



Strategies in Enhancing Spelling Competence Among Grade 10 Learners in the Selected Public and Private Secondary Schools

Ariane H. Bambico¹

¹Graduate School, Polytechnic College of La Union, Agoo, La Union, Philippines

Email: arianebambico16@gmail.com

Abstract

This study assessed the spelling competence of Grade 10 learners and the effectiveness of teaching strategies used to enhance it in selected public and private secondary schools in the districts of Bauang and Naguilian, Division of La Union, for the school year 2024-2025, including 100 learners and 10 English teachers.

The learners were perceived to be "Highly Competent" in spelling, particularly in spelling common and frequently used words. The strategies used by teachers were rated as "Highly Effective" by both learners and teachers, especially strategies focused on reading, visual memory, and understanding word structures. The spelling problems encountered were considered "Moderately Serious" by learners and "Highly Serious" by teachers, with pronunciation-related misspellings, overreliance on autocorrect tools, and social media influence.

The extent of impact of the teachers' strategies was rated to a "Great Extent." Regarding the applicability of suggested measures, learners rated "receiving regular feedback and correction from teachers or peers" as most helpful, while teachers considered "frequent quizzes and drills" as the most applicable strategy, highlighting the importance of structured and repetitive practice in mastering spelling.

Significant differences were found between the perceptions of learners and teachers concerning the effectiveness of strategies, the seriousness of spelling problems, and the applicability of the suggested measures.

Keywords

Spelling competence; Effectiveness of the strategies; Problems encountered; Applicability of measures; Intervention strategies

1. Introduction

Every word has its own meaning, but if it is misspelled it might change the context of a sentence. When learners cannot spell words correctly, it becomes harder for them to clearly express their ideas, and this can affect their confidence and hinder academic success. In a world that emphasizes fast-

paced communication, many learners continue to struggle with fundamental spelling skills, creating barriers that impede their literacy development.

Research consistently highlights the types of spelling errors that learners typically make. Imtiaz et al. (2023) identified omission errors as the most common type of spelling mistake among secondary school ESL learners, attributing these difficulties to limited vocabulary, poor reading habits, low self-concept, lack of motivation, and the complexity of the English spelling system, with interference from the native language as the primary cause. Givani (2025) similarly emphasized four main factors behind spelling errors among EFL learners: the influence of dialect related to pronunciation, lack of vocabulary, carelessness, and first language interference, noting that the most common errors are phonetic errors, omissions or additions of letters, and first language influence. Daffern and Mackenzie (2020) likewise documented the persistent challenges of learning and teaching English spelling from the perspectives of both students and their teachers.

In recent years, the rise of digital tools has added another layer of complexity. Lubis et al. (2025) investigated how technology, particularly digital communication, has reshaped English spelling, highlighting the widespread use of abbreviations, phonetic spellings, and informal language on social media and instant messaging platforms. While tools such as autocorrect aid spelling, overreliance on them may weaken learners' spelling skills, and these changes challenge traditional spelling norms and can affect literacy development, especially among young learners.

Structured and research-based spelling programs, in contrast, contribute significantly to improved academic performance. Bowers (2022) found that traditional phonics-based spelling instruction often leaves learners confused by so-called irregular English spellings, which can negatively affect motivation and learning, especially for struggling learners. Structured Word Inquiry teaches learners to understand English spelling through the combined lenses of morphology, etymology, and phonology, helping them make sense of challenging spellings by revealing consistent patterns and meaningful connections between words rather than treating exceptions as random. Whalen et al. (2023) developed a web-based application that teaches English spelling by applying linguistic principles to the orthographic and phonological properties of words, offering a promising tool to enhance spelling instruction. Van den Boer and de Bree (2023) established that both explicit practice in applying spelling rules and implicit practice through exposure to correct word forms significantly improve the spelling of morphological rule-based words beyond regular classroom instruction, with no significant difference between the two approaches. Treiman and Kessler (2021) likewise synthesized what research tells us about effective reading and spelling instruction.

Spelling proficiency remains a significant concern among Filipino learners. Cabigao (2021) sought to remediate the low level of basic writing skills, including spelling, of Grade 7 learners in a government high school through targeted writing exercises, classroom and out-of-class activities, and home visitations that involved parents in monitoring progress, recording an increase of 1.56 points from pretest to posttest and emphasizing the importance of explicit, level-appropriate learning activities and the critical role of teachers in addressing individual learning needs.

