ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

DRTA AND SQ3R STRATEGIES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GRADE 8 LEARNERS' READING COMPREHENSION

Jen Reeve Mendoza Montecillo
Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effects of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) and the Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review (SQ3R) method on the reading comprehension of Grade 8 students at Santa Cruz Integrated National High School. It also assessed the students' familiarity with both strategies, determined the overall effect on their reading comprehension, and more importantly, analyzed any significant differences in reading comprehension using DRTA and SQ3R methods across literal, inferential, and critical thinking levels.

The study utilized the descriptive method design of research. The focus of the study was the 60 Grade 8 students of Santa Cruz Integrated National High School. Two (2) sections responded to the research questions. The research utilized self-made survey questionnaires, reading materials and test questionnaires to assess the effect of DRTA and SQ3R on their reading comprehension.

The results revealed that students perceived both strategies as beneficial. However, student preferred SQ3R due to its perceived ease of understanding and implementation. In addition, the students generally achieved good to very good levels of comprehension using both DRTA and SQ3R. Interestingly, DRTA has no statistically observed significant effect in reading comprehension across different texts or comprehension levels. However, there might be an isolated effect on critical comprehension. SQ3R, on the other hand, yielded a significant boost in students' ability to draw conclusions and make inferences beyond the surface level of the text.

Based on the findings, the following conclusions drawn; the study revealed a preference for the SQ3R method compared to DRTA; encouragingly, students' reading comprehension remained within a good to very good range regardless of the method used. As anticipated, DRTA did not significantly affect overall reading comprehension across various texts or comprehension levels, justifying its limitation as a primary strategy. However, it may hold potential for developing critical thinking skills. The SQ3R method offered partial support for the hypothesis, demonstrating a significant effect but its influence on literal and critical comprehension remains inconclusive.

In light of these findings, the study recommends that teachers experiment with both DRTA and SQ3R to determine which strategy is more effective for their students, considering the potential benefits for critical thinking with DRTA and inferential comprehension with SQ3R. Additionally, providing explicit instruction and sufficient practice time for students to learn and implement these strategies effectively is crucial. Finally, further research is needed to explore the inconclusive findings, particularly the potential advantage of DRTA for critical thinking and the varying effectiveness of SQ3R across different comprehension levels and text difficulties.

KEYWORDS: *Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA); reading comprehension; (SQ3R)*

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension, the ability to extract and process information from text, is a fundamental skill for academic success across all disciplines. However, many students struggle to grasp the true meaning of what they read, hindering their ability to learn and retain information. To address this challenge, educators have developed various reading comprehension strategies, each with its own strengths and weaknesses.

Among the various reading comprehension strategies, Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review (SQ3R) stand out for their distinct approaches. DRTA is a collaborative, teacher-directed method that guides students through a series of pre-reading, during-reading, and post-reading activities (Vacca et al., 2017). These activities encourage students to activate prior knowledge, predict content, clarify understanding, and make connections with the text, fostering a deeper engagement with the material (Almasi & Hansen, 2018).

SQ3R, on the other hand, is a structured, student-centered strategy that equips learners with a systematic approach to navigate text independently (Francis & Vincent, 2015). SQ3R guides students through the steps of surveying the text to get an overview, formulating questions to guide their reading, actively reading, reciting key points to solidify understanding, and reviewing the entire passage for comprehension (McIntyre & Vaughn, 2019). Proponents of SQ3R emphasize its ability to empower students to take ownership of their learning and develop metacognitive skills (Andre & Anderson, 2015). However, concerns exist about SQ3R's potentially rigid structure, suggesting it may not be adaptable to all text types.
Given the potential benefits and limitations of both DRTA and SQ3R, a comparative analysis is necessary to determine which strategy is more effective in fostering students' reading comprehension across literal, inferential, and critical levels.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

This study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse in reading comprehension instruction by investigating the relative effectiveness of DRTA and SQ3R in a controlled setting. The findings of this research provided valuable insights for educators seeking to optimize student-learning outcomes by identifying which strategy, or potentially a combination of both, best promotes a deeper understanding of complex texts.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, this research sought the answer to the following questions:

1. What is the level of students DRTA in terms of:
   1.1. schema prediction;
   1.2. justification;
   1.3. reading; and
   1.4. validation?
2. What is the level of students SQ3R in terms of:
   2.1. survey;
   2.2. question;
   2.3. read;
   2.4. recite; and
   2.5. review?
3. What is the level of the comprehension of the Grade 8 learners with regards to:
   3.1. literal;
   3.2. inferential; and
   3.3. critical?
4. Is there a significant effect on students' reading comprehension in using the DRTA Strategy?
5. Is there a significant effect on students' reading comprehension in using the SQ3R Method?
6. Is there a significant difference in students' reading comprehension in using DRTA and SQ3R in terms of:
   6.1. literal;
   6.2. inferential; and
   6.3. critical?

