

Original Research Article

Improving Select Grade 7 Filipino Students' Reading Performance Using the Eclectic Model

Edison C. Dizon^{1*} & Richard D. Sanchez²

¹Department of Education, Schools Division of City of San Fernando, Pampanga, Philippines

²Department of Education, Schools Division of City of San Fernando, Pampanga, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Edison C. Dizon, E-mail: edison.dizon@deped.gov.ph

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: May 21, 2020

Accepted: June 29, 2020

Volume: 2

Issue: 2

KEYWORDS

Eclectic Model, Reading Performance, Quasi-Experimental Research, Intervention.

ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental research investigated on the effects of using the Eclectic Model in the reading performance of select Grade 7 students in a schools division in Central Luzon, Philippines. Overall findings show that there is a significant difference between the reading performance of the experimental group and the control group before and after the use of the eclectic model. The reading performance of the experimental group is significantly better than the control group after the use of the intervention. Based on the results, the study concludes that using the eclectic reading model is effective than the traditional reading method as evidenced by the significant difference in the mean percentage score in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, the effectiveness of using this innovation in the classroom was established through the results of the posttest. The students actively participated and enjoyed performing the reading activity. This proves that the use of the eclectic reading model has a positive outcome to the reading performance of the students thus can be tried and utilized by teachers. The study recommends that other teachers adopt the use of the eclectic reading model and further test its effectiveness in improving the reading performance of other students.

Introduction

The world at the moment is in a contemporary form – a rapid and competitive world. This is a world where change is inevitable, where change is unchanged. Without change and innovation on the part of the society, then living will be futile and will have no meaning at all. In a world full of changes, the only constant is moving forward. To survive in this very complex world and to be internationally competitive, there is a need to have the so called survival skills. If one never attained these skills, he/she will be left out while others are moving to grasp what they desire in their lives or greatest aspiration. Reading is one of those survival skills (Aguiluz, et. al, 2016). For most people living in today's modern world, reading is an everyday ordinary task to which little thought is given, yet it is one of the most important skills that learners acquire at school as it forms the foundation for all further learning. Unlike the ability to speak, to read is not inborn, and a learner does not acquire it simply by watching and listening to others reading. Many of the day-to-day tasks require reading, and a person who can read well can function more effectively in everyday activities, yet for an illiterate person, many of life's seemingly mundane and ordinary tasks which many literate people take for granted can become insurmountable hurdles (Darrel cited in Hlaethwa, 2013). Without regard to what reading can give to one's development, there can also be no regard to what it can bring to national development in general. Reading is not just for the mind; it goes beyond the idea. It creates opportunities. It builds and achieves dreams. It builds a person's image and confidence. It makes him do more and give more. Reading also builds the nation. Through it, a nation prospers and finds its full potential. With the great importance of reading, schools are challenged to meet the needs of young learners who are not performing at grade level expectations in reading and provide support services to help these students achieve better. Schools are challenged to innovate and initiate all possible interventions for the

ultimate benefits of the learners. With all these premises, the present study investigated on the effects of using the Eclectic Model in the reading performance of select Grade 7 students in a schools division in Central Luzon, Philippines.

Literature Review

Reading Comprehension: Stages and Progress

The Institute of Reading Development (2011) presents four stages in reading: (a) learning to read, (b) developing independent reader, (c) reading with absorption, and (d) critical reading. Meanwhile, Pang, et. al (2003) observed that the real progress in reading depends on oral language development, an observation that suggests that children learn to read by associating the written form with speech. For children to know how to read they must learn the vocabulary, grammar and sound system of the oral language in which the reading takes place. Reading, as a language-based activity (Lyon, 2000), does not develop naturally, and for many children, decoding, word recognition, and reading comprehension skills must be taught directly and systematically. If a child's knowledge of English is poor the reading skill as well as reading comprehension will also be poor (Baker, 2006). Hence, if learners are struggling to understand what they read because of difficult words, concepts, or sentence structure, they will not be able to read quickly.

