

# THE IMPACT OF READING PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS AT-RISK IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN QUEZON CITY: A BASIS FOR PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONAL INTERVENTION MODEL

CHINETTE C. PEÑAFLOR

*Commonwealth Elementary School*

**penaflorchinette@yahoo.com**

**Abstract:** *The study determined the reading performance of Grade 3 students of Selected Schools in Quezon City as basis for instructional intervention model for the school year 2017-2018 using descriptive survey research design. The Philippine-Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) materials were used in assessing the level of reading performance of Grade 3 students. The data were statistically analyzed using weighted mean and t-test of independent sample. All hypothetical questions will be analyzed and interpreted at 5% level of significance. The results revealed that majority of the students belonged to frustration level of reading performance in oral and silent reading during the pre test and the respondents for the post test belonged to the instructional level. There is no significant difference on the levels of reading proficiency levels of students when analyzed according to their test before and after reading. However, in order for a students to be able to achieve better performance in reading, the students need to be fluently read and comprehend test materials to become more proficeint in their reading skills. Students that can read and read a wide range of test materials and provide a wide range of knowledge that really helps the students better comprehend to test questions and other reading materials.*

**Keywords:** Reading Performace, Reading Intervention Program, Descriptive Survey, Student St Risk

## INTRODUCTION

The problem of students with low reading comprehension skills in the Philippines is growing. The number of Filipinos, aged 10-64 years old, who do not understand what they read, has grown to 20.1 million (Tarra Quismundo, 2010). It is especially visible in English used as language and it shows thru their level of performance in subjects that are using English as medium of instruction. The situation is very alarming especially for our educators and our young generations. Learning to read is a prerequisite for success in our literate society” (Hines, 2009, p. 21). For purposes of education, students with learning needs are those who require special education and related services if they are to realize their full human potential. They require full special education because they are markedly different from most students in one or more of the following ways: they may have intellectual disabilities, learning or attention disabilities, emotional or behavioral disorders, physical disabilities and disorder of communication.

More research needs to be completed and reviewed to better understand the enigmas of reading and the effects reading interventions have on elementary children who are at risk and low performing reading

disabilities. With so many non readers, struggling readers with difficulty in reading it is better to know the roots of one’s diffulities in reading and to provide proper intervention to address the needs of these children. The literature was giving information to find the best, effective proposal to intervene with pupils who are at risk of reading disabilities. It is inevitable for pupils to get proper instruction needed for them to find accomplishment in the classroom. Performance and success in reading can affect high achievement in their every day life.

## Background of the problem

Reading is the foundation of all study skills. It is a very important skill a person can acquire. Reading is a complex process. Thus, it cannot be taught in isolation. Moreover, reading is not merely an ability to recognize written or printed words, but it also refers to connect and understand the sentences/paragraphs together and be unified for the readers to receive the message with clarity.

Cited by Abeberese, Kumler and Linden (2013), the deteriorating quality of public schools in developing countries is a major factor. However, in the Philippines, the limited understanding of the education production function hinders attempts to ameliorate their conditions.

We know information without other inputs rarely improve student performance. We know information can affect improvements when paired with a wider scale of inputs. We do not know which inputs are necessary. For reading in particular, studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of large comprehensive changes which studies an Indian remedial education program, is a good example. The intervention causes students' reading skills to improve, but because the intervention changes the educational environment along multiple dimensions—additional teachers, new pedagogical methods, new curriculum, changes to organization of the classroom, and additional resources—we cannot identify which components cause the improvement. Since reading comprehension skill is the most important and the most difficult to achieve in the basic education, education stakeholders are searching for approaches and methods in which will be more meaningful and interesting for the Filipino students. Hence, resulting to higher reading comprehension and level of performance.