2. METHODOLOGY

The present study utilized the descriptive method of research to determine the effect of DRTA and SQ3R Method on the reading comprehension among Grade 8 students of Santa Cruz Integrated National High School. Widely accepted, the descriptive method of research is a fact-finding study that involves adequate and accurate interpretation of findings.

Descriptive Research Design is a type of research design that is devoted to gather information about existing conditions or situation from a specific group of people used by the researcher, in a particular time for the purpose of description and interpretation. This type of research is not simply gathering a large amount of valuable data but also includes proper observation, analysis, interpretation, comparison, identification of trends and relationships.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents, analyzes and interprets the data gathered that showed the significant effect and difference on students' reading comprehension using DRTA strategy and SQ3R method.

Level of the Students Directed Reading Thinking Activity

The level of students directed reading thinking activity include schema prediction, justification, reading and validation and statistically measured using mean and standard deviation.

Table 1. Level of Students DRTA in terms of Schema Prediction.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
Before starting to read, I usually try to predict what the text will be about.	3.83	0.91	Agree
I find it helpful to think about what I already know about a topic before I start reading about it.	4.20	0.71	Agree
Making predictions about a text helps me stay engaged while reading.	3.80	0.81	Agree
I am confident in my ability to make accurate predictions about texts.	3.77	0.77	Agree
I enjoy making predictions about texts, even if my predictions are not always correct.	4.10	0.88	Agree

Overall Mean = 3.94
Standard Deviation = 0.83
Verbal Interpretation = High

Table 1 presents the results of a study assessing students' engagement in DRTA in terms of Schema Prediction. Based on the result of the survey students agree that using Directed Thinking Activity makes them enjoy the process of making predictions about the text, even if their predictions are not always correct (M= 4.10, SD= 0.88). Moreover, they exhibit confidence in their capacity to make precise prediction about the text (M= 3.77, SD= 0.77).The overall mean of 3.94 and standard deviation of 0.83 indicate a high level of students engagement in using Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) in terms of Schema Prediction.

This implies that using DTRA encourages students to tap individual prior knowledge and experiences, setting the stage for more meaningful engagement with the text and retaining information they read.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 2. Level of Students DRTA in terms of Justification.
The table below presents the results of a study assessing students' engagement in Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) in terms of Justification. Based on the result of the survey, students agree that engaging in directed thinking activities brings them enjoyment when sharing their prediction and explaining their reasoning (M= 4.17, SD= 0.87). Furthermore, the data indicate that students are receptive to change as they read more of the text (M= 3.86, Sd=0.73). The overall mean of 3.99 and standard deviation of 0.81 indicate a high level of students' engagement in using DRTA in terms of Justification. This means that students constantly assess their understanding and make necessary adjustments to their comprehension strategy.

Table 2. Level of Students DRTA in terms of Justification.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
I am able to provide reasons for my predictions about texts.	4.00	0.87	Agree
I can justify my predictions by using evidence from the text.	3.97	0.67	Agree
I enjoy discussing my predictions with others and explaining my reasoning.	4.17	0.87	Agree
I am open to changing my predictions as I read more of the text.	3.87	0.73	Agree
I find it helpful to compare my predictions with those of my classmates.	3.93	0.91	Agree

Overall Mean = 3.99
Standard Deviation = 0.81
Verbal Interpretation = High

Table 2 presents the results of a study assessing students' engagement in Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) in terms of Justification. Based on the result of the survey, students agree that engaging in directed thinking activities brings them enjoyment when sharing their prediction and explaining their reasoning (M= 4.17, SD= 0.87). Furthermore, the data indicate that students are receptive to change as they read more of the text (M= 3.86, Sd=0.73). The overall mean of 3.99 and standard deviation of 0.81 indicate a high level of students' engagement in using DRTA in terms of Justification. This means that students constantly assess their understanding and make necessary adjustments to their comprehension strategy.

