



IMPLEMENTATION OF 8-WEEK READING PROGRAM FOR STRUGGLING READERS: BASIS FOR ENHANCED SCHOOL REMEDIATION PROGRAM

Marcory S. Escalante ¹

¹ Student, Graduate School, The Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra17455>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra17455

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to determine the effect of Implementing the 8-week Reading Program on the Struggling Learners: Basis for Enhanced Remediation Program. This study employed the non-experimental descriptive survey research design in investigating the research problem. It is descriptive because the data are presented in quantitative descriptions on the “Implementation of 8-week Reading Program for Struggling Readers: Basis for Enhanced School Reading Program. According to Good (2023), this method of research shows merely description of tasks presenting the conditions regarding the nature of the group of persons or class of events that involved procedure of analysis, classification, and measurement. It involves varied information regarding the current or present condition (Deauna, 2022). This study will be conducted in Almendras Elementary School. The respondents in this study are the 150 struggling learners of the research locale. The respondents will answer a researcher made assessment test on reading comprehension. This study makes use of the universal sampling procedure considering the manageable number of respondents in the research locale. This revealed that learners’ level in majority of the least mastered competency in reading is at Approaching competency except for giving judgment where they are at developing level. Therefore, it is concluded that the current reading program should be enhanced giving more focus on giving judgment.

KEYWORDS: implementation of 8-week reading program, struggling readers, basis for enhanced school remediation program

INTRODUCTION

Education for all means no one should be left behind; thus, teachers should provide effective strategies for struggling readers. The “one-size fits all strategy” further divides the gap between the slow and advanced learners. The develop strategic intervention reading materials used in remedial programs were composed of 5 parts: vocabulary, getting the main idea, sequencing event, noting details, giving judgement on text. The post-tests show that the participants reading ability progressed to instruction and independent level after the remedial program. It was concluded that determining the student’s present ability is beneficial to develop effective intervention materials. It was suggested that the school leaders and program specialists should develop faculty and student support programs ideally to uplift the student’s literacy.

Reading programs must monitor and evaluate learners’ attainment of the five essential sub-skills of reading instruction (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension). Note that each of the key elements of a high-quality reading program must be designed, monitored and evaluated to increase learners’ attainment of these sub-skills. USAID endorses the use of validated data collection instruments and processes in its programs. All attempts should be made to identify and adapt validated instruments to a particular context before creating new, untested instruments. USAID has developed many tools that might be useful in the monitoring and evaluation process, including the CLA Toolkit, the EGRA Toolkit, the EGRA itself, guidance on which assessment instruments are best suited for which purposes, an oral language assessment module, a classroom observation tool, a How-To Note on Collecting Data on Disability.



One of the most prominent researchers in the field of reading programs for struggling readers is Dr. Louisa Moats. Dr. Moats is a renowned literacy expert who has conducted extensive research on reading development and effective instructional practices, particularly for students with reading difficulties. Her work emphasizes the importance of early intervention, systematic and explicit instruction in phonics and phonemic awareness, and the use of evidence-based instructional approaches. Dr. Moats has authored numerous scholarly articles, books, and professional development materials that have significantly influenced reading instruction practices in schools across the United States. A remedial reading teacher in the Philippines or a reading specialist in the U.S. and majority of the European countries is a professional teacher who has an adept background and training in honing the reading abilities of students in general and assists struggling readers to improve themselves (International Reading Association [IRA], 2018.). Although the majority of the work of a remedial reading teacher revolves on providing instruction for struggling readers, he or she is also tasked to serve as a focal person to teachers to further hone their pedagogical practices related to literacy education. In America, the competencies and requirements of being a remedial reading teacher are set by the publication Standards for Reading Professionals (IRA, 1998). The stipulated standards are bases for differentiating remedial reading teachers from regular reading classroom teachers. Since they are considered education professionals, it is clear in the Standards that those without appropriate credentials, degrees, training, and backgrounds and those who cannot show advanced skills in literacy education are not legible to be remedial reading teachers.

According to a study conducted by National Reading Panel, five literacy skills namely, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, phonics, and comprehension goes into the making of a reader with skills in reading (NICHD, 2022). Various studies have emphasized the inclusion of these areas of reading in the academic curriculum (Castles, Rastle, & Nation, 2022). A platform should be made available for students for improving their reading skills with prompting systems and remedial feedback (Dessemontet et al., 2021).