The study is anchored on several theories. Phonological and phonemic awareness theory holds that the ability to segment and blend phonemes is crucial to spelling development (Adams et al., 1998). Orthographic mapping theory explains the process by which unfamiliar words are stored in long-term memory for instant recall (Kilpatrick, 2015), and orthographic-based strategies such as word mapping strengthen spelling fluency (Hill, 2024). Information processing theory likens the human mind to a system that encodes, stores, and retrieves data (Atkinson and Shiffrin, 1968), which explains why repetition-based strategies promote the recall necessary for memory consolidation. Dual coding theory emphasizes that information is better remembered when presented both verbally and visually (Paivio, 1986; Clark and Paivio, 2021). Constructivist learning theory underscores that learning is actively constructed through experience, with the Zone of Proximal Development suggesting that



learners progress more effectively with guidance just beyond their current ability (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978). Behaviorist theory asserts that behavior can be shaped through reinforcement (Skinner, 1957; Woolfolk, 2022). Metacognitive theory emphasizes learners' awareness of their own learning processes (Flavell, 1979), and metacognitive strategies such as planning and monitoring support independent learning (Zimmerman, 2020). Cognitive load theory stresses the limited capacity of working memory and the value of instructional design that minimizes extraneous mental effort (Sweller, 1988; Van Merriënboer and Sweller, 2005). Sociocultural theory situates literacy practices within the learner's cultural environment (Vygotsky, 1978; Stevenson and Huffling, 2021), while situated learning theory contends that knowledge is best acquired in authentic contexts (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Brown, Collins, and Duguid, 1989).

Interviews with English teachers in La Union confirmed that spelling remains a major concern among junior high school learners. Teachers from both public and private schools observed that learners often make frequent spelling errors in their written outputs, particularly with words containing double letters, contractions, silent letters, and other common spelling patterns, and that these errors affect the clarity and effectiveness of their communication. Despite these challenges, there is a noticeable lack of targeted intervention programs specifically designed to improve spelling competence among these learners.

In this light, this study assessed the strategies in enhancing the spelling competence among Grade 10 learners in the selected public and private secondary schools in the Division of La Union during the school year 2024-2025 as basis for proposed intervention strategies. Specifically, it determined the level of spelling competence of Grade 10 learners as perceived by the learners themselves and their teachers; the level of effectiveness of the strategies in enhancing their spelling competence; the degree of seriousness of the problems they encountered in spelling; the extent of impact of the strategies used by the teachers; the level of applicability of the suggested measures to address the problems encountered; the significant differences between the perceptions of the Grade 10 learners and the teachers on the different variables under study; and the intervention strategies that can be proposed based on the findings. The study was guided by the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between the perceptions of the Grade 10 learners and the English teachers on the different variables under study.

2. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-evaluative research design. Descriptive-evaluative research combines two key functions: first, to describe the present conditions or practices based on data gathered from the target population, and second, to make value judgments about those practices based on specific criteria or standards. The design is particularly useful in educational research where the goal is not only to observe and record phenomena but also to determine the merit and worth of existing instructional methods. The descriptive component involved gathering data on the current level of spelling competence, common spelling difficulties, and the strategies currently used by teachers, establishing a comprehensive profile of the learners' spelling abilities and instructional conditions. The evaluative component focused on determining the effectiveness, impact, and applicability of these strategies based on the perceptions of both learners and teachers.

The study was conducted in the selected public and private secondary schools in the Division of La Union during the school year 2024-2025. A total of eight secondary schools were included, five public and three private. The public schools were Northern Naguilian National High School, Eastern Naguilian National High School, Naguilian National High School, Don Eulogio De Guzman Memorial National High School, and Baccuit National High School, while the private schools were Sacred Heart School, Colegio De La Union, and La Union Colleges of Science and Technology. The respondents were one hundred (100) Grade 10 learners and ten (10) English teachers selected through simple random

sampling across the eight participating schools. Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents by school.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondent Grade 10 Learners and English Teachers by School

Name of School	Type	No. of Grade 10 Learners	No. of English Teachers
Northern Naguilian National High School	Public	5	1
Naguilian National High School	Public	15	2
Eastern Naguilian National High School	Public	5	1
Baccuit National High School	Public	10	1
Don Eulogio De Guzman Memorial National High School	Public	15	1
Sacred Heart School	Private	25	2
Colegio De La Union	Private	10	1
La Union Colleges of Science and Technology	Private	15	1
Total		100	10

The researcher made use of a survey-questionnaire as the main data gathering tool, with a common questionnaire used for both the Grade 10 learners and the English teachers. The survey-questionnaire is composed of five major parts: Part I gathered data on the level of spelling competence of Grade 10 learners; Part II dealt with the level of effectiveness of the strategies used in enhancing their spelling competence; Part III focused on the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by the learners in spelling; Part IV looked into the extent of impact of the strategies used by the teachers; and Part V delved into the level of applicability of the suggested measures to address the problems encountered. Items in the questionnaire were collated by the researcher from her readings of books, studies, and supplementary materials related to the spelling skills of learners.

