

Identifying Core Linguistic Factors for Effective Writing: Basis for the Development of Contextualized Activities for Grade V Learners

Kathrine Mae P. Resayaga

Graduate School, University of Saint Anthony (Dr. Santiago G. Anthony Memorial), City of Iriga, Camarines Sur, Philippines

Publication history: Received: May 6, 2026; Revised: May 31, 2026; Accepted: June 5, 2026

Email of Corresponding Author: kathrinemae.resayaga@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study examined the core linguistic factors affecting the writing proficiency of Grade V learners and developed, validated, implemented, and evaluated contextualized writing activities under Project WRITE. Anchored on Sociocultural Theory, Contextual Learning Theory, and Process Writing Theory, the study employed a Research and Development (R&D) design combined with a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest approach. The respondents included 72 Grade V learners from Bonga Elementary School in Ligao City, Albay. Based on the diagnostic assessment, 11 learners identified under the Low Mastery level participated in the intervention phase. Data were collected using the Linguistic Factors Writing Test and the DepEd Learning Resource Evaluation Form (LR Form No. 2A). Findings revealed that learners performed strongest in discourse competence, while lexicon emerged as the weakest linguistic factor, followed by sentence structure and syntax and grammar. The results indicated uneven development across the identified linguistic components, particularly among learners classified under the Low Mastery level. These findings served as the basis for the development of Project WRITE, which consisted of contextualized writing activities supported by a Learner's Module and Teacher's Guide. Following implementation, learners demonstrated improvements in lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. The developed instructional materials were evaluated by teachers and language experts and received Very Satisfactory ratings in terms of content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-datedness, indicating their suitability for classroom use. The study concluded that contextualized writing activities can effectively improve the writing proficiency of Grade V learners by addressing identified linguistic weaknesses and providing meaningful learning experiences. The findings support the integration of contextualized writing instruction and the continued development of validated instructional materials to enhance literacy outcomes in elementary education. The study aligns with SDG 4 (Quality Education), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), and SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) by promoting inclusive literacy development through context-responsive instruction. It contributes to educational, institutional, and socio-economic sustainability by strengthening learners' communication skills and supporting evidence-based classroom practices.

Keywords: Contextualized Writing Activities; Discourse Competence; Grade V Learners; Lexicon; Project WRITE; Sentence Structure; Syntax and Grammar; Writing Proficiency

1. Introduction

Writing proficiency is a fundamental component of language learning and academic achievement. As one of the most complex language skills, writing requires learners to integrate vocabulary knowledge, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence to communicate ideas effectively (Hyland, 2003; Nation, 2013; Richards & Renandya, 2002; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Despite educational initiatives promoting literacy and communicative competence in the Philippines through the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic of the Philippines, 2013) and the K to 12 Curriculum (Department of Education, 2016a), many elementary learners continue to experience difficulties in producing coherent and meaningful written texts (Graham et al., 2012; Saavedra, 2020; Park & Lee, 2025). To address these challenges, this study investigates the core linguistic factors affecting the writing proficiency of Grade V learners and develops validated contextualized writing activities under Project WRITE to improve their writing performance.

1.1 Writing Proficiency and Core Linguistic Factors among Grade V Learners

Language serves as a primary medium for communication, learning, and meaning-making within social contexts (Halliday, 1978). In educational settings, language proficiency supports academic achievement by enabling learners to comprehend, express, and demonstrate knowledge across subject areas (Cummins, 2000). Among the macro language skills, writing is particularly important because it requires learners to organize ideas and apply language conventions effectively (Hyland, 2003). Writing proficiency depends on several linguistic components, including lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence (Nation, 2013; Richards & Renandya, 2002; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Recent studies

affirm that proficiency in these areas significantly influences learners' writing performance and literacy development (Skar et al., 2024; Shin & Lee, 2025). However, elementary learners commonly experience difficulties related to vocabulary limitations, grammatical inaccuracies, sentence construction, and organization of ideas, which negatively affect writing quality (Graham et al., 2012; Saavedra, 2020; Park & Lee, 2025). Instructional materials that are disconnected from learners' experiences may further hinder writing development. Learning becomes more meaningful when connected to learners' social experiences and existing knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978). Consequently, contextualized instruction has been promoted as an effective approach for improving engagement and writing performance (Department of Education, 2016b; Bernardo, 2019; Skar et al., 2024; Park & Lee, 2025; Shin & Lee, 2025).