One of the most important aspects of education is reading, which is essential to progress in a literate society. It is important then to speed up reading through reading programs. The Implementation of 8-Week Reading Program meant to address the reading skills and close the gap from current skills to expected literacy that would help early-grade learners progress better. With this, intervention programs like the 8-Week Reading Program should be sustained and others with similar features that address learning gaps may be implemented as well. Following our spiral curriculum along the implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum, the level of difficulty in reading is ascending; that is the challenge among reading teachers. If the child has poor reading, chances are his or her performance in any other subjects is poor and eventually affects learning (Dacalos et al., 2021).

Reading remediation is a supplemental reading program that focuses on correct phonological processes. An effective reading program develops reading competence in all students and is based on proven practices. Three components are critical to the design, implementation, and sustainability of powerful reading instruction: professional development that equips educators with a solid knowledge base; effective instructional tools that are aligned to the knowledge base; and school systems that support and nurture implementation.

According to the Alliance for Excellent Education (2023), one significant risk factor for dropping out of school is reading achievement level. Students with below grade level reading skills are two times as likely to drop out of school as those who can read on or above grade level (Biancarosa & Snow, 2022).

Currently, many publishers claim to have balanced reading programs that offer both explicit phonics instruction and literature-based instruction. Teachers must look beyond publishers' claims and marketing strategies and evaluate the instructional integrity of these materials by using research-based criteria. The impact of poorly conceived and ill-designed instruction, instruction not supported by the findings of the research literature, cannot be underestimated. While there might not be a single "national researcher" in this specific field, there are scholars who have made significant contributions to understanding and addressing the challenges faced by struggling readers in the Philippines. Queena N. Lee-Chua: A professor at the Ateneo de Manila University, Dr. Lee-Chua's research spans various areas of psychology and education, including cognitive processes in reading and learning difficulties. Her work contributes to understanding the factors that contribute to reading struggles and effective interventions. Dr. Allan B. I. Bernardo: A professor at the University of Santo Tomas, Dr. Bernardo's research focuses on cognitive psychology and



educational assessment. He has conducted studies on reading comprehension strategies and assessment tools for identifying reading difficulties in Filipino children.

In the Division of Davao Del Sur particularly in Almendras Elementary School Sta. Cruz North District problem in reading both in decoding and comprehension is prevalent. This is a perennial problem across the globe when students can read but cannot understand what they read. The researcher being a reading teacher developed this 40-day reading program hoping it can mitigate the problem in reading.

This study seeks to determine the level of implementation of the eight-week reading remediation program on the reading competencies like vocabulary, noting details, getting the main idea, sequencing events and giving judgment. Eventually, this study will come up with an enhanced school reading remediation program addressing the reading difficulty of the learners. Specifically, it seeks answer to the following questions:

1. What is the level of implementation of the following competencies in reading?”

1.1 Vocabulary,

1.2 Noting details,

1.3 Getting the main idea,

1.4 Sequencing Events and

1.5 Giving judgement?

2. From the findings drawn out from this study, what enhanced school reading program can be designed and proposed.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed the non-experimental descriptive survey research design in investigating the research problem. It is descriptive because the data are presented in quantitative descriptions on the “Implementation of 8-week Reading Program for Struggling Readers: Basis for Enhanced School Reading Program. According to Good (2023), this method of research shows merely description of tasks presenting the conditions regarding the nature of the group of persons or class of events that involved procedure of analysis, classification, and measurement. It involves varied information regarding the current or present condition (Deauna, 2022).

Participants and Sampling

This study was conducted in Almendras Elementary School. The respondents in this study are the 150 struggling learners of the research locale. The respondents answered a researcher made assessment test on reading comprehension. This study makes use of the universal sampling procedure considering the manageable number of respondents in the research locale.

Distribution of Respondents

Almendras ES	No of Respondent
Grade 1	30
Grade 2	25
Grade 3	23
Grade 4	22
Grade 5	25
Grade 6	25
TOTAL	150

Research Instruments

This study was utilized the researcher developed assessment test which items and indicators are focused on the least learned reading competencies of the struggling readers in the elementary. The respondents gave their responses on the items in the assessment test. To measure its validity and reliability of the test, a pilot testing will be conducted in a school that is not a part of the research locale using Cron Bach alpha.

To determine the level of reading comprehension on the least learned reading competencies, the following continuum will be used.



Interval	Scale	Level	Criteria
96 and above	5	Advanced	The student at this level exceeds the core requirements in terms of knowledge, skills and understandings and, and can transfer them automatically and flexibly through authentic performance tasks.
89 - 95	4	Proficient	The student at this level has developed the fundamental knowledge and skills and core understandings and, and can transfer them independently through authentic performance tasks.
82 - 88	3	Approaching Proficiency	The student at this level has developed the fundamental knowledge and skills and core understandings and, with little guidance from the teacher and/or with some assistance from peers, can transfer these understandings through authentic performance tasks.
75 - 81	2	Developing	The student at this level possesses the minimum knowledge and skills and core understandings, but needs help throughout the performance of authentic tasks.
Below 75	1	Beginning	The student at this level struggles with his/her understanding; prerequisite and fundamental knowledge and/or skills have not been acquired or developed adequately to aid understanding.