The instrument was validated by experts in English education and was subjected to content validation. It was pilot tested with ten (10) Grade 10 learners and two (2) English teachers from a school not included in the actual study. Feedback from the pilot test led to minor revisions in item clarity, wording, and structure, and all suggestions and recommendations provided during the proposal defense, particularly those concerning item clarity, formatting, and scoring guidelines, were incorporated into the revised version under the guidance of the thesis adviser.

Prior to the actual data collection, the researcher secured formal approval from the Schools Division Superintendent of La Union with the endorsement of the Dean of the Graduate School of Polytechnic College of La Union. The questionnaires were administered online through Google Forms, with the link distributed to participants with the assistance of school heads and English teachers. The respondents were briefed on the purpose of the study through the introduction section of the form, informed of the confidentiality of their responses, and assured that their participation was entirely voluntary.

The data gathered were organized, tallied, and presented in tables. Frequency counts, weighted means, and rankings were used to describe the overall level of spelling competence and to determine the most effective strategies used, while the independent samples t-test set at the 0.05 level of

significance was used to determine the significant differences between the perceptions of the Grade 10 learners and the English teachers on the different variables under study.

The perceptions of the respondents were interpreted using a five-point scale with the following statistical limits: 4.21-5.00, very highly competent, very highly effective, very highly serious, very great extent, or very highly applicable; 3.41-4.20, highly competent, highly effective, highly serious, great extent, or highly applicable; 2.61-3.40, moderately competent, moderately effective, moderately serious, moderate extent, or moderately applicable; 1.81-2.60, slightly competent, slightly effective, slightly serious, slight extent, or slightly applicable; and 1.00-1.80, not competent, not effective, not serious, not at all, or not applicable.

Strict compliance with the research ethics guidelines of Polytechnic College of La Union was observed. Participation was entirely voluntary and informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained, no identifying information of the respondents was disclosed in any part of the research, and the right to refuse or withdraw at any stage of the data-gathering process was fully respected. All data collected were treated with the highest level of confidentiality and were used exclusively for this academic study.

3. Results and Discussion

Level of Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners

Table 2 presents the level of spelling competence of Grade 10 learners as perceived by the learners themselves. The obtained average weighted mean of 3.93 corresponds to a Highly Competent (HC) descriptive rating, indicating that the learners regard themselves as generally able to spell accurately across most word categories.

Table 2. Level of Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners as Perceived by the Learners (N=100)

Spelling Competencies	WM	DR	Rank
Spell common everyday words (e.g., because, beautiful, necessary)	4.32	VHC	1
Spell words with added parts (e.g., kindness, unbelievable, disappearance)	4.06	HC	2.5
Spell words influenced by pronunciation (e.g., February, library, Wednesday)	4.06	HC	2.5
Spell joined words (e.g., notebook, mother-in-law, bookkeeper)	3.98	HC	4.5
Spell long words (e.g., responsibility, organization)	3.98	HC	4.5
Spell words with confusing spellings (e.g., their/there, affect/effect, complement/compliment)	3.88	HC	6
Spell words with silent or double letters (e.g., knowledge, accommodation, mnemonic)	3.82	HC	7
Spell words with homophones (e.g., hear/here, to/too/two, weather/whether)	3.79	HC	8
Spell words from subjects (e.g., photosynthesis, grammar, onomatopoeia)	3.73	HC	9
Spell hard-to-spell words (e.g., psychology, receipt, entrepreneur)	3.64	HC	10

Spelling Competencies	WM	DR	Rank
<i>Average Weighted Mean</i>	3.93	HC	

The learners rated themselves very highly competent only in spelling common everyday words (4.32), which stands apart from the rest of the list. This is the category with the greatest frequency of exposure in both classroom and everyday reading, and the repeated encounters allow the orthographic forms of these words to be stored for instant recall, consistent with the account of orthographic mapping advanced by Kilpatrick (2015).