1.2 Linguistic Factors and Contextualized Writing Instruction: Themes and Insights from Related Literature

The literature consistently identifies four major linguistic factors influencing writing proficiency: lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence (Hyland, 2003; Weigle, 2002). Lexical knowledge enables learners to communicate ideas accurately and effectively (Nation, 2013). Studies show that explicit vocabulary instruction improves lexical variety, clarity, and writing quality (Smith & Lee, 2022; Schmitt, 2010). Sentence structure contributes to grammatical accuracy and coherence in written communication (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Nunan, 2003). Research indicates that elementary learners often struggle with sentence construction, affecting overall writing quality (Saavedra, 2020). Syntax and grammar are essential for clarity and correctness in written texts (Halliday, 1978; Weigle, 2002). Structured feedback and revision activities have been shown to improve grammatical accuracy and syntactic complexity (Shin & Lee, 2025). Discourse competence supports the organization of ideas into coherent and cohesive texts (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; Hyland, 2003). Learners with stronger discourse competence demonstrate better idea development, logical sequencing, and writing quality (Garcia, 2021; Park & Lee, 2025). The literature further highlights the effectiveness of contextualized instruction in improving writing proficiency by linking learning tasks to authentic experiences and familiar contexts (Johnson, 2002; Berns & Erickson, 2001; Dawson & Tran, 2021; Torres & Manalo, 2020; Lopez, 2022).

1.3 Local, National, and Global Context of Writing Proficiency Development among Elementary Learners

Globally, writing proficiency is recognized as a critical literacy skill influenced by linguistic competence, meaningful learning experiences, and instructional support (Hyland, 2003; Weigle, 2002; Graham et al., 2012). International studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of contextualized and process-oriented writing interventions in improving learners' writing performance (Dawson & Tran, 2021; Roberts & Silva, 2021; Nguyen & Smith, 2022). Nationally, the Philippines promotes literacy and communicative competence through Republic of the Philippines (2013) and the K to 12 Curriculum (Department of Education, 2016a), and contextualized learning policies (Department of Education, 2016b). Nevertheless, learners continue to experience difficulties in vocabulary use, grammar, sentence construction, and organization of ideas (Saavedra, 2020). Locally, public elementary schools face challenges associated with English instruction in multilingual learning environments. These realities emphasize the need for context-responsive interventions that directly address learners' linguistic difficulties and writing needs.

1.4 Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations of Project WRITE

This study is anchored on Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978), Contextual Learning Theory (Johnson, 2002), and Process Writing Theory (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Sociocultural Theory explains that learning develops through social interaction, scaffolding, and guided participation within the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978). Contextual Learning Theory posits that learning becomes meaningful when connected to learners' real-life experiences (Johnson, 2002). Process Writing Theory views writing as a recursive process involving planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Drawing from these theories, the study adopts the KATH Model (Knowledge–Application–Tasks–Holistic Writing), which integrates linguistic knowledge, guided application, contextualized tasks, and holistic writing development. The model explains how learners improve writing proficiency through structured support, meaningful writing experiences, and continuous feedback. The study is further guided by an Input–Process–Output (IPO) framework. The input consists of learners' proficiency in lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. The process involves the development, validation, implementation, and evaluation of contextualized writing activities. The output is Project WRITE, composed of a Learners' Module and Teacher's Guide designed to improve writing proficiency through contextualized instruction.

1.5 Research Gaps and Rationale for Developing Contextualized Writing Activities for Grade V Learners

Although substantial research highlights the importance of linguistic competence, contextualized instruction, and validated instructional materials in writing development, important gaps remain. Most studies have focused on secondary and tertiary learners, with limited attention given to elementary learners in multilingual classrooms (Nguyen & Smith, 2022; Johnson & Huang, 2021). Existing Philippine studies acknowledge difficulties in vocabulary, grammar, sentence construction, and idea organization (Saavedra, 2020), yet few have translated diagnostic findings into systematically developed and validated instructional interventions. Furthermore, while contextualized writing approaches improve engagement and performance (Torres & Manalo, 2020), many interventions do not integrate diagnostic assessment, contextualized material development, validation, and effectiveness evaluation within a single framework. Similarly, studies on instructional materials often

examine validation separately from learner outcomes (Alvarez & Chung, 2021; Kim & Santos, 2022). This study addresses these gaps by developing, validating, implementing, and evaluating Project WRITE, a contextualized writing intervention designed to improve Grade V learners' proficiency in lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence.