Philippine Measurement of Reading Comprehension

In the Philippines, the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI) is an inventory tool that assists in determining the reading strengths and weaknesses of an individual learner. This tool gives due importance to the value of knowing one's strengths and areas for improvement for purposes of authentic development (Sanchez & Sarmiento, 2020). Determining the root causes of the problems through the perspectives and stories of the individual learners would greatly help in resolving issues and concerns and reading skills among young people. Knowing how the education system can really address the problem of the learners is the key to progress, not only in reading, but in life as well. More so, the PHIL-IRI is an assessment tool that evaluates the reading proficiency level of elementary school pupils. It is the first validated instrument that presents the overall profile of public elementary school nationwide. The emphasis of the PHIL-IRI is on learning the skills, abilities and needs of pupils to plan reading instructions. Thus, PHIL-IRI can provide educators, policy makers and teachers not only with information about the pupil's reading capabilities but also with what intervention may be provided for each reading level. Through the use of the PHIL – IRI one can identify the level of reading difficulty of a pupil as independent reader, frustrated reader and instructional reader. Independent reader as described by authorities would have one or less word calling errors in 100 words of text, 100 percent accuracy and a student could read alone with ease. Instructional is best suited when mentoring or coaching is taking place between teacher and the learner. At this stage, it is said that the learners are able to really decipher what they read but at some points of such reading, some meaning are not grasped by the learners. The frustration level is the last among levels under PHIL-IRI. It is the stage or level wherein there is an obvious difficulty in finding meaning, or worse of reading the words themselves, which usually ranges from 5 to 100 words. While efforts have been offered by the teacher in this level, there are still various forms of difficulties that are encountered by learners under this category. Comprehension questions are below 70 percent accuracy.

Addressing Concerns on Reading Comprehension through Reading Models and Other Interventions

Digging the roots of the problems and issues at the outset, nipping them in the buds, is the best intervention. "It is easier to prevent reading difficulties in the early grades before they emerge than to try and remediate them after they become entrenched and intractable" (Coyne, et. al, 2006, p. 166). On the other hand, Stanberry and Swanson (2009) presented a research based reading program to help students with reading difficulties. The following are the presented intervention reading programs; (a) increasing word recognition skills, and (b) improving reading comprehension. In increasing word recognition skills, the following are the instruction components: (1) sequencing – sequences short activities, (2) segmentation - Segments or synthesizes component parts, and (3) advanced organizers – directs children to look over material prior to instruction. While in improving reading comprehension, the following are the instruction components: (1) directed response / questioning – the teacher encourages students to ask questions, (2) control difficulty of processing demands of task – the teacher provides assistance as needed, (3) elaboration – provide students with additional information or explanation about concepts, steps, or procedures, (4) modeling of steps by the teacher - teacher demonstrates the processes and/or steps the students are to follow, (5) group instruction - Instruction and/or verbal interaction takes place in a small group composed of students and teacher, and (6) strategy cues – reminds the student to use strategies or multiple steps.

Reading models were also identified to help teachers in their strategies in teaching how students read. A reading model is a theory of what is going on in the reader's eyes and mind during reading and comprehending (or miscomprehending) a

text. Models of the reading process try to explain and predict reading behaviour. They are the bases on which reading instructions are built. The Bottom-up Model (Text – based Model, also known as the part-to-whole approach) for teaching reading begins with the sound of letters and progresses upwards from the single letters to the combination of letters that form words, and that the point of departure is to teach letter-sound relations and then sounds and say the words. In this model rules for word pattern and sounding out words are more important than understanding longer texts (Norton, 2007; Landsberg, et. al, 2005; Joubert, Bester & Meyer, cited in Hlaethwa, 2013). Meanwhile, Landsberg, et. al (2005) state that the point of departure in the top-down model is to teach learners to identify whole words and to read sentences without sounding the words and that the readers become aware of the phonemes and letter-sound relations while they are reading and that the top-down model is concept-driven, the reader being more important than the text being read, and the reader has pre-knowledge which gives him or her an indication of its meaning. Readers' pre-knowledge therefore influences their understanding of the text, which is less important and the decoding action serves only to determine whether the meaning the reader assigns to the text is correct or not. Readers read complete sentences and consequently attach meaning to what they have read. Learners see words as a whole and learn to recognize them on sight. According to Landsberg, et. al (2005), teachers using this model employ a synthetic approach for reading instruction, such as the language experience approach. Norton (2007) refers to this approach as the whole language approach.