Being a sped teacher especially in the k-12 curriculum means being a facilitator. It is important to let the student acquire the knowledge and skills through discovery and collaborative learning. Using appropriate approaches make the students think critically and have their own reflection resulting to a deeper and more appreciated understanding about the lesson. To address this concern at its very core, students have to be trained at the earliest age to read well. This means access to a wide variety of quality books at their schools and a program that encourages reading for pleasure — because the surefire way to develop good reading comprehension is by making reading a habit.

It is in this premise that the researcher conducted a study on the Reading Performance of Grade 3 by the use of Phi-Iri and basis for Instructional Intervention Model

**Objectives of the Study** The following are the objectives of the study. It aims to: 1. Determine the reading performance level of Grade 3 students of Selected Schools in Quezon City in both silent and oral reading during the pre test and the post test; 2. Determine the significant difference between the impact of standardized testing tool of pre and post test on students of their reading performance 3. Develop an instructional intervention model that would address the reading deficiencies of the pupils as well as enhance the reading abilities of those pupils who CAN read independently

### Statement of the Problem

This undertaking was an attempt to assess the impact of reading performance of children at risk of selected school in Quezon City Division as a basis for a proposed instructional intervention model.

More specifically, the following problems are raised:

- i. What is the impact of reading performance of pupils at risk using standardized testing tool during the pre test of oral reading test and silent reading test?
- ii. What is the impact of reading performance of pupils at risk using standardized testing tool during the post test of oral reading and silent reading test?
- iii. Is there a significant difference between the level of performance during the pre and post test of oral and silent reading?

### Research Hypothesis ( $H_0$ )

In the conduct of the study, the researcher was graded by the following hypothesis in the null form:

There is no significant difference between the level of performance during the pre and post test of oral and silent reading?

### Content:

Over the past decade, there has been an increased focus nationally on the development of literacy for all students. This increased focus has spawned several important documents to assist teachers in providing effective reading instruction to prevent reading difficulties (National Research Council, 1998) and to improve overall reading performance (National Reading Panel [NRP], 2000). Each of these documents identified reading comprehension as an essential literacy outcome for students and the ultimate goal of reading instruction. However, these national panels also acknowledged a need for more research on reading comprehension. In comparison to existing research on the code-based components of reading (i.e., phonemic awareness, alphabetic understanding, automaticity with the code), research on reading comprehension, including vocabulary development, is less extensive, rigorous, and current. This conclusion was echoed by the RAND Reading Study Group (2002) which determined that “evidence-based improvements in the teaching practices of reading comprehension are sorely needed” (p. xxiii). As a result, a number of important research initiatives, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences, are currently underway that could significantly add to our understanding of ways to support reading comprehension for all students.

In Philippines, according to the Department of Education (DepEd), recent National Achievement Tests (NAT) administered to public schools paint a picture that may threaten that competitiveness. The Department of Education (DepEd) reports that there has been a 21.36 percent increase in NAT results from 2006 to 2012. The 2012 NAT revealed a rise in Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of only 48.9 percent from 44.33 percent in 2006, which equates to an improvement of 4.6 percent. The percentage gains were in all subject areas and point to a steady improvement in the secondary education of the country's public school system. But at the same time it's not enough because a

48.9 MPS (from 44.33 in 2006) is still a rather low score. In fact, it's at the "near mastery level".

If we will try to analyze the reading profile of children in the Philippines as a whole, we might be lacking reliable data showing the real picture of it.

The result of Philippine Reading Inventory is a shallow if not superficial basis of describing the average reading ability of Filipino children. The conduct, implementation, and reporting of the result of Philirri is considered an additional burden to Filipino teachers, which always ends as 'for compliance report' only. More often than not, the result given by the teacher-adviser, as well the school, is not the real outcome of the assessment but a fixated result that saves the image and reputation of each school. On December 2013, The NSO's 2010 Census of Population and Housing (CPH) showed that of the 71.5 million individuals who are 10 years old and above, 97.5 percent or 69.8 million were literate or could read and write. This is higher compared to the literacy rate of 92.3 percent recorded in the 2000 CPH. 97.5% literacy rate is quite an impressive figure but if we will take a look at the result of the National Achievement Test (NAT) ON 2012, Grade 3 students got a Mean Percentage Score of 54.42% in English reading Comprehension and 58.61% in Filipino. This figures shows that 3rd grade Filipino children are considered as average readers in general. It also shows that Filipino 3rd grade students have problem understanding what she/he is reading whether the text is written in English or Filipino.

