READ, ENJOY, AND DEVELOP (READ): A MULTIMODAL READING REMEDIATION PROGRAM FOR GRADE 10 NON-READERS

PATRICK JAMES R. PELICANO
Master Teacher I
Biñan Secondary School of Applied Academics

ABSTRACT

Reading comprehension remains a persistent issue in both public and private schools, including Biñan Secondary School of Applied Academics (BSSAA). Of particular concern is the fact that there were two (2) students diagnosed as non-readers in Grade 10. To address this problem, the researcher developed modern solutions for these 21st-century learners by integrating multimodal teaching methods for non-readers. The research implemented an experimental design involving one (1) language teacher, two (2) grade 10 students, and three (3) experts as validators. The participants underwent a 4-week reading program using Project READ (Read, Enjoy, and Develop) developed by the researcher. The project aims to explore the effectiveness of multimodality in developing reading comprehension skills among non-readers. The results of the Phil-IRI post-test showed that the participants still struggled with reading at the 'Frustration Level.' However, their number of mistakes and comprehension scores showed a significant improvement. Additionally, the scores in the linear test have significantly improved, but they still fall short of the passing mark of 75%. Nevertheless, both readers were able to achieve a passing mark in the multimodal text test, which is a noteworthy accomplishment. The results suggest that when a text is presented in visual and auditory channels, students find it easier to comprehend. However, further research is needed to investigate the effectiveness of multimodality in developing reading comprehension skills among non-readers.

Keywords: *Multimodality, Reading Comprehension, Reading Skills*

INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension continues to be a persistent issue in many public and private schools, including Biñan Secondary School of Applied Academics (BSSAA), where there were approximately 3,400 students, including frustrated readers and non-readers. These findings were determined from the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI), a standardized reading assessment used in public schools. Students are evaluated based on their silent and oral reading skills.

Concerningly, there were two (2) diagnosed non-readers in Grade 10, specifically in sections Curie and Rousseau, which the researcher was handling. This was especially worrying because these Grade 10 students will be moving to Grade 11, which requires proficient reading comprehension skills. Students in Grade 10 should be able to read at instructional or independent levels. However, various factors, such as the student, the text, and the context, may have influenced their reading comprehension. Moreover, the pandemic has exacerbated the issue by causing different learning gaps.

To help address this problem, the researcher will create modern solutions for these 21st-century learners by integrating multimodal teaching methods for non-readers. Multimodality refers to the interplay between different representational modes, for instance, between images and written/spoken words (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001, p. 20). This approach will enable students to develop basic reading comprehension skills and will be a dynamic way of teaching reading, explicitly viewing (Zhang, 2016).

In traditional reading lessons, teachers focus only on printed texts and seldom blend reading with other skills. However, this 21st-century approach to teaching reading will employ various skills and techniques to help students develop their reading comprehension skills.

METHODOLOGY

This study used an experimental research design to evaluate the progress of the learners. To assess the learners' progress, the researcher used the Phil-IRI pre- and post-assessment tools, as well as a researcher-made reading assessment at the end of each week's session. These standardized assessment tools were used at the program's end to evaluate the learners' progress and the program's effectiveness.

Additionally, every week, the researcher employed a researcher-made reading assessment to check the learners' progress. The data obtained from the weekly assessment will be quantitatively analyzed using the Average Mean, which will determine if the weekly procedures and materials yield positive results and help the researcher modify them accordingly.

Moreover, a comparative analysis of the Phil-IRI pre-assessment data and post-assessment data will be conducted to determine the effectiveness of this program.

RESULTS

Q1. What is the current reading level of the learners based on the Phil-IRI Assessment?

The students underwent an initial assessment using the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) pre-assessment. This tool is designed for classroom use to measure and describe students' reading performance. The assessment results helped the researcher design appropriate reading instruction for the students.