Another model in reading is the Interactive Reading Model. The interactive model emphasizes sound recognition, sound-symbol association and reading comprehension. It takes the view that the reader continually shifts his/her attention between the text (i.e., analysis of specific letters and words) and reading comprehension (i.e., thought content of the reading material). According to this model the reader will use the top-down approach when the reading material is known and the bottom-up approach when the reading material is not known, and as the reader's skill increases more attention is given to reading comprehension and less to word recognition and analysis of individual letters (Norton, 2007).

With all of these apprehensions and issues confronting learners in so far as reading is concerned, it is now a calling for every teacher to initiate interventions addressing such issues and concerns. Without a sincere intent to resolve all these things for the ultimate benefits of the learners, there can really be no true learning and sharing of knowledge that will ever take place. Without serious consideration of this necessity to really help learners, education becomes inutile and non-responsive to learners' needs.

Methodology

Type of Research

This study employed the quasi-experimental design, specifically a two-group pre-test, post test study design. The prefix quasi means "resembling." Thus, quasi-experimental research is a research that resembles experimental research but is not a true experimental research. Although the independent variable is manipulated, participants are not randomly assigned to conditions or orders of conditions (Cook & Campbell, 1979). Quasi-experimental research is the most suitable research design in the present study because despite the presence of the independent variable (the use of the eclectic model – that was manipulated and applied only to the experimental group) and the dependent variable (the reading performance – which was eventually measured), there were no random assignment that took place in the determination of the participants in both groups.

Participants

The participants in this study were seventy (70) Grade 7 students in a school division in Central Luzon, Philippines, forty (40) of which consisted the experimental group and the other thirty (30) consisted the control group. They were selected via total enumeration sampling technique since all of them comprised the only two Grade 7 sections in the specific school where the intervention was conducted.

Instruments

For the pretest and the posttest, the Department of Education's PHIL-IRI standardized tests were used. The said instruments were already validated by DepEd and they are actually being used nationwide in the basic education. The respective Keys to Corrections for the pretest and the posttest, respectively, were also made available.

Data Collection Procedures

Initially, a pretest was done to determine the baseline level of the participants on their reading performance. The pretest scores of the participants from the control and experimental groups were compared using appropriate statistical procedures. The intervention was then applied to the experimental group while the control group was taught using the conventional or traditional method of teaching. Conventional teaching basically followed the lessons and/or activities as suggested in the teaching guide (TG) of DepEd for the subject, while the experimental method used the eclectic model. After a week, a posttest was conducted. During the actual data collection, the DepEd’s policy on the non-disruption of classes was strictly observed as the intervention and the facility of the instruments were both conducted as the lessons themselves as evidenced by daily lesson logs (DLLs) and the budget of work. Other activities necessary to accomplish the objectives of the study were done during vacant periods to avoid class disruptions.

Ethical Considerations

The following ethical considerations in the conduct of research were seriously taken note in this endeavor: (1) the confidentiality clause in research and the protection of the privacy of the participants, (2) the respect for intellectual property rights through the non-adherence to any forms of plagiarism and intellectual dishonesty, (3) the non-adherence to any form of conflict of interest, and (4) others research ethics’ protocols.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The pretest scores of the control and the experimental groups were compared using independent t test. Moreover, a variance ratio test was performed to determine whether t test for groups with equal or unequal variance was used. After the intervention, the posttest scores were compared following the same procedures mentioned for the pretest scores. P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Statistical computations were done using the Social Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Results and Discussion

