the first assessment on cognitive skills has more than two thirds (70.83%) among the respondents who got scores ranging from 26-30; one out of four (25.00%) among respondents got scores ranging from 21-25; while there is only one (4.17) respondent got a score that ranges from 16-20 and no respondent got scores below sixteen.

The second assessment shows the same result with the first assessment. Therefore, the test results of the two assessments are reliable.

Table 9. Average of the school readiness assessment result (Motor Skills, receptive-expressive skills, cognitive skills)

| Scores | First Assessment | Second Assessment |
|--------|------------------|-------------------|
|        | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| 41-45  | 6    | 10    | 16    | 6    | 10    | 16    |
| 36-40  | 5    | 1     | 6     | 5    | 2     | 7     |
| 31-35  | 0    | 1     | 1     | 0    | 0     | 0     |
| 26-30  | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0    | 0     | 0     |
| 21-25  | 1    | 0     | 1     | 1    | 0     | 1     |
| Mean   | 39.42| 43.17 | 41.30 | 39.75| 43.17 | 41.46 |
|        | 87.6 | 95.933333 | 91.76667 | 88.333333 | 95.933333 | 92.133333 |
Table 9 depicts the school readiness assessment results on motor, receptive/expressive and cognitive skills. The first assessment indicates that there are two-thirds (66.67%) among the respondents who scored ranging from 41-45; a fourth (25.00%) among the respondents got the score ranging from 36-40; one (4.17%) got the score belonging from 31-35; there is also one (4.17%) who scored from 21-25; meanwhile, no respondent fall under the range of 26-30.

On the second assessment, two-thirds (66.67%) among the respondents got the score ranging from 41-45; seven (29.17%) of the respondents fall under the range of 36-40; one (4.17%) got the score ranging from 21-25; while none of the respondents got the scores ranging from 26-35.

Generally, the results of the first and second assessment in the three domains of learning show similar results. In the first assessment, the mean is 41.30, while in the second assessment, the mean is 41.46. These facts justify the results of both tests and the assessment tool itself to be reliable and are valid for interpretation.

With regards to the cognitive domain on the school readiness assessment, result on the first assessment reveals that more than two thirds (70.83%) among the respondents got scores ranging from 26-30; one out of four (25.00%) among respondents got scores ranging from 21-25; while there is only one (4.17) respondent got a score that ranges from 16-20 and no respondent got scores below sixteen.

The second assessment shows the same result with the first assessment. Therefore, the test results of the two assessments are reliable.
To determine whether there is a significant correlation on the academic performance and the school readiness assessment results, the data were subjected to Pearson Product Moment Correlation as reflected in Table 10. The result showed a correlation coefficient ratio of 0.6754, which is greater than the critical value of 0.404 at 21 df and 0.05 level of significance, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The significant correlation implies that there is a relationship between Academic Performance and the School Readiness Assessment Result. This goes to show that the academic performance runs parallel with the Assessment Test results, that is, the higher is the academic performance, and the better is the School Readiness Assessment Result. This confirms the study conducted by Heilman (1961) on readiness test for grade one entrants that it was found out that the pupils who attended kindergarten got higher level of readiness as manifested by their assessment results. But then, unlike Heilman’s study that it was concluded that pupils who attended kindergarten got higher level of readiness compared to those who did not attend any preschool training, this particular undertaking only covered UB-UGS preschoolers.

Table 10. Correlation Between the Academic Performance and the Readiness Assessment Result

| Preschoolers | Academic Performance | Readiness Assessment Result |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Sum          | 2081.57               | 181004.2653               |
| Mean         | 86.73                 | 41.46                     |
| Std. Dev.    | 4.4969                | 5.0215                    |
| N            | 24                    |                            |

\[ r = 0.6754 \]

Crit. Value at 0.05 = 0.404

Result: Significant

Ho: Rejected
Table 11. Significant Difference Between the Performance of the Preschoolers in the First and Second Assessment

| Preschoolers | First | Second | D    | D²   |
|--------------|-------|--------|------|------|
| Sum          | 991   | 995    | -4   | 12   |
| Mean         | 41.29 | 41.46  | -0.17|      |
| Std. Dev.    | 4.4969|        | 5.0215|      |
| N            | 24    |        |      |      |

\[ t = 1.1864 \]

Crit. Value of \( t \) at 23 df (0.05) = 2.069

Result: Significant

Ho: Accepted

To determine whether there is significant degree of difference in the school readiness assessment as to the first and second assessment result, the data were subjected to analysis of variance as presented in Table 11. The obtained result was 1.1864 which was lesser than the critical value of 2.069 at 23 df and 0.05 level of significance, hence the null hypothesis was accepted. The result showed that there is no significant degree of difference in the school readiness assessment as to the first and second assessment result. It can be gleaned that the two School Readiness Assessment Results do not significantly vary, hence, the two school readiness assessments are reliable. It affirms the condition stated by Saluja, et al (2000) that it might be useful to take a look at what the tests really capture, or the test capture what is necessary in order to claim that a child is ready to enter school setting.

CONCLUSIONS

Based from the aforementioned findings, the following generalizations are drawn out:

1. The academic performance of the pre-school pupils yielded a higher percentage under proficient and advanced levels of proficiency which is an indicator that they are performing well in the classroom.

2. Among the three domains, motor skills got the highest percentage that belongs to Advanced level on both assessment results among the male and female subjects. This is in consonance with Erik Erikson’s initiative vs guilt theory among preschoolers. They direct their energies in play that includes motor activities. A need for adults to help children manage their energies...
in positive ways. This is followed by the cognitive domain. The last among three domains is the receptive/expressive skills with Advanced level for both assessments. This is an affirmation of the theory of Jean Piaget that children at this age belong to the pre-operational stage and have egocentric line of thinking, they lack the capacity to think logically.

3. Through the use of Pearson Product of Correlation, the academic performance and school readiness assessment results were correlated. It shows that the computed value of r is way higher than the critical value and thus concludes a significant correlation between the two domains. This implies that the academic performance of a child can greatly affect his or her readiness to formal education.

4. After being subjected to statistical treatment, it was found out that the first and second readiness assessment had no significant difference. It can be inferred that the assessment tool as well as the process of conducting the test were very reliable for it shows consistent results.
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