The assessment consisted of two stages: the Group Screening Test (GST) and the Oral Reading Stage. Only those who scored 13 or below in the GST proceeded to the oral reading stage.

The researcher chose reading material for the oral reading stage based on the student's initial GST score. Students who scored 0-7 points received a passage three (3) grade levels below their current level, while those who scored 8-13 points received a passage two (2) grades below their current level.

Students' oral reading score, reading rate, and reading comprehension were measured during the oral reading stage. The number of miscues, reading speed, and comprehension level were used to determine the student's reading profile.

An 'Independent Reader' is the highest level at which a student can read

independently and easily. An 'Instructional Reader' is the level at which the pupil can benefit from instruction. A 'Frustration Reader' is the lowest level, indicating the student needs significant help with reading.

According to the results, both students were categorized as 'Frustration Readers.' This means they committed a significant number of reading errors, had a slow reading speed, and had a low comprehension level. The first reading text was 'Get Up Jacky,' a Grade 3 text with 67 words.

After the Phil-IRI process, readers are classified as 'Frustration Readers'. This means that their instructional and independent levels have not yet been determined. Since they cannot recognize words quickly and efficiently, they are considered 'Non-Readers' who possess weak fluency skills, read with no good expression, intonation, pitch, or phrasing, and demonstrate a low level of word recognition. They may also struggle to recognize some letters or words like their own name, classroom labels, signs, and other environmental prints. This is evidenced by the remarkable number of oral reading miscues when they are assessed.

As part of the study, the researcher conducted a pre-assessment to check the initial effect of multimodal texts on the student's comprehension. The pre-assessment consisted of two types of texts: a linear type and a multimodal type. Each type of test has fifteen (15) comprehension questions composed of literal, inferencing, and critical questions.

The researcher ran them through a text analyzer to ensure the texts were appropriate for the participants' level. The texts are appropriate for A1 English readers, meaning they can understand familiar names, words, and very simple sentences, for example, on notices, posters, or catalogs. The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for languages describes what language users who have acquired a new language can do and how well and efficiently they do so. These CEFR levels indicate the various levels of language proficiency of users of a language.

Based on the results of a pre-test of linear and multimodal texts that were administered to both readers, both readers scored below the passing mark of 75% in the linear test.

However, it can be inferred from the graph that although their scores were lower than the expected passing mark in their multimodal test, there was a significant improvement compared to their linear test results.

It is initially inferred that multimodal texts assist the student's understanding of the text.

Q2. What is the reading level of the learners after the multimodal reading intervention?

After four weeks of receiving multimodal instruction, the researcher conducted the Phil-IRI post-test on the readers. Using the same process as the pre-test, the researcher administered graded passages three levels lower than the readers' current level.

The results show that after the first passage was administered to the readers, despite still having a "Frustration" reading profile, their number of miscues and comprehension scores have shown a significant increase.

Additionally, the students were administered a post-test in both linear and multimodal texts. The post-test had the same qualities as the pre-test.

The scores in the linear test have significantly improved but still fall short of the passing mark of 75%. However, both readers achieved a passing mark in the multimodal text test, which is a significant achievement.

Q3. Is there a significant difference between the current reading level of the learners and after the implementation of the multimodal reading intervention?

Based on the data, it can be inferred that although Reader A is still at the 'Frustration Level', their reading speed has increased, the number of miscues has decreased significantly, and their comprehension level has increased even more significantly.

Similarly, the results of the pre and post-Phil-IRI assessments of Reader B have a significant difference. Their reading speed has increased, the number of miscues has decreased significantly, and their comprehension level has increased significantly.

The results of the Phil-IRI assessments show a connection with the results of pre and post-tests of Linear and Multimodal texts.

The data shows that both readers have not reached the passing mark of 75% in their pre and post-test in linear texts. It displays the remarkable results of both readers achieving a passing mark in the post-test for their multimodal text.