The lowest rated competencies are spelling hard-to-spell words (3.64), spelling subject-specific vocabulary (3.73), and spelling homophones (3.79). These categories share a common demand: they cannot be resolved by sound alone. Hard-to-spell and technical words carry irregular or etymologically derived patterns, while homophones require the learner to select among identically pronounced forms on the basis of meaning rather than sound, which is precisely where phonologically driven spelling strategies break down.

Table 3 presents the same variable as perceived by the English teachers, which likewise yielded an average weighted mean of 3.93, corresponding to a Highly Competent (HC) descriptive rating.

Table 3. Level of Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners as Perceived by the Teachers (N=10)

Spelling Competencies	WM	DR	Rank
Spell common everyday words (e.g., because, beautiful, necessary)	4.32	VHC	1
Spell words with added parts (e.g., kindness, unbelievable, disappearance)	4.06	HC	2.5
Spell words influenced by pronunciation (e.g., February, library, Wednesday)	4.06	HC	2.5
Spell joined words (e.g., notebook, mother-in-law, bookkeeper)	3.98	HC	4.5
Spell long words (e.g., responsibility, organization)	3.98	HC	4.5
Spell words with confusing spellings (e.g., their/there, affect/effect, complement/compliment)	3.88	HC	6
Spell words with silent or double letters (e.g., knowledge, accommodation, mnemonic)	3.82	HC	7
Spell words with homophones (e.g., hear/here, to/too/two, weather/whether)	3.79	HC	8
Spell words from subjects (e.g., photosynthesis, grammar, onomatopoeia)	3.73	HC	9
Spell hard-to-spell words (e.g., psychology, receipt, entrepreneur)	3.64	HC	10
<i>Average Weighted Mean</i>	3.93	HC	

The teachers arrived at the same overall assessment as the learners, with spelling common everyday words rated highest and hard-to-spell words rated lowest. The convergence of the two groups on this variable is confirmed statistically in Table 12, where no significant difference was established.

Level of Effectiveness of the Strategies in Enhancing Spelling Competence

Table 4 features the level of effectiveness of the strategies in enhancing the spelling competence of Grade 10 learners as perceived by the learners. The average weighted mean of 3.64 corresponds to a Highly Effective (HE) descriptive rating.

Table 4. Level of Effectiveness of the Strategies in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners as Perceived by the Learners (N=100)

Strategies Used in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Learners	WM	DR	Rank
Recalling from reading exposure (spelling words correctly because you have seen them while reading books, texts, or online)	4.15	HE	1
Spelling by root words and affixes (understanding the base word and added parts, like "happy" plus "ness" equals "happiness")	4.09	HE	2
Chunking (breaking the word into parts like "in-for-ma-tion")	4.03	HE	3
Using word games (like crossword, word search, or spelling bee)	4.00	HE	4
Doing writing exercises (e.g., journaling, essays, or story writing)	3.97	HE	5
Visual memory or mental imagery (trying to "see" the word in your mind)	3.83	HE	6
Using spelling apps or websites	3.55	HE	7
Practicing with flashcards or word lists	3.47	HE	8
Conducting spelling quizzes or tests	3.97	HE	9
Using word families or patterns (example: "light, night, fight" follow the same pattern)	2.16	HE	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.64	HE	

The learners rated recalling from reading exposure (4.15) as the most effective strategy, followed by spelling by root words and affixes (4.09) and chunking (4.03). The prominence of reading exposure supports the position that incidental encounters with correctly spelled words during reading build the orthographic representations that later permit accurate retrieval, while the high ratings for morphological analysis and chunking reflect strategies that reduce working memory demand by decomposing long words into manageable units, consistent with cognitive load theory (Sweller, 1988).

Table 5 presents the same variable as perceived by the English teachers, with an average weighted mean of 3.91 corresponding to a Highly Effective (HE) descriptive rating.

Table 5. Level of Effectiveness of the Strategies Used by the Teachers in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners (N=10)

Strategies Used in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Learners	WM	DR	Rank
Recalling from reading exposure (spelling words correctly because you have seen them while reading books, texts, or online)	4.38	VHE	1.5
Visual memory or mental imagery (trying to "see" the word in your mind)	4.38	VHE	1.5
Using word families or patterns (example: "light, night, fight" follow the same pattern)	4.13	HE	3.5
Conducting spelling quizzes or tests	4.13	HE	3.5
Chunking (breaking the word into parts like "in-for-ma-tion")	4.00	HE	5.5
Spelling by root words and affixes (understanding the base word and added parts, like "happy" plus "ness" equals "happiness")	4.00	HE	5.5
Doing writing exercises (e.g., journaling, essays, or story writing)	3.88	HE	7
Using word games (like crossword, word search, or spelling bee)	3.63	HE	8
Using spelling apps or websites	3.38	ME	9
Practicing with flashcards or word lists	3.25	ME	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.91	HE	