1.6 Alignment of Project WRITE with Relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

This study aligns primarily with SDG 4 – Quality Education by supporting the development of literacy, communicative competence, and equitable learning opportunities through contextualized instructional materials (Republic of the Philippines, 2013; Department of Education, 2016a). The study also supports SDG 8 – Decent Work and Economic Growth by strengthening foundational literacy and communication skills necessary for lifelong learning, employability, and productive participation in society. Additionally, the study contributes to SDG 10 – Reduced Inequalities by addressing learning needs within multilingual and diverse educational contexts through responsive and contextualized instruction.

1.7 Contribution of Project WRITE to Multidisciplinary Sustainability

The study contributes primarily to educational sustainability by enhancing writing proficiency through evidence-based and context-responsive instructional interventions. By strengthening learners' literacy skills, the study promotes sustained academic development and lifelong learning. It also contributes to socio-economic sustainability, as improved communication skills support future educational and employment opportunities. Through contextualized learning experiences, the study advances community and cultural sustainability by integrating learners' local experiences, social realities, and cultural backgrounds into the writing process. Furthermore, the development and validation of Project WRITE support institutional sustainability by providing teachers, curriculum developers, and school administrators with validated instructional resources that can strengthen literacy programs and improve classroom practice.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study utilized a Research and Development (R&D) design following Borg and Gall (1983), combined with a quasi-experimental approach. The R&D component guided the needs analysis, identification of least mastered linguistic factors, development of contextualized writing activities, expert validation, revision, and implementation of instructional materials. The quasi-experimental component employed a pretest-posttest design to determine changes in learners' writing proficiency after exposure to the developed activities. Only learners identified under the Low Mastery level were included in the intervention phase, allowing the study to provide focused support to those who demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. This combined design enabled the systematic development of instructional materials while examining their effect on learners' writing performance.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted at Bonga Elementary School in Ligao City, Albay. The school was purposively selected because it represents a public-school setting where English is taught within a diverse linguistic environment. This context provided an appropriate setting for examining learners' writing proficiency in terms of lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents consisted of Grade 5 pupils from Bonga Elementary School and teacher-evaluators from the Schools Division of Ligao City. A total of seventy-two (72) Grade 5 learners participated in the pretest phase to determine their writing proficiency levels. Based on the results, learners were classified according to mastery levels. Eleven (11) learners who fell under the Low Mastery category were selected for the intervention because they demonstrated significant difficulties in lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. Teachers and language experts from various schools within the division also served as evaluators of the developed instructional materials.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was employed in selecting both the research site and the participants for the intervention. Bonga Elementary School was chosen because of its suitability for examining writing proficiency among elementary learners. All seventy-two Grade 5 learners participated in the pretest; however, only the eleven learners identified under the Low Mastery level were included in the implementation phase. This targeted selection ensured that the intervention addressed learners with the greatest need for remediation. Teacher-evaluators and language experts were purposively selected to assess the quality and usability of the developed instructional materials.

2.5 Research Instrument

Two instruments were utilized in the study. The first was the Linguistic Factors Writing Test for Grade V learners, which assessed writing proficiency in terms of lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. The