Table 3. Level of Students DRTA in terms of Reading

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
I actively try to confirm or revise my predictions as I read.	3.90	0.61	Agree
I pay attention to details in the text that support or contradict my predictions.	3.87	0.73	Agree
I adjust my reading pace based on my understanding of the text.	3.80	0.71	Agree
I am able to identify the main ideas and supporting details in a text.	3.83	0.75	Agree
I can make inferences and draw conclusions based on the information in the text.	3.73	0.74	Agree

Overall Mean = 3.83
Standard Deviation = 0.70
Verbal Interpretation = High

Table 3 presents the results of a study assessing students' engagement in DRTA in terms of Reading. Based on the result of the survey students agree that they actively strive to confirm or revise their prediction as they read (M= 3.90, SD= 0.61), additionally it indicates that students make inference and draw conclusion based on the information presented in the text (M= 3.73, SD= 0.74).

The overall mean of 3.99 and standard deviation of 0.81 indicate a high level of students' engagement in using DRTA in terms of reading. This implies that students are not simply passively reading the text, but rather actively seeking to confirm or revise their predictions.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 4. Level of Students DRTA in terms of Validation

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
I am able to determine whether or not my predictions were correct after reading the text.	3.90	0.80	Agree
I can identify the parts of the text that support my predictions.	3.93	0.78	Agree
I can explain why my predictions were correct or incorrect.	3.93	0.78	Agree
I am able to learn from my incorrect predictions and use that knowledge to make better predictions in the future.	4.07	0.83	Agree
I feel a sense of satisfaction when my predictions are correct.	4.03	0.81	Agree

Overall Mean = 3.97
Standard Deviation = 0.79
Verbal Interpretation = High

Table 4 presents the results of a study assessing students' engagement in DRTA in terms of Validation. Based on the result of the survey students agree that DTR helps them learn from their incorrect prediction and utilize that knowledge to make better predictions and utilize that knowledge to make better predictions in the future (M= 4.07), SD= 0.83). Additionally the data conclude that students are able to determine whether their prediction were correct or not.

The overall mean of 3.97 and standard deviation of 0.79 indicate a high level of students' engagement in using DRTA in terms of Validation.Their findings showed that students who actively monitored their understanding and corrected their predictions based on new information displayed improved comprehension compared to those who did not engage in this process.

Level of the Students (SQ3R)

In this study Level of students SQ3R comprises survey, question, read, recite and review and statistically measured using mean and standard deviation.

Table 5. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Survey

Table 5 below indicates the level of students SQ3R in terms of survey. Students strongly agree that the SQ3R method particularly the survey aspect, assists them in concentration on crucial information (M= 4.63, SD= 0.49), additionally surveying the text was found to be effective in activating students pre-existing knowledge on the topic. Similarly, the practice of previewing readings and pictures was reported to simplify the process of getting and understanding the main ideas for every reading materials that will be used by the students this can be seen through the result of the survey with (M= 4.40, SD= 0.63). The overall mean of 4.49 and the standard deviation of 0.61 indicate a very high level of SQ3R method in terms of survey.

Table 5. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Survey.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
Skimming the text before reading helps me get a general idea of the topic.	4.53	0.63	Strongly Agree
Previewing headings and pictures makes it easier to understand the main points.	4.40	0.62	Strongly Agree
Surveying the text helps me activate my prior knowledge about the subject.	4.63	0.56	Strongly Agree
I find skimming the text to be a productive use of time.	4.23	0.68	Strongly Agree
Skimming helps me focus on important information while reading.	4.63	0.49	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.49
Standard Deviation = 0.61
Verbal Interpretation = Very High

Their analysis highlighted the importance of activating prior knowledge and previewing text features (headings, pictures) as effective strategies for enhancing comprehension and recall. This aligns with the findings in Table 5, which suggest that the survey aspect of SQ3R, by encouraging students to preview headings and activate prior knowledge, facilitates a deeper connection with new information and improves comprehension.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 6. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Question

Table 6 indicates the level of students SQ3R in terms of questioning. Students strongly agree that SQ3R method, particularly the questioning method , aids in converting headings into questions, thereby facilitating a deeper understanding of both the author intent (M= 4.50, Sd= 0.57). Likewise students agree that formulating question about the reading materials come naturally with them (M= 4.17, SD= 0.70).