Table 1. Performance of the students in the Control Group during the Pre-test and the Post-test

Level	Control Group Pre-test		Control Group Post Test	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1. Frustration	19	47.5	9	22.5
2. Instructional	18	45.0	25	62.5
3. Independent	3	7.5	6	15.0
Total	40	100.0	40	100.0

Table 1 shows the Pretest and Post-test results of the Control Group. Forty (40) students comprised this group with the following frequency for the pre-test: 19 students (47.5%) under the frustration level; 18 students (45.0%) in the instructional level; and only 3 students (7.5%) in the independent level. After the post-test, only 9 students, or with a decrease of 10 students (25%), are in the frustration level. For the instructional level, after the post-test, there is an increase of 7 students (17.5%). For the independent level, there is also an increase of 3 students (7.5%). This means that from the pre-test, there is also improvement in students’ reading performance after their post-test even without the intervention – the use of the eclectic model in reading.

Table 2. Performance of the Participants (Experimental Group) before and after the use of eclectic model

Level	Experimental Pretest		Experimental Post-Test	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1. Frustration	25	83.3	1	3.3
2. Instructional	5	16.7	11	36.7
3. Independent	0	.0	18	60.0
Total	30	100.0	30	100.0

Table 2 shows the performance of the participants (Experimental Group) before and after the use of eclectic model. Thirty (30) students comprised this group with the following frequency for the pre-test: 25 students (83.3%) under the frustration level; 5 students (16.7%) in the instructional level; and no student classified in the independent level. After the conduct of the intervention, the post-test results show that out of 30 students, only 1 student, or with a decrease of 24 students (80%), is in the frustration level. For the instructional level, after the post-test, there is an increase of 6 students (36.7%). For the independent level, there were 18 students (60.0%). This means that from the pre-test, there is an overwhelming improvement in students' reading performance after their post-test with the use of the intervention – the use of the eclectic model in reading.

Table 3. Summary of Reading performance of participants' both in the control and experimental groups before and after the use of the intervention

Test	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	53.35	23.989	41.10	17.862
Post Test	65.93	15.138	81.93	14.636

As presented in Table 3 posttest scores from the experimental group were higher compared with the control group. Those who used the eclectic reading model had a lowest number of learners under the frustration level whereas control group had a higher number of learners under the frustration level. The results show that there is a significant difference between using the eclectic reading model and the traditional reading with a p-value of 0.00 and a higher mean score. Based on the post test conducted there is a mean of 81.93 for the experimental group, higher than the mean score of 65.93 for the control group.

Table 4. Significant difference between the performance of the experimental group before and after the use of eclectic model

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	p-vale
Experimental Pretest	41.10	17.862	-13.01**	.000
Experimental Post-Test	81.93	14.636		

A Paired t-test was used to verify the research and resulted with significant difference in favor of the experimental group because the p-value is less than 0.05 and mean score is higher. As shown on Table 3, there is significant difference on the mean between the pretest and posttest of the experimental group. Through this research, it was found out that using the eclectic reading model yielded a better result where the mean score of the control group is lower compared to the experimental group with a much higher mean. Based on the results, it only means that using the eclectic reading model as an innovative way of teaching reading to students would improve their reading performance rather than the traditional reading method because there is a high significant difference between the mean percentile score. The 81.93 of the experimental group is relatively higher compared to the 65.93 of control group. Therefore, the effectiveness of using the eclectic reading model in the classroom was established through the results of the posttest. These findings are supported by McLaren, et. al (2015) stating that interventions in the classrooms enhance learning opportunities. So, if the teachers learn to innovate their teaching practices, students will participate actively and voluntarily and that authentic learning will take place (Hamari, et. al, 2014; Deterding, 2012). This is also consistent with the idea that since learners are different nowadays, the education system is likewise challenged to shift from the traditional method to innovative ways of inculcating knowledge. Reading is not exempted from these changes. Teachers are now called to not just teach students how to read but also to teach them authentic reading comprehension. All educators want to help their students succeed in life. What was considered good in education a decade ago, however, is no longer enough for success in education, career, and citizenship in the 21st century. To meet this, challenged schools must be transformed in ways that will enable students to acquire the necessary skills they will need to be successful in work and life.