test was developed and adapted from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR; Council of Europe, 2001). It served as both the pretest and posttest to determine learners' writing proficiency before and after the intervention. The second instrument was the DepEd Learning Resource Evaluation Form (LR Form No. 2A), which was used by teachers and language experts to evaluate the contextualized writing activities. The instrument assessed the materials in terms of content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-dateness. The use of this standardized evaluation tool ensured that the developed materials met Department of Education standards for quality, relevance, and classroom usability.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, permission was secured from the Schools Division Office of Ligao City and the principal of Bonga Elementary School. After approval, participants were identified and schedules for testing and implementation were arranged during the summer class period. The study began with the administration of the Linguistic Factors Writing Test to determine learners' initial proficiency in lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. The results served as the basis for identifying learners' linguistic needs and for developing the Learner's Module and Teacher's Guide containing contextualized writing activities. Following development, the instructional materials underwent expert and teacher validation to assess their clarity, appropriateness, accuracy, and alignment with intended competencies. Feedback from validators was incorporated into the revision and refinement of the materials. After validation, the contextualized writing activities were implemented solely by the researcher during the summer class period to ensure consistency and fidelity of implementation. Upon completion of the intervention, the same writing test was administered as a posttest. The resulting data were analyzed and compared with the pretest results to determine changes in learners' writing proficiency and to identify areas for further improvement of the developed materials.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative methods were used to analyze the collected data. Frequency was employed to describe and summarize learners' performance in the identified linguistic factors and to determine the distribution of proficiency levels. Mean scores were computed to determine learners' average performance in lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence, as well as to evaluate the developed contextualized writing activities. Interpretation of learners' performance was based on the DepEd Mastery Level Scale (MPS), which classified proficiency according to established mastery levels ranging from Absolutely No Mastery to Highly Mastered. Mean scores from the DepEd Learning Resource Evaluation Form (LR Form No. 2A) were likewise used to determine the evaluators' assessment of the instructional materials in terms of content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-dateness. All statistical computations were performed using appropriate statistical software. The results were interpreted with the assistance of a statistician to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the findings.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Pretest Results of Grade V Learners in the Core Linguistic Factors for Effective Writing

3.1.1 Lexicon

The pretest results showed that learners obtained a mean score of 2.07, interpreted as Average Mastery. Most learners demonstrated basic vocabulary knowledge, with no learner reaching the highest score level. The findings indicate limited lexical range and difficulty using varied and context-appropriate vocabulary in writing. This result suggests that learners possess only developing vocabulary knowledge, which restricts their ability to express ideas clearly and effectively. According to Nation (2013), vocabulary knowledge is a strong predictor of writing performance because it influences how accurately learners communicate meaning. A broad and flexible vocabulary base is essential for effective written communication and supports learners' ability to express ideas clearly and precisely (Nation, 2013).

3.1.2 Sentence Structure

Learners obtained a mean score of 2.18, interpreted as Average Mastery. Most learners demonstrated only basic competence in sentence construction, with very few showing advanced proficiency. The findings indicate that learners can construct simple sentences but continue to experience difficulties in producing complete, coherent, and grammatically accurate statements. Common weaknesses include fragmented sentences, incorrect word order, and limited sentence complexity. These findings support Myhill (2018) and Graham and Perin (2007), who emphasized that explicit instruction and meaningful practice in sentence construction are essential for improving writing quality. This result informed the inclusion of scaffolded sentence-building activities in Project WRITE.

3.1.3 Syntax and Grammar

The pretest yielded a mean score of 2.47, interpreted as Average Mastery. Learners showed developing grammatical competence but demonstrated inconsistencies in applying grammatical rules accurately. The findings reveal recurring errors in subject-verb agreement, tense consistency, punctuation, capitalization, and sentence construction. Ellis (2008) emphasized that grammatical competence is necessary for accurate written communication, while Richards (2006) argued

that grammar instruction should be integrated into meaningful writing tasks. Goh and Burns (2012) further explained that grammar develops more effectively when embedded in contextualized activities. These findings justified the inclusion of grammar-integrated writing tasks in the intervention.

3.1.4 Discourse Competence

Discourse competence obtained the highest mean score of 3.10, interpreted as Moving Toward Mastery. Learners demonstrated a relatively stronger ability to organize ideas logically and produce coherent written outputs. Although learners showed strength in idea organization, weaknesses in vocabulary and grammar limited the overall quality of their writing. Hyland (2019) and Tribble (2014) emphasized that coherence must be supported by strong lexical and grammatical resources. Likewise, Nation (2013) highlighted the importance of vocabulary in expressing ideas effectively. These findings indicate that discourse competence should be developed alongside other linguistic components to achieve balanced writing proficiency.

3.1.5 Comparative Performance Across Linguistic Factors

Among the four linguistic factors, discourse competence ranked highest, followed by syntax and grammar, sentence structure, and lexicon. Lexicon obtained the lowest mean score, indicating it was the weakest area among learners. The findings suggest uneven development across linguistic components. Learners demonstrated stronger organizational skills than linguistic accuracy. Goh and Burns (2012) observed that discourse-level skills often develop earlier than lexical and grammatical accuracy. However, effective writing requires the integration of vocabulary knowledge, grammatical accuracy, sentence construction, and discourse competence (Nation, 2013; Hyland, 2003). This finding served as the primary basis for the design of Project WRITE.