Data Gathering Procedure

At the outset of data gathering procedure, the researcher drafted a letter signed by the Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Pablo F Busquit seeking for permission that this research study be conducted and will be sent to the Dr. Lorenzo Mendoza CESO V, the Schools Division Superintendent in the division of Davao Del Sur.

While letters seeking for permission were delivered to the DepED Schools Division Superintendent and principal concerned, the researcher constructed a questionnaire and have it validated by the experts preferably the experts of the study.

After permission has been granted that this study be conducted in Almendras Elementary School and after the research questionnaire has been thoroughly examined by the expert validators, the researcher will launch the questionnaire to the respondent. Responses of the respondents was been submitted to the statistician for statistical computation after which the researcher were make analysis and interpretation on the data gathered.

Data Analysis

The following statistical tools used in the analysis and interpretation the responses in this study.

Mean used to described the level of reading comprehension of struggling readers on the least mastered competency in reading.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter displays the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations drawn out by the researcher after the analysis and interpretation of the findings had been made.

This study seeks to determine the effect of Implementing the 8-week Reading Program on the Struggling Learners: Basis for Enhanced Remediation Program.

This study employed the non-experimental descriptive survey research design in investigating the research problem. It is descriptive because the data are presented in quantitative descriptions on the “Implementation of 8-week Reading Program for Struggling Readers: Basis for Enhanced School Reading Program. According to Good (2023), this method of research shows merely description of tasks presenting the conditions regarding the nature of the group of persons or class of events that involved procedure of analysis, classification, and measurement. It involves varied information regarding the current or present condition (Deauna, 2022).



This study will be conducted in Almendras Elementary School. The respondents in this study are the 150 struggling learners of the research locale. The respondents will answer a researcher made assessment test on reading comprehension. This study makes use of the universal sampling procedure considering the manageable number of respondents in the research locale.

This revealed that learners' level in majority of the least mastered competency in reading is at Approaching competency except for giving judgment where they are at developing level. Therefore, it is concluded that the current reading program should be enhanced giving more focus on giving judgment.

Conclusions

Based on the collective findings on this study, the following conclusions are drawn: The learners reading competency in Vocabulary is Approaching Proficiency, noting detail is Approaching Proficiency, Getting the main idea is Approaching Proficiency, Sequencing Events is Approaching Proficiency and Giving Judgement is Developing.

This result supports Marzano's (2022) theory that effective teaching methods are crucial for encouraging vocabulary growth. Explicit vocabulary training is one of the research-based methods that teaches word meanings through word connections, context, and repeated exposure to new terms. To help pupils grasp terminology more deeply, visual organizers, word maps, and semantic mapping are some more useful techniques.

This aligns with Klesius's (2021) perspective that various instructional strategies are effective in teaching students to identify the main idea. Effective main idea instruction often includes explicit teaching, modeling, and guided practice. To support students in visualizing and organizing key information.

Harvey and Goudvis's (2021) research, which indicated that a number of instructional techniques work well in training students to take attention of details, supports this. Effective detail noting training must include explicit explanation, modeling, and guided practice. Teachers can assist students in identifying and organizing important information by using visual organizers, such as text annotation tools and detail maps.

Collins (2021) provides support for this. Research indicates that reading comprehension improves when explicit education in event sequencing is provided. Collins' meta-analysis revealed that teaching students to sequence events has a major favorable impact on their comprehension of narrative literature.

Kuhn (2022) supports this by stating that making judgments is necessary to foster deeper comprehension of a book and the development of critical thinking abilities. According to research, pupils who are able to create well-reasoned conclusions are better able to assess the reliability of sources, recognize biases, and draw connections between various texts. Additionally, the capacity for judgment fosters the growth of pupils' analytical and persuasive writing abilities.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings drawn out by the researcher in this study, the following recommendations are offered: The Department of Education officials should give priority to the implementation of reading programs in order to develop the reading skills of our learners. Reading is very important because it is the foundation of all the competencies in our curriculum. If a child does not how to read then it is understood that in other subject areas, they also found difficulty in learning.

School heads should have their own innovation in solving reading problem in school. Decoding and comprehension are two parts of reading. If a learner can't decode words it follows without understanding what they read in a selection. Reading innovation in school becomes important along this line to make our learners in school literate.

Parental and Community Involvement should support and encourage Home Reading Programs: encouraging reading at home with guided reading materials and parent workshops. Community Resources: Partnering with local libraries, literacy organizations, and volunteers to support reading initiatives.