Table 6. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Question

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
Turning headings into questions helps me understand the author's purpose.	4.50	0.57	Strongly Agree
Creating questions before reading makes me more engaged with the text.	4.33	0.48	Strongly Agree
I easily come up with questions about the reading material.	4.17	0.70	Agree
Having questions in mind helps me find answer while reading.	4.33	0.71	Strongly Agree
Questioning helps me identify key information in the text.	4.37	0.67	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.34
Standard Deviation = 0.63
Verbal Interpretation = Very High

The overall mean of score of 4.34 and the standard deviation of 0.63 indicate a very high level of SQ3R method particularly questioning aspect. This means that this method can help the students to promote active reading and critical thinking skills to enhance individual comprehension

This aligns with the findings in Table 6, suggesting that SQ3R's questioning aspect can be a valuable tool for enhancing critical thinking and comprehension skills.

Table 7. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Read

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
I easier to concentrate while reading after surveying and questioning.	4.50	0.68	Strongly Agree
Using SQ3R helps me focus on understanding the meaning of the text.	4.30	0.53	Strongly Agree
I am not distracted while reading, even when using SQ3R.	4.40	0.62	Strongly Agree
I remember important details from the text.	4.50	0.57	Strongly Agree
I easily understand the content of the text.	4.10	0.66	Agree

Overall Mean = 4.36
Standard Deviation = 0.63
Verbal Interpretation = Very High

Table 7 indicates the level of students SQ3R in terms of reading. Students strongly agree that the SQ3R method that reading helps them remember important details and text. Additionally they find it easier to concentrate on their reading after employing the survey and questioning technique (M= 4.50, SD= 0.57, 0.68) respectively. Students agree that through this method they easily understand the context of the text (M= 4.10, SD= 0.66).

The overall mean of 4.36 and the standard deviation of 0.63 indicate a very high level of SQ3R method particularly reading aspect. This means that it helps the students to retain information, improve concentration and comprehension by helping them remember key details, focus better, and understand the context, SQ3R equips students with valuable strategies for effective reading.

They found that students who engaged in reading comprehension strategies, like those emphasized in SQ3R (e.g., summarizing key details), showed improved information retention compared to those who did not. This aligns with the findings in Table 7, where students reported better memory for important details after using SQ3R. McDaniel & Callan also highlighted the importance of rereading for comprehension, which can be seen as an implicit aspect of SQ3R as students pause to survey and question before reading.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 8. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Recite

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
Summarizing the main points in my own words helps me solidify my understanding.	4.40	0.62	Strongly Agree
It is easier to explain the text to myself after reading.	4.43	0.50	Strongly Agree
Reciting the information helps me identify areas where I need to reread.	4.60	0.56	Strongly Agree
I feel more confident answering questions about the text after reciting the information to myself.	4.40	0.56	Strongly Agree
Explaining the information in my own words helps me remember it better.	4.53	0.51	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.47
Standard Deviation = 0.55
Verbal Interpretation = Very High

Table 8 revealed the level of students SQ3R in terms of reciting. Students strongly agree that the SQ3R method in terms of reciting, helps students identify the areas where they need to reread the information (M= 4.60, SD= 0.56). Furthermore, they find it easier to explain the text to themselves, summarizing the main points in their own words after reading (M= 4.40, SD= 0.56). The overall mean of 4.47 and standard deviation of 0.55 indicate a very high level of SQ3R method particularly reciting aspect.

These findings illustrate the valuable role of this method in promoting interest of among students specifically in analyzing text, identifying the different areas that requires a thorough analysis, also for further review of some parts of text in which they found difficult to understand and lastly by enhancing self-explanation review.

Table 9. Level of Students SQ3R in terms of Review.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Remarks
Reviewing key points and questions helps me remember the information for a longer period.	4.63	0.67	Strongly Agree
Reviewing helps me clear those important notes that I missed.	4.37	0.61	Strongly Agree
Reviewing helps me connect new information with what I already know	4.40	0.56	Strongly Agree
I can assessed my understanding after reading a text.	4.50	0.63	Strongly Agree
Reviewing those relevant parts from the text is very helpful.	4.43	0.63	Strongly Agree

Overall Mean = 4.47
Standard Deviation = 0.62
Verbal Interpretation = Very High

Table 9 shows the level of students SQ3R in terms of reviewing. Students strongly agree that the SQ3R method in terms of reviewing helps them to remember the information for a longer period of time (M= 4.63, SD= 0.67), and understand important notes they missed (M= 4.37, SD= 0.61). The overall mean of 4.47 and standard deviation of 0.62 indicate a very high level of SQ3R method particularly reviewing aspects.