3.1.6 Mastery Level Distribution of Learners

Most learners were classified under Average Mastery, while a smaller group fell under Low Mastery. Only a few learners reached Moving Toward Mastery and Closely Approximating Mastery levels. The presence of learners under Low Mastery indicates substantial writing difficulties that require intervention. Canale and Swain (1980) stressed the importance of grammatical and discourse competence in communication, while Ellis (2008) highlighted the negative effects of limited vocabulary and weak grammar on writing performance. Uy and Guillermo (2024), and Richards (2006), further support the need for structured and contextualized writing interventions for struggling learners.

3.1.7 Linguistic Factors Among Low Mastery Learners

The Low Mastery group demonstrated particularly weak performance in lexicon and sentence structure, while syntax and grammar showed Average Mastery and discourse competence remained relatively stronger. The overall mean reflected generally weak and uneven writing proficiency. The findings indicate severe deficiencies in foundational writing skills. Learners struggled to express ideas effectively because of limited vocabulary and weak sentence construction. Nation (2013), Ellis (2008) and Goh and Burns (2012) emphasized that writing proficiency depends on the integration of vocabulary, grammar, and organization. These results strongly justified the development of a targeted intervention under Project WRITE.

3.2 Development of Contextualized Writing Activities Under Project WRITE

3.2.1 Alignment of Activities with Identified Linguistic Needs

Project WRITE was developed based on the diagnostic findings of the pretest. The intervention consisted of progressive and contextualized writing activities targeting lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. Activities were sequenced from foundational to more complex writing tasks and supported by a Learner's Module and Teacher's Guide. The intervention directly addressed the linguistic weaknesses identified among learners. Vocabulary-building activities targeted lexical deficiencies, sentence construction tasks addressed structural weaknesses, grammar activities strengthened syntactic competence, and discourse-focused tasks enhanced idea organization. The design reflects a diagnostic-driven approach in which instructional content was aligned with actual learner needs, ensuring relevance and responsiveness.

3.3 Posttest Results After the Implementation of Contextualized Writing Activities

3.3.1 Lexicon

The posttest results showed an increase in the mean score from 1.27 to 2.18, moving from Low Mastery to Average Mastery. The improvement indicates that learners expanded their vocabulary knowledge and became more capable of using words appropriately in writing. Tomlinson (2013) emphasized that authentic and context-based activities enhance language learning. Bernardo (2019), likewise found that contextualized instruction significantly improves vocabulary acquisition and application. These findings support the effectiveness of Project WRITE in strengthening lexical competence.

3.3.2 Sentence Structure

Learners improved from a pretest mean score of 1.36 to a posttest mean score of 2.00, resulting in a shift from Low Mastery to Average Mastery. The results indicate that learners developed greater competence in constructing meaningful and coherent sentences. Tomlinson (2013) emphasized that language learning is enhanced when learners engage in meaningful and authentic communicative activities. Similarly, Aporbo (2021) reported that contextualized instruction enhances sentence construction skills. The findings confirm the effectiveness of the intervention in improving sentence structure.

3.3.3 Syntax and Grammar

The mean score increased from 2.09 to 2.36, with learners remaining under Average Mastery but demonstrating measurable improvement. The findings indicate better grammatical accuracy and increased awareness of correct language forms. Ellis (2006) emphasized the importance of meaningful language use and feedback in grammar development, while Krashen (1985) Input Hypothesis highlights the role of comprehensible input in grammatical acquisition. Bernardo (2019) similarly found that contextualized learning improves grammar retention and application. These results suggest that Project WRITE contributed to the gradual development of grammatical competence.

3.3.4 Discourse Competence

Discourse competence increased slightly from 3.35 to 3.36 and remained under Moving Toward Mastery. The findings indicate that learners maintained and slightly enhanced their ability to organize ideas coherently. Hyland (2003) emphasized that discourse competence develops through sustained writing practice, while Derewianka (2015) highlighted the value of scaffolded instruction in improving text organization. Berns and Erickson (2001) further noted that contextualized learning strengthens higher-order writing skills. The results demonstrate that the intervention helped sustain and reinforce learners' strengths in discourse competence.