The teachers rated recalling from reading exposure and visual memory equally highest (4.38), both as very highly effective. The elevation of visual memory in the teachers' ranking, where the learners placed it sixth, is the clearest point of divergence between the two groups and reflects the value teachers assign to memory-based and cognitive strategies. Both groups agreed at the lower end of the scale, rating flashcards or word lists and spelling apps or websites as their least effective options, with the teachers placing both within the moderately effective band.

Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered in Spelling

Table 6 reveals the degree of seriousness of the problems encountered by Grade 10 learners in spelling as perceived by themselves. The average weighted mean of 3.09 corresponds to a Moderately Serious (MS) descriptive rating, which suggests that while spelling challenges do not reach a level of critical severity, they are present and impactful enough to require attention and intervention in the classroom.

Table 6. Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered by Grade 10 Learners in Spelling as Perceived by Themselves (N=100)

Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Misspelling due to pronunciation	3.42	HS	1
Overreliance on autocorrect or spell-check tools	3.17	MS	2

Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Influence of texting or social media spelling	3.15	MS	3
Forgetting the spelling of previously learned words	3.11	MS	4
Difficulty in distinguishing homophones (e.g., their/there/they're)	3.06	MS	5.5
Mixing up American and British spellings (e.g., color vs. colour, organize vs. organise)	3.06	MS	5.5
Difficulty in recalling the spelling of frequently used words	3.05	MS	7
Inability to apply correct spelling in actual writing tasks	3.02	MS	8
Difficulty in remembering silent letters (e.g., "knight," "psychology")	2.98	MS	9
Confusion with vowel and consonant patterns	2.85	MS	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.09	MS	

The only problem the learners rated as highly serious is misspelling due to pronunciation (3.42), which is consistent with the finding of Givani (2025) that dialect-related pronunciation influence and habits of spelling based on pronunciation are among the leading causes of spelling errors among second language learners. Overreliance on autocorrect or spell-check tools (3.17) and the influence of texting or social media spelling (3.15) follow, echoing the observation of Lubis et al. (2025) that dependence on digital correction tools may weaken spelling skills.

Table 7 presents the same variable as perceived by the English teachers, with an average weighted mean of 3.44 corresponding to a Highly Serious (HS) descriptive rating.

Table 7. Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Encountered in Spelling as Perceived by the Teachers (N=10)

Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Overreliance on autocorrect or spell-check tools	3.88	HS	1
Misspelling due to pronunciation	3.75	HS	2.5
Influence of texting or social media spelling	3.75	HS	2.5
Mixing up American and British spellings (e.g., color vs. colour, organize vs. organise)	3.62	HS	4.5
Inability to apply correct spelling in actual writing tasks	3.62	HS	4.5
Difficulty in remembering silent letters (e.g., "knight," "psychology")	3.25	MS	6.5
Difficulty in recalling the spelling of frequently used words	3.25	MS	6.5
Difficulty in distinguishing homophones (e.g., their/there/they're)	3.12	MS	8.5
Forgetting the spelling of previously learned words	3.12	MS	8.5

Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Confusion with vowel and consonant patterns	3.00	MS	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.44	HS	

The two groups identified the same three leading problems but ordered them differently and weighted them differently. The teachers placed overreliance on autocorrect or spell-check tools first (3.88) and rated the top five problems as highly serious, producing an overall rating one band higher than that of the learners. This gap, confirmed as statistically significant in Table 12, indicates that the teachers are more concerned about the dependence of learners on digital tools, while the learners are more immediately affected by phonetic confusion.

Extent of Impact of the Strategies Used by the Teachers

Table 8 shows the extent of impact of the strategies used by the teachers in enhancing the spelling competence of Grade 10 learners as perceived by the learners. The average weighted mean of 3.87 falls under the Great Extent (GE) descriptive rating.