This result concludes that reviewing allows students to revisit and consolidate the information concept and skills they have acquired leading to individual improvement. Their study revealed that students who engaged in spaced repetition techniques showed better long-term retention of information compared to those who did not. This aligns with the results in Table 9, suggesting that SQ3R's review process, by encouraging students to revisit information at spaced intervals, strengthens memory and knowledge consolidation.

Table 10. Level of the Students Comprehension using DRTA and SQ3A

Table 10 presents data on the level of comprehension among Grade 8 learners using two different reading comprehension strategies. This also evaluate the effectiveness of the DRTA and SQ3R methods in improving students' reading comprehension across different levels in terms of literal, inferential, and critical findings provide insights into which method may be more beneficial for enhancing students comprehension skills

The overall mean score of the students in the story of two brothers as indicated in the table (M= 2.56, SD= 1.51) with the remarks of Good in using DTRA and (M= 1.99, SD= 1.41) using SQ3R with the remarks of Fair. Likewise the overall mean score of the students in the story of Makato and the cowrie shells as indicated in the table (M= 2.76, SD= 1.20) with the

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

remarks of good the same remarks attain with student using SQ3R (M= 2.67, SD= 1.33), lastly the story of The Man with the Coconuts students using DRTA got the overall (M= 2.95, SD= 1.16) and students using SQ3R got the (M= 2.43, SD= 1.35)

Table 10. Level of the Students Comprehension using DRTA and SQ3A

		DRTA			SQ3R		
		Mean	SD	Remarks	Mean	SD	Remarks
The two brothers	Literal	3.76	1.21	Very Good	3.18	1.18	Very Good
	Inferential	2.17	1.39	Good	1.73	1.31	Fair
	Critical	1.76	1.12	Fair	1.06	0.79	Fair
Overall		**2.56**	**1.51**	**Good**	**1.99**	**1.41**	**Fair**
Makto and the cowrie shell 1	Literal	2.83	1.36	Good	3.13	1.48	Very Good
	Inferential	3.07	1.10	Very Good	2.74	1.18	Good
	Critical	2.38	1.05	Good	2.13	1.12	Good
Overall		**2.76**	**1.20**	**Good**	**2.67**	**1.33**	**Good**
The Man with the Coconuts	Literal	3.14	0.99	Very Good	2.74	1.26	Good
	Inferential	3.00	1.20	Good	2.65	1.31	Good
	Critical	2.72	1.28	Good	1.90	1.30	Fair
Overall		**2.95**	**1.16**	**Good**	**2.43**	**1.35**	**Good**

This emphasized that students generally achieved good to very good levels of comprehension using both DRTA and SQ3R strategies across different texts and levels of comprehension. However, there were some variations in the effectiveness of each strategy for different texts and comprehension levels.

They investigated the effects of DRTA and SQ3R on students' reading comprehension across different texts and found that both strategies led to improvements, but with some variation in effectiveness depending on the specific text and comprehension level. This aligns with your findings that students generally scored well using both DRTA and SQ3R, but with some variations across different stories and comprehension levels (literal, inferential, and critical).

Table 11. Significant effect on students' reading comprehension in using the DRTA Strategy

Literal	F	p-value
The two brothers	1.233	0.378
Makto and the cowrie shell	1.825	0.166
The Man with the Coconuts	0.733	0.728
Inferential	F	p-value
The two brothers	1.231	0.379
Makto and the cowrie shell	0.385	0.962
The Man with the Coconuts	1.199	0.396
Critical	F	p-value
The two brothers	0.88	0.61
Makto and the cowrie shell	1.05	0.487
The Man with the Coconuts	0.675	0.775

*Note: * p < .05.*

Table11 presents the results of statistical tests assessing the significant effect on students' reading comprehension when using the DRTA (Directed Reading Thinking Activity) strategy. While students perceive that the data strategy as beneficial , yet not observing any improvement on th1eir test score across the three stories involved in the assessment which

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

is also indicated (p= 0.378, 0.166, 0.728) in terms of literal (p= 0.379, 0.962, 0. 396) in terms of inferential and (p= 0.61,0.48,0.075) in terms of critical. All p -values are greater than 0.05 level of significance.

This means that there are no statistically significant improvements in reading comprehension with the DRTA strategy for any of the texts or levels of comprehension tested in this study. Students have different learning styles. Some may benefit more from the structured approach of DRTA, while others might respond better to independent learning strategies. For students with limited English proficiency, DRTA might have felt overwhelming or confusing due to the language barrier.