According to Juan Miguel Cruz (2007), despite our supposedly high literacy rate, many Filipinos can barely read and write. This is true especially of those living in remote areas as well as the slum areas of the country. Someone once remarked that we are not a nation of readers; we are a nation of storytellers. Ours is a culture of oral history passed on by word of mouth not through the written word. Does the problem really stem from the culture? Somehow, yes. But beside the issue of culture lies the problem in the quality of instruction among public schools. The ancient problem of financial support from the government is the root of this problem.

In 2012, the government allocated a sum of 21,000 Pesos for its Every Child a Reader Program allocating 1,000,000 pesos for the National Capital region which composed of more than 4,000,000 school children. P25.00 cannot even buy a good book for a young reader to explore and enjoy. A study conducted by a non-profit organization located in Manila demonstrates that a short-term reading program that provides age-appropriate reading material and trains teachers to use it can have a significant effect on the reading ability of primary school children. The government has a thrust of building proficiency through language (Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education) as part of our newly implemented k-12 curriculum. This trust is considered as another burden to

Filipino educators. There are no available materials in areas of science and mother-tongue based language. Teacher guides and learner materials (which are usually soft copy) are all written in English and the burden of translating it into the language /dialect of the local community is left to teachers. There are no available language books from kinder-grade IV. Language books which will expose children to written texts are not available.

Reading is a basic skill which should not be compromised in a humane society. Reading instruction should be given emphasis and must be prioritized by a responsible government. In this age of information where orality is not enough to communicate to the world anymore, quality reading instruction among public schools should be a top priority. We cannot afford to raise a generation of non readers. To address this concern at its very core, students have to be trained at the earliest age to read well. This means access to a wide variety of quality books at their schools and a program that encourages reading for pleasure — because the surefire way to develop good reading comprehension is by making reading a habit.

Response to intervention (RTI) may sound complicated, but it's based on a fairly simple idea. Early in the year, your child's school can start looking at everyone's skills in reading, writing and math. They can provide targeted teaching—called interventions—to help struggling students catch up. A big part of the RTI process involves closely monitoring student progress. That way the school can see which kids need more academic support. In the general classroom, chances are good to see different students struggling for different reasons. Some pupils may have undiagnosed learning and attention issues. The goal of this intervention is to intervene, or step in, and start helping before anyone falls really far behind. RTI aims to identify struggling pupils early on and give them the support they need to be successful in school

## CONCLUSION

This presents the research design, research instrument, research sample, and data gathering procedure. It also includes the ethical consideration to be observed in the entirety of the research process, and the statistical analysis in treating the data.

### Research Design

According to Adanza, research method is designed for the investigator to gather information about the present conditions. The main objective of the study is to determine the level of performance of the students before and after the implementation of the program, as well as its effect. It involves a collection of data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject or prevailing conditions.

### Research Sample and Sampling

The selected respondents were twenty-five (30) pupils. These will be the Grade 3 pupils from different schools in Quezon City. Respondents were selected using simple random sampling. Simple random sample (SRS) is a special case of a random sample. A sample is called simple random sample if each unit of the population has an equal chance of being selected for the sample. Whenever a unit is selected for the sample, the units of the population are equally likely to be selected.