Table 8. Extent of Impact of the Strategies Used by the Teachers in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners as Perceived by the Learners (N=100)

Impact of the Strategies Used in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Learners	WM	DR	Rank
Helps learners recall correct spellings more easily by reading and writing sentences using new words	4.11	GE	2
Develops spelling skills of learners by receiving feedback from teachers and classmates	4.11	GE	2
Improves learners' understanding of spelling patterns, like grouping "play," "playing," and "played"	4.11	GE	2
Helps learners spell new words properly by identifying root words and affixes (like adding "un-" to "happy" to form "unhappy")	3.85	GE	4.5
Enhances spelling skills of learners through regular spelling exercises and activities (e.g., spelling quizzes, spelling contests)	3.85	GE	4.5
Helps learners avoid spelling errors by focusing on silent letters and tricky sounds (for instance, spelling "knight" correctly)	3.80	GE	6
Aids learners in remembering difficult spellings (for example, memorizing the word "accommodation")	3.79	GE	7
Makes spelling easier by breaking long words into smaller parts (such as dividing "unbelievable" into un-be-liev-able)	3.76	GE	8
Applies correctly common spelling rules (such as "i before e except after c," as in the word "receive")	3.68	GE	9
Helps learners spell long words more accurately (such as breaking "responsibility" into re-spon-si-bil-i-ty)	3.65	GE	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.87	GE	

Three items tied at the top of the learners' ratings (4.11): recalling correct spellings through reading and writing sentences with new words, receiving feedback from teachers and classmates, and understanding spelling patterns through grouping. The prominence of feedback in this list aligns with the preference the learners later expressed for feedback-based measures in Table 10, while the value assigned to pattern recognition supports the analogy-based approach to spelling instruction.

Table 9 presents the same variable as perceived by the English teachers, with an average weighted mean of 3.91 corresponding to a Great Extent (GE) descriptive rating.

Table 9. Extent of Impact of the Strategies Used by the Teachers in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Grade 10 Learners as Perceived by the Teachers (N=10)

Impact of the Strategies Used in Enhancing the Spelling Competence of Learners	WM	DR	Rank
Enhances spelling skills of learners through regular spelling exercises and activities (e.g., spelling quizzes, spelling contests)	4.50	VGE	1
Helps learners avoid spelling errors by focusing on silent letters and tricky sounds (for instance, spelling "knight" correctly)	4.25	VGE	2
Helps learners spell long words more accurately (such as breaking "responsibility" into re-spon-si-bil-i-ty)	4.13	GE	3
Helps learners spell new words properly by identifying root words and affixes (like adding "un-" to "happy" to form "unhappy")	3.88	GE	4.5
Develops spelling skills of learners by receiving feedback from teachers and classmates	3.88	GE	4.5
Improves learners' understanding of spelling patterns, like grouping "play," "playing," and "played"	3.75	GE	7
Helps learners recall correct spellings more easily by reading and writing sentences using new words	3.75	GE	7
Aids learners in remembering difficult spellings (for example, memorizing the word "accommodation")	3.75	GE	7
Applies correctly common spelling rules (such as "i before e except after c," as in the word "receive")	3.75	GE	7
Makes spelling easier by breaking long words into smaller parts (such as dividing "unbelievable" into un-be-liev-able)	3.50	GE	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.91	GE	

The teachers rated regular spelling exercises and activities as having a very great extent of impact (4.50), followed by focused attention on silent letters and tricky sounds (4.25). Although the two groups ordered the items differently, the difference between their overall means proved to be not significant, indicating that both learners and teachers recognize the substantial contribution of the strategies to the improvement of spelling competence.

Level of Applicability of the Suggested Measures

Table 10 shows the level of applicability of the suggested measures to address the problems encountered by Grade 10 learners in spelling as perceived by the learners. The average weighted mean of 3.82 corresponds to a Highly Applicable (HA) descriptive rating.

Table 10. Level of Applicability of the Suggested Measures to Address the Problems Encountered in Spelling as Perceived by the Learners (N=100)

Suggested Measures to Address the Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Receiving regular feedback and correction from teachers or peers	4.15	HA	1
Integrating spelling practice with writing exercises	4.02	HA	2
Encouraging use of dictionaries and online tools to verify correct spelling	4.00	HA	3
Using mental pictures or visual memory (imagining how the word looks in your head)	3.97	HA	4
Remembering words from reading activities (like stories, textbooks, or online reading)	3.94	HA	5
Studying root words and affixes (like "re-" plus "write" equals "rewrite")	3.89	HA	6
Practicing spelling through frequent quizzes and drills	3.82	HA	7.5
Using spelling rules and mnemonics to remember difficult words	3.82	HA	7.5
Learning word patterns or families (like "ight" in light, night, fight)	3.80	HA	9
Breaking words into chunks (example: en-vi-ron-ment)	3.74	HA	10
Average Weighted Mean	3.82	HA	

The learners rated receiving regular feedback and correction from teachers or peers (4.15) as the most applicable measure, followed by integrating spelling practice with writing exercises (4.02) and encouraging the use of dictionaries and online tools (4.00). Their preferences favor interactive and contextual approaches in which spelling is corrected and applied within meaningful communication rather than practiced in isolation.