Their analysis highlights that students with different learning styles and language proficiency levels may benefit more from specific trategies. This aligns with the discussion about how DRTA might not be equally effective for all students due to individual differences and learning styles in which the teacher should always consider in order to attain the target goal.

Table 12. Significant effect on students' reading comprehension in using the SQ3R Method

Literal	F	p-value
The two brothers	1.164	0.409
Makto and the cowrie shell	0.336	0.981
The Man with the Coconuts	1.625	0.207
Inferential	F	p- value
The two brothers	3.384	0.022*
Makto and the cowrie shell	1.333	0.319
The Man with the Coconuts	1.43	0.276
Critical	F	p- value.
The two brothers	0.527	0.890
Makto and the cowrie shell	0.549	0.875
The Man with the Coconuts	2.096	0.106

*Note: * p < .05.*

Table12 presents the results of statistical tests assessing the significant effect on students' reading comprehension when using the SQ3R Method. The impact of the SQ3R method on reading comprehension varied across different comprehension levels. SQ3R showed a statistically significant improvement in students' inferential comprehension for the story of the Two Brothers with (p=0.022), suggesting its potential to help students make connections beyond the text's surface level. However, SQ3R did not significantly impact literal comprehension for any stories, and its influence on critical thinking skills was inconclusive.

These mixed results might be due to factors like text difficulty, how well SQ3R was implemented, and the amount of time students had to practice the strategy. =

Table 13. Significant difference in students' reading comprehension using the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review (SQ3R)

	DRTA		SQ3R			95% CI				
Indicators	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	Mean Difference	*L*	*U*	*T*	*df*	*p*
Literal	3.24	0.90	3.01	0.95	0.23	-0.27	0.73	0.94	29.00	0.356
Inferential	2.75	1.02	2.36	1.03	0.39	-0.21	0.99	1.34	29.00	0.191
Critical	2.29	0.81	1.66	0.74	0.63	0.29	0.97	3.80	29.00	0.001*

*Note: * p < .05*

Table 13 show the significant difference in students reading comprehension using DRTA and SQ3R. Among the three indicators of reading comprehension such as literal, inferential and critical , result indicates only the significant difference between DRTA and SQ3R in enhancing critical comprehension skills given the mean of 2.29 in utilizing DRTA and 1.66 in utilizing SQ3R also the (p= 0.001 <0.05). This means that using the DRTA effectively encourages students to think critically about the text and make connection and analyze the information presented. Likewise other indicators such as literal and inferential do not show significant differences in students' comprehension skills. The p= value is greater than 0.05 level of significance and the level of their performance was almost the same.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions drawn; the study revealed a preference for the SQ3R method compared to DRTA; encouragingly, students' reading comprehension remained within a good to very good range regardless of the method used. As anticipated, DRTA did not significantly affect overall reading comprehension across various texts or comprehension levels, justifying its limitation as a primary

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 10| Issue: 9| September 2024|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

strategy. However, it may hold potential for developing critical thinking skills. The SQ3R method offered partial support for the hypothesis, demonstrating a significant effect but its influence on literal and critical comprehension remains inconclusive

In the view of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are given:

1. Teachers may experiment with both DRTA and SQ3R to see which strategy is more effective for their students, considering the potential benefits for critical thinking with DRTA and inferential comprehension with SQ3R.
2. Providing explicit instruction and sufficient practice time for students to learn and implement these strategies effectively is crucial.
3. Providing scaffolded support for students with lower English proficiency, offering choices between written predictions and visual representations for diverse learning styles, and tailoring instruction based on pre-assessed student needs may improve the effectiveness of the strategy for a wider range of students.

REFERENCE

1. *Vacca, J. L., Vacca, R. T., Gove, M. N., & Linares, C. (2017). Reading apprenticeship: Concepts to classrooms (7th ed.). Pearson.• Bao, J., Zhang, J., & Xu, L. (2022). Schema theory and its implications for reading comprehension instruction: A review of the literature. Reading Psychology, 43(3), 247-271.*
2. *Almasi, J. F., Sousa, D. A., et al. (2018). The foundations of reading instruction: A cognitive approach. Routledge.*
3. *Francis, P. L., & Vincent, W. J. (2015). Reading and writing to learn (3rd ed.). Routledge.*
4. *McIntyre, S. D., & Vaughn, S. (2019). Strategies for reading intervention (6th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.*
5. *Andre, M., & Anderson, V. (2015). Metacognition and effective reading instruction. Routledge.*