Conclusion

From frustration level, the participants from the control group dominantly moved to instructional level based on the post test results while the experimental group which also started in the frustration level moved to independent level after the use of eclectic model. This means that the control group progressed from having difficulty recognizing words into having the ability to comprehend short constructions with a little supervision from the teacher while the experimental group moved to having the ability to recognize and understand words, sentences and longer texts with no supervision from the teacher. There is a

significant difference between the reading performance of the control and experimental groups before and after the use of eclectic model. The experimental group performed significantly better than the control group as reflected in the post test results.

Based on the results, using the eclectic reading model is effective than the traditional reading method as evidenced by the significant difference in the mean percentage score in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, the effectiveness of using this innovation in the classroom was established through the results of the posttest. The students actively participated and enjoyed performing the reading activity. This proves that the use of eclectic reading model has a positive outcome to the reading performance of the students thus can be tried and utilized by teachers.

References

- [1] Aguiluz, J., Austria, M., Bacani, D., Basilio, R., & Sapnu, J. (2016). Assessing the study process of the grade VI pupils and its relation to their language and reading achievement in selected public schools in Lubao and Porac, Pampanga. *Unpublished Thesis*, Pampanga, Philippines
- [2] Baker, C. (2006). *Foundation of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 4th Edition. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- [3] Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Houghton Mifflin.
- [4] Coyne, M. D., Zipoli, R. P., & Ruby, J. R. (2006). Beginning reading instruction for students at risk for learning disabilities: What, how, and when. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 41, 161-168. doi:10.1177/10534512060410030601
- [5] Deterding, S. (2012). Gamification: designing for motivation. *Interactions*, 19(4). 14–17
- [6] Hamari J., Koivisto J., & Pakkanen T. (2014b). Do Persuasive Technologies Persuade? - A Review of Empirical Studies, in: Spagnoli A., Chittaro L., Gamberini L. (Eds.), *Persuasive Technology* (pp. 118-136), Springer International Publishing, Switzerland.
- [7] Hlaethwa, B. (2013). Reading difficulties experienced by learners in the foundation phase in inclusive schools in Makapanstad. Retrieved from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/13678/dissertation_hlaethwa_bd.pdf?sequence=1 on March 6, 2017
- [8] Institute of Reading Development (2011). Stages of Reading Development. Retrieved from <http://readingprograms.org/ourapproach/stages-of-reading-development/> on March 7, 2017
- [9] Landsberg, E. Kruger, D., & Nel, N. (eds). (2005). *Addressing barriers to learning: A South African perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. Retrieved from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/13678/dissertation_hlaethwa_bd.pdf?sequence=1 on March 7, 2017
- [10] Lyon, G. R. (2000). Why some children have difficulties to learn to read. Retrieved from <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/296> on March 7, 2017
- [11] McLaren, B. M., Adams, D. M., & Mayer, R. E. (2015). Delayed learning effects with erroneous examples: A study of learning decimals with a web-based tutor. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 25(4), 520–542. doi:10.1007/s40593-015-0064-x
- [12] Norton, D.E. (2007). *Literacy for Life*. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.
- [13] Pang, E. S., Muaka, A., Benhardt, E. B., & Michael, K. L. (2003). *Teaching Reading*. Educational Practices Series-12. New York: International Bureau of Education: UNESCO
- [14] Sanchez, R., & Sarmiento, P. J. (2020). Learning together hand-in-hand: An assessment of students' immersion program in a schools division. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 9(1), 85-97 DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2020.5809
- [15] Stanberry, K., & Swanson, L. (2009). *Effective Reading Interventions for Kids with Learning Disabilities*. Retrieved from <http://www.idonline.org/article/33084/> on March 5, 2017