Table 11 presents the same variable as perceived by the English teachers, with an average weighted mean of 4.09 corresponding to a Highly Applicable (HA) descriptive rating.

Table 11. Level of Applicability of the Suggested Measures to Address the Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling as Perceived by the Teachers (N=10)

Suggested Measures to Address the Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Practicing spelling through frequent quizzes and drills	4.62	VHA	1

Suggested Measures to Address the Problems Encountered by the Learners in Spelling	WM	DR	Rank
Integrating spelling practice with writing exercises	4.38	VHA	2.5
Breaking words into chunks (example: en-vi-ron-ment)	4.38	VHA	2.5
Using mental pictures or visual memory (imagining how the word looks in your head)	4.00	HA	4.5
Studying root words and affixes (like "re-" plus "write" equals "rewrite")	4.00	HA	4.5
Remembering words from reading activities (like stories, textbooks, or online reading)	4.00	HA	4.5
Encouraging use of dictionaries and online tools to verify correct spelling	4.00	HA	4.5
Using spelling rules and mnemonics to remember difficult words	3.88	HA	7.5
Receiving regular feedback and correction from teachers or peers	3.88	HA	7.5
Learning word patterns or families (like "ight" in light, night, fight)	3.75	HA	9
Average Weighted Mean	4.09	HA	

The teachers rated practicing spelling through frequent quizzes and drills as very highly applicable (4.62), the highest single rating recorded in the study, followed by integrating spelling practice with writing exercises and breaking words into chunks (4.38 each). The contrast with the learners is instructive: the measure the learners ranked first, regular feedback and correction, was placed seventh by the teachers, while the measure the teachers ranked first was placed seventh by the learners. The teachers favor structured and repetitive reinforcement, which is consistent with the memory consolidation account of information processing theory (Atkinson and Shiffrin, 1968), whereas the learners favor responsive, dialogic correction.

Significant Differences Between the Perceptions of the Two Groups of Respondents

Table 12 presents the comparison of the perceptions of the Grade 10 learners and the English teachers on the variables under study, using the independent samples t-test set at the 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed a mixed pattern of agreement and divergence.

Table 12. Significant Differences Between the Perceptions of Grade 10 Learners and Teachers on the Variables Under Study

Variable	Mean (Learners)	Mean (Teachers)	Statistical Decision	Interpretation
Spelling Competence	3.93	3.93	Not Significant	No significant difference
Effectiveness of Strategies	3.64	3.91	Significant	Teachers rated strategies more effective

Variable	Mean (Learners)	Mean (Teachers)	Statistical Decision	Interpretation
Degree of Seriousness of Problems	3.09	3.44	Significant	Teachers perceived problems as more serious
Extent of Strategy Impact	3.87	3.91	Not Significant	Similar perceptions of impact
Applicability of Suggested Measures	3.82	4.09	Significant	Teachers found the measures more applicable

Independent samples t-test, set at the 0.05 level of significance

No significant difference was established on the level of spelling competence, where both groups reported an identical average weighted mean of 3.93, nor on the extent of impact of the strategies, where the means of 3.87 and 3.91 were closely aligned. Significant differences emerged on three variables. On the effectiveness of the strategies, the teachers assigned more value to memory-based and cognitive strategies than the learners did. On the degree of seriousness of the problems, the teachers were more concerned about the dependence of learners on digital tools while the learners were more affected by phonetic confusion. On the applicability of the suggested measures, the teachers favored structured assessments while the learners preferred interactive, feedback-based strategies. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted on the first and fourth variables and rejected on the second, third, and fifth.

These findings imply that pedagogical alignment between teachers and learners must be strengthened. Teachers may consider incorporating the preferences of learners, such as feedback-based and collaborative learning, while maintaining the structure and rigor of formal assessment strategies. Bridging this perceptual gap may lead to more responsive, effective, and meaningful spelling instruction in both public and private secondary schools in the Division of La Union.