3.4 Validation Results of the Developed Contextualized Writing Activities

3.4.1 Content Validity

Experts and teachers rated the content of the developed materials as Very Satisfactory, with the overall score exceeding the required passing standard. The materials were found suitable for learners, aligned with objectives, capable of developing higher-order thinking skills, and free from bias. The findings indicate strong content validity and instructional relevance. The materials effectively support meaningful learning experiences and writing development. This supports Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory and Bruner's (1966) Constructivist Theory, which emphasize meaningful and context-based learning experiences as foundations for knowledge construction.

3.4.2 Format of the Materials

The format of the Learners' Module and Teacher's Guide received Very Satisfactory ratings across nearly all indicators, exceeding the required passing score. The findings indicate that the materials are visually organized, readable, attractive, and culturally relevant. Mayer's (2009) Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning explains that effective integration of visual and textual elements improves comprehension. Moreno (2019) and Omodan (2022) likewise found that well-designed instructional materials enhance engagement and motivation. These results confirm the usability and learner-friendliness of Project WRITE.

3.4.3 Presentation and Organization

The presentation and organization of the instructional materials received perfect ratings from validators, indicating excellent sequencing, clarity, and coherence. The findings suggest that the materials provide learners with structured and progressive writing experiences that support understanding and skill development. Saragih (2019) and Alsubaie (2020) emphasized that logically organized instructional materials improve comprehension, retention, and learner engagement. These results demonstrate that Project WRITE effectively supports the development of coherent writing skills.

3.4.4 Accuracy and Up-to-Datedness of Information

Validators rated all indicators under accuracy and up-to-datedness as Very Satisfactory, with the materials obtaining a perfect score. The findings indicate that the instructional materials are accurate, reliable, error-free, and suitable for classroom implementation. Tomlinson (2013) emphasized the importance of accurate and clear instructional materials in language learning, while Richards (2015) underscored the role of well-designed instructional resources in supporting effective language teaching and learning. Hidalgo and Quijano (2020), Tomlinson (2013), and Richards (2015) emphasized that accurate, well-designed, and updated instructional materials contribute to improved writing accuracy, language performance, and learner confidence. These findings confirm the overall quality and readiness of Project WRITE for classroom use.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study found that Grade V learners demonstrated stronger performance in discourse competence than in lexicon, sentence structure, and syntax and grammar, with learners under the Low Mastery group showing significant weaknesses in vocabulary and sentence construction. These findings served as the basis for the development of Project WRITE, a contextualized writing intervention designed through a Research and Development (R&D) process. The implementation of the developed contextualized writing activities resulted in improved learner performance across lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. Furthermore, the developed Learner's Module and Teacher's Guide were evaluated by experts and teachers as very satisfactory in terms of content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-datedness, confirming their suitability and usability for classroom implementation.

Teachers are encouraged to integrate contextualized writing activities regularly to strengthen learners' vocabulary, sentence construction, grammar, and overall writing proficiency. Structured vocabulary enrichment, guided sentence-building, and paragraph-writing activities should be continuously provided to address identified linguistic gaps. School administrators and curriculum planners should support the development, refinement, and localization of contextualized instructional materials, while teachers should be provided with training on R&D-based instructional material development and validation. The developed materials may also be enhanced through improved design, durability, and digital versions, and future studies may examine similar contextualized writing interventions across other grade levels and contexts.

The study was limited to Grade V learners of Bonga Elementary School and focused only on the four linguistic factors of writing proficiency: lexicon, sentence structure, syntax and grammar, and discourse competence. The intervention was implemented only among learners identified under the Low Mastery level using a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest approach, and the effectiveness of the developed contextualized writing activities was evaluated within the duration of the intervention. Consequently, the findings are limited to the participants, context, and scope of the study and may not fully represent learners from other grade levels, schools, or learning environments.

Compliance with ethical standards

The study adhered to institutional and administrative requirements for the conduct of educational research. Prior to data collection and implementation, the necessary permissions were secured from the appropriate educational authorities and school administration. All research procedures were conducted within the approved study setting and followed the established protocols for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the contextualized writing intervention.