Students, Motivation and Engagement Student Interests: Incorporating students' interests into reading materials to increase engagement. Goal Setting and Rewards: Setting achievable goals and celebrating milestones to motivate students. Teach students to engage actively with the text by asking questions, making predictions, summarizing, and connecting the material to their own experiences or other texts they've read.

Future researchers are encouraged to conduct study on reading remediation program proposing some innovations that will make our learners good and independent readers.

REFERENCES

1. Abocejo, F. T (2022). *The informal reading inventory (Phil-IRI) program: critical analysis. Budapest international research and critics in linguistics and education (BirLE) journal, approach.*
2. Ashdown J., Simic O. (2021). *Is early literacy intervention effective for english language learners?evidence from reading recovery. literacy teaching and Learning, 5, 27-42.*
3. Bettinger E. P., Long B. T. (2021). *Addressing the needs of under-prepared students in higher education: does college remediation work? journal of Human Resources, 44, 736-771.*
4. Boltron, M. T., & Ramos, A. L. (2021). *Improving beginning reading literacy through marungko*
5. Borgonovi F., Ikeda M., Park S. (2021). *Does investing in after-school classes pay off? PISA in Focus, 3, 1-4.*
6. Borman G. (2021). *Summers are for learning. principal, 80(3), 26-29.*
7. Brothen T., Wambach C. A. (2024). *Refocusing developmental education. Journal of Developmental Education, 28(1), 16-22.*
8. Case, M. (2021). *The impact of reading recovery on the reading achievement of first grade*
9. Clay, Marie M.(2023) *An observation survey of early literacy achievement. Heinemann, Hanover St.,*
10. Cosden M., Morrison G., Gutierrez L., Brown M. (2024). *The effects of homework programs and after-school activities on school success. Theory Into Practice, 43, 220-226.*
11. Dennis, D. (2023). *Resilience of the community in the early phase of the covid-19 Pandemic in the Estrema M. L. &Estrema G. L. (2022). factors affecting the reading comprehension of Grade Six*
12. Feleo J. (2021). *Lielong learning and the new educational order. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.*
13. Gordon E. W., Bridglall B. L., Meroe A. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Supplementary education: The hidden curriculum of high academic achievement. Washington, DC: Rowman & Littlefield.*
14. Jacob B. A., Lefgren L. (2024). *Remedial education and student achievement: A regression-discontinuity analysis. Review of Economics and Statistics, 86, 226-244.*
15. Lavy V., Schlosser A. (2024). *Targeted remedial education for under-performing teenagers: Costs and benefits. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.*
16. Little P., Wimer C., Weiss H. B. (2021). *After school programs in the 21st century: Their potential and what it take to achieve it. Issues and Opportunities in Out-of-School Time Evaluation, 10, 1-12.*
17. Luftig R. (2023). *When a little bit means a lot: the effects of a short-term reading program on economically disadvantaged elementary schoolers. Reading Research and Instruction, 42(4), 1-13.*
18. Dacalos et al., (2021) *Effective teaching practices in handling non readersClaude Goldenberg (2022) Teaching English Language Learners: What the research does-and does not-say*
19. Biancarose, G, & Snow (2022) *A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy.*
20. Coltheart,et.al. (2021) *A dual route cascaded model of visual word recognition and reading aloud.*
21. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). **A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Allyn & Bacon.*
22. Becker, A. (2011). *Examining rubrics used to measure writing performance in US intensive English programs. *The CATESOL Journal*, 22(1), 113-130.*
23. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.*
24. Bloom, B. S. (1956). **Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: The cognitive domain*. David McKay Co Inc.*
25. Flavell, J. H. (1979). *Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911.*
26. Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *A linguistic introduction to english fictional prose*. pearson education.*
27. Marzano, R. J. (2000). **Designing a New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Corwin Press.*
28. Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). **Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Erlbaum.*



29. Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Southern Illinois University Press.
30. Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
31. Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 239-264.
32. Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
33. Armbruster, B. B., & Anderson, T. H. (1984). Structure strategy training: Its theoretical basis and its application to less skilled readers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(3), 304-328.
34. Williams, J. P., Stafford, K. B., Lauer, K. D., Hall, K. M., & Pollini, S. (2009). Embedding reading comprehension training in content-area instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(1), 1-20.
35. van den Broek, P., & Kremer, K. E. (2000). *The mind in action: What it means to comprehend during reading*. *Handbook of reading research*, 3, 1-31.
36. Pinnell, G. S., & Fountas, I. C. (2009). *When readers struggle: Teaching that works*. Heinemann.
37. Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117-175.