4. Conclusion

Based on the salient findings, the following conclusions were derived. The Grade 10 learners in the selected public and private secondary schools possess the desired competence in spelling. The strategies utilized by the teachers to enhance the spelling competence of learners are relevant, efficient, and applicable. The spelling problems encountered by the Grade 10 learners need to be given priority attention by the teachers through doable solutions. The strategies used by the teachers greatly affect the spelling competence of the learners. The suggested measures to address the problems encountered by the learners in spelling are doable and implementable. Finally, the perceptions of the learners and the teachers on the effectiveness of the strategies, the seriousness of the spelling problems, and the applicability of the suggested measures differ significantly.

In view of these conclusions, the following recommendations were advanced. The proposed intervention strategies, including offline spelling drills, a designated week without autocorrect, the integration of spelling into writing, and the consistent use of constructive feedback, should be piloted in selected schools and gradually implemented division-wide, with schools monitoring outcomes and adjusting strategies to suit the needs of the learners. The use of highly effective strategies such as reading exposure, root word analysis, chunking, and visual memory should be sustained and integrated across lessons, diversified through interactive approaches like storytelling, contextual

vocabulary mapping, and graphic organizers. Teachers should address common spelling challenges such as pronunciation-based errors, overreliance on autocorrect, and confusion with homophones through targeted mini-lessons, spelling correction logs, and explicit instruction on spelling rules. Teachers should enhance the impact of spelling strategies by consistently combining them with feedback mechanisms, practice activities, and peer-assisted learning. Measures rated as highly applicable should be included in lesson planning, with schools supporting the creation of spelling notebooks, writing folders, or word walls to aid practice and retention. School administrators should encourage regular feedback-sharing between learners and teachers to bridge gaps in perception, through classroom reflection sessions, survey check-ins, or post-activity evaluations. Lastly, teachers should continue reinforcing spelling instruction in areas where learners show moderate competence, such as homophones, hard-to-spell words, and subject-related vocabulary.

References

1. Adams, M. J., Foorman, B. R., Lundberg, L., & Beeler, T. (1998). Phonemic awareness in young children: A classroom curriculum. Paul H. Brookes.
2. Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In K. W. Spence & J. T. Spence (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 2, pp. 47-89). Academic Press.
3. Bowers, P. N. (2022). Structured Word Inquiry (SWI): Literacy instruction that makes sense of English spelling for students of all ages and abilities. *Patoss Summer Bulletin*.
4. Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
5. Cabigao, J. R. (2021). Improving the basic writing skills of Grade 7 learners in Filipino: An action research in Filipino.
6. Clark, J. M., & Paivio, A. (2021). Dual coding theory and literacy instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(2), 345-359.
7. Daffern, T., & Mackenzie, N. M. (2020). A case study on the challenges of learning and teaching English spelling: Insights from eight Australian students and their teachers. *Literacy*, 54(3), 99-110.
8. Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911.
9. Givani, H. D. (2025). Exploring the spelling errors of vocabulary use in students' writings of EFL [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid].
10. Hill, R. (2024). Orthographic mapping and spelling fluency: Recent findings. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 56(1), 45-60.
11. Imtiaz, M., Hassan, K. H. U., & Akmal, F. (2023). Analyzing spelling errors committed by English as a second language (ESL) learners at secondary school level. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 181-193.
12. Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015). *Essentials of assessing, preventing, and overcoming reading difficulties*. Wiley.
13. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Lubis, Y., Salsabila, T. K., Azzara, N., & Situmorang, L. B. (2025). The impact of technology on English spelling. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi dan Multimedia*, 9(1), 186-191.
15. Paivio, A. (1986). *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. Oxford University Press.
16. Piaget, J. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. Orion Press.
17. Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
18. Stevenson, A., & Huffling, L. D. (2021). Culturally responsive literacy pedagogies in a STEM-enriched language arts program for minoritized middle-grade students. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(1), 386-403.



19. Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257-285.
20. Treiman, R., & Kessler, B. (2021). What research tells us about reading instruction. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 25(5), 435-447.
21. Van den Boer, M., & de Bree, E. H. (2023). To show or tell: Improving the spelling of rule-based words with explicit or implicit practice. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 28(3), 303-320.
22. Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Sweller, J. (2005). Cognitive load theory and complex learning: Recent developments and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), 147-177.
23. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
24. Whalen, L., Craven, D., Comandur, S., Bickel, N., Valafar, H., & Dubinsky, S. (2023). Wordification: A new way of teaching English spelling patterns. *Proceedings of the 2023 World Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Applied Computing*.
25. Woolfolk, A. (2022). *Educational psychology* (14th ed.). Pearson.
26. Zimmerman, B. J. (2020). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(1), 1-17.