DISCUSSION

The study participants have been identified as non-readers due to the high number of oral reading miscues they make during assessment. Non-readers struggle to recognize words quickly and efficiently, and often possess weak fluency skills. They read without good expression, intonation, pitch, or phrasing, and demonstrate a low level of word recognition. According to Martin & Pappas (2006), a non-reader is someone who lacks the skills of a fluent reader, reads below their grade level, and struggles with comprehension, phonics, and vocabulary. These individuals often feel defeated and lose their desire to read, leading them to exhibit inappropriate behaviors to hide their inability to read and comprehend. They read very little and do not enjoy it, and also lack effective word attack skills. Additionally, they exhibit poor reading skills and have limited language and vocabulary.

As a part of the program, non-printed multimodal text was used as reading materials. According to Walsh (2006), multimodal texts are those that use more than one "mode" (a type of meaningful sign or symbol) to convey their meaning through a synchronization of modes. The integration of technology has been highlighted in the program taking into consideration the technology available to the participants and the type of mode they are most interested in.

According to the results of the Phil-IRI post-test, the participants still struggled with reading at the 'Frustration Level'. However, their number of mistakes and comprehension scores showed a significant improvement. This can be attributed to the weekly multimodal instruction that helped the participants develop the skill of reading with the teacher's assistance.

Furthermore, the scores in the linear test have significantly improved, but they still fall short of the passing mark of 75%. Despite this, both readers were able to achieve a passing mark in the multimodal text test, which is a noteworthy accomplishment.

According to McConnell (2014), multimodal texts offer an authentic and engaging way to explore how meaning is created and help students communicate more effectively in different contexts.

It can be inferred that the use of multimodal texts provides authentic materials that relate to students' real-life experiences, which has a significant impact on their critical thinking and reading comprehension abilities.

The scores of the multimodal texts were significantly different from those of linear texts, indicating that using multimodal texts can improve students' comprehension more effectively than linear texts. According to Mayer's cognitive theory (2005), when a text is presented in visual and auditory channels, students find it easier to comprehend. Using multimodal texts, which include written text, visual aids, sound, images, and motions available on the internet, supports Mayer's theory and can aid in students' understanding.

These findings highlight the usefulness of technology in learning English, as it can improve students' skills and motivation.

cooperation and provision of essential data; and

To the faculty members and stakeholders of Biñan Secondary School of Applied Academics are thanked for their full and significant concern throughout the entire period of the endeavor.

REFERENCES

Erasmus University Rotterdam. (n.d.). *CEFR levels*. Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam | Erasmus University Rotterdam. https://www.eur.nl/en/education/language-training-centre/cefr-levels

Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication.* London: Arnold Publishers.

Kudo, Ines & Bazán, Jorge. (2009). Measuring beginner reading skills: An empirical evaluation of alternative instruments and their potential use for policymaking and accountability in Peru. The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper Series.

Martin, P., & Pappas, P. (2006). *Strategies for struggling readers* [PDF]. Content Reading Strategies That Work. https://www.peterpappas.com/blogs/read-blog/non-reader-complete.pdf

Mayer, R. E. (2005). Cognitive theory of multimedia learning. In R. Mayer (Ed.), *Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning* (pp. 31–48). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, R. E. 2010. *Multimedis learning:Are we asking the right questions*. Educational Psychologist, 32, 1-19.

McConnell, P. 2014. *Get the Picture: Teaching with Multimodal Texts*. ELTWorldOnline.com. Volume 6, May 2014.

Miller-Cochran, S. (2017). Understanding multimodal composing in an L2 writing context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, pp. 38*, 88–89.

Walsh, M. 2015. *Reading Visual and Multimodal texts: how is 'reading' different?*. Research Gate journal.

Zhang, L.J. (2016). Teaching Reading and Viewing to L2 Learners. In: Renandya, W., Widodo, H. (eds) *English Language Teaching Today. English Language Education, vol 5. Springer, Cham.* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_10