REFERENCES

- Alsubaie, M. A. (2020). The role of instructional materials in enhancing learner engagement and retention. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(5), 45–52.
- Alvarez, M., & Chung, P. (2021). Expert validation in interactive language learning materials. *Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 112–128.
- Aporbo, R. (2021). Contextualized English lessons and learner fluency in Philippine elementary classrooms. *Philippine Journal of Language Education*, 8(1), 45–63.
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (2019). *Language learning and literacy development in Philippine education*. Rex Book Store.
- Berns, R. G., & Erickson, P. M. (2001). Contextual teaching and learning: Preparing students for the new economy. *The Highlight Zone: Research @ Work*, 5, 1–8.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction* (4th ed.). Longman.
- Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Harvard University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5–35.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
- Dawson, P., & Tran, T. (2021). Contextualized writing instruction and its effects on EFL learners' writing performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(3), 412–423.
- Department of Education. (2016a). *K to 12 curriculum guide: English*.
- Department of Education. (2016b). DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016: *The learning action cell as a K to 12 basic education program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning*.

- Derewianka, B. (2015). Teaching and learning narrative writing. Primary English Teaching Association Australia.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- Ellis, R. (2008). The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
- Garcia, L. M. (2021). Discourse competence and writing quality among ESL learners: A correlational study. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 11(4), 88–102.
- Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). Teaching speaking: A holistic approach. Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graham, S., Gillespie, A., & McKeown, D. (2012). Writing: Importance, development, and instruction. *Reading and Writing*, 25(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-011-9311-2>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. Edward Arnold.
- Hidalgo, J., & Quijano, M. (2020). Validation of instructional materials and its impact on learners' writing performance. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 6(3), 120–128.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writing. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2019). Second language writing (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, E. B. (2002). Contextual teaching and learning: What it is and why it's here to stay. Corwin Press.
- Johnson, K., & Huang, L. (2021). Task-based speaking interventions in EFL contexts. *Modern Language Journal*, 105(2), 330–347.
- Kim, S., & Santos, R. (2022). Teacher evaluation and usability of instructional materials in language classrooms. *Asian Journal of Educational Development*, 8(1), 23–39.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. Longman.
- Lopez, M. (2022). Writing anxiety and contextualized instruction among Filipino learners. *Philippine Journal of Language Education*, 14(2), 55–70.
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Moreno, R. (2019). Multimedia learning and instructional design principles. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31(2), 1–18.
- Myhill, D. (2018). Grammar as a meaning-making resource for improving writing. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 18, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2018.18.04.04>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). Learning vocabulary in another language (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nguyen, T., & Smith, J. (2022). Real-world writing tasks and EFL learners' writing performance: An experimental study. *TESOL Quarterly Research Reports*, 56(3), 210–225.
- Nunan, D. (2003). Practical English language teaching. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Omodan, B. I. (2022). Influence of instructional materials on learner motivation and engagement. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 12(1), 88–96.
- Park, J., & Lee, J. (2025). Action research on paragraph writing instruction to enhance the writing competence of third-grade elementary students: Focusing on threaded models and curriculum-based measurement. *Korean Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 417–443. <https://doi.org/10.14333/KJTE.2025.41.3.18>
- Republic of the Philippines. (2013). Republic Act No. 10533: Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). Communicative language teaching today. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). Key issues in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice. Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, T., & Silva, P. (2021). Task-based language teaching and oral fluency. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 12(3), 145–163.
- Saavedra, A. (2020). Factors that contribute to the poor writing skills in Filipino and English of the elementary pupils. *International Journal on Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 14(12), 1–17.
- Saragih, A. (2019). The effect of well-organized instructional materials on learners' understanding. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(4), 789–795.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shin, H., & Lee, D. (2025). Corpus-based feedback in elementary English writing: Impacts on performance and learner attitudes. *Brain, Digital, & Learning*, 15(2), 217–234.
- Skar, G. B., Graham, S., Huebner, A., Kvistad, A. H., Johansen, M. B., & Aasen, A. J. (2024). A longitudinal intervention study of the effects of increasing amount of meaningful writing across grades 1 and 2. *Reading and Writing*, 37(6), 1345–1373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10460-0>
- Smith, A., & Lee, J. (2022). Effects of vocabulary instruction on EFL learners' writing performance: A quasi-experimental study. *Journal of English Language Teaching Studies*, 10(2), 134–150.
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). Developing materials for language teaching (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury.

- Torres, M., & Manalo, P. (2020). Contextualized writing instruction and its impact on learners' writing performance in the Philippine classroom. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(4), 112–120.
- Tribble, C. (2014). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Uy, K. A., & Guillermo, R. (2024). The Effect of Language Intervention Activities on the Performance of Elementary Learners. *Social Science & Humanities Journal*, 8(05), 3731–3745.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.