### Research Instruments

This study used the Philippine – Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) materials in assessing the level of reading proficiency of the students. The level of reading comprehension of the students was computed using the following formula below:  $\text{Comprehension (C)} = \frac{\text{no. of correct answers}}{\text{no. of questions}} \times 100\%$  The Phil-IRI-Silent Reading Test gives quantitative information about the pupil's silent reading capabilities. Quantitative information shows the reading levels namely: frustration, instructional and independent. Furthermore, it uses predetermined set of criteria in identifying the reading levels of the pupils such as the reading speed and percentage of correct answers to comprehension questions. It has adapted the combination of bands of reading rate (words per minute) proposed by Morris and Gunning. In this study, the level of reading proficiency was interpreted based on the result of the computation. The Manual of Phil-IRI Test Administration and Interpretation which was retrieved from the DepEd Muntinlupa City Division was used as main reference in the interpretation. The following is the interpretation for the level of reading comprehension:

Computed Value of Comprehension Levels of Reading Proficiency 90 – 100% Independent Level 75 – 89% Instructional Level 74 % and below Frustration Level Data Analysis In this investigation, the researcher uses frequency, mean, standard deviation, t-test for paired sample and analysis of variance. All hypothetical questions will be analyzed and interpreted at 5% level of significance.

### Data-Gathering Procedures

The researcher gathered the necessary data based on the ratings during the pre test of oral and silent reading to identify the level of performance of the selected respondents.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

After collating all the data, the researcher will arrive at an in-depth analysis and interpretation of the gathered data.

1. Weighted Mean was used to interpret the problem statement 1, 2 and 3. The responses of the informants using assigned points are interpreted as follows:
2. T-test of dependent sample was used to determine the significant difference among the

groups in their assessment of respondent's level of performance before and after the oral and silent reading test.

### CONCLUSION

#### Summary of Findings

Impact of reading performance of pupils at risk using standardized reading tool during the pre test of oral and silent reading. Most of the respondents belonged to the frustration level during the pre test of oral and silent reading given in the 1st quarter periodical test using the phil iri reading assessment tool. Impact of reading performance of pupils at risk using standardized reading tool during the post test of oral and silent reading. The respondents obtained a higher score of 20-60% belonged to frustration level, 10 respondents belonged to independent level and 6 respondents obtained for the instructional level. The average mean of the post test given before the last quarter periodical examination has an average of 3.5, 80% in oral reading and 4, 80% for the silent reading test. It is observed that there is an increased of performance in the post test and it was categorized only on the instructional level of performance.

Significant difference between the level of reading performance of the respondents from the pre test and post test:

The null hypothesis is rejected since the computed of values of the level of performance of the respondents as assessed is greater than the critical value of at 5% level of significance. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the level of performance of the respondents during the pre test and post test of oral and silent reading

### CONCLUSION

From the study, it can be determined that reading is a fundamental and essential skill that can predict successful scores. In order for students to be able to achieve proficiently. Students need to be fluently read and comprehend test materials.

The following conclusions are drawn by the researcher based on the findings of the study.

- i. Majority of the students belonged to frustration level of performance in oral and silent reading.
- ii. There is no significant difference on the levels of reading performance levels of students at risk during the pretest and posttest of oral and silent reading test.

### Recommendations

Based on the results and conclusions of the study, the researcher offers the following recommendations:

- i. Teachers should guide the struggling learners thoroughly to improve their level of performance.
- ii. Integrating schools RTI team should be prioritized
- iii. Differentiated Instruction should be implemented with students at risk
- iv. The RTI team which students need instructional intervention
- v. Progress monitoring team with respond to RTI
- vi. Future research may be conducted in a wider scope using parallel method to determine the level of performance of the students in reading.
- vii.

### Concluding Statement

Bases from the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study, it's visible that the reading comprehension of the students in grade 3 are belonged to frustration level even in the post test that is being administered for last quarter of the school year. The researcher proposed an instructional intervention model Response to Intervention (RTI)

### Figures, Tables and Equations

This chapter presents the data that have been interpreted and analyzed following the same sequence of questions in the statement of the problem.

- i. The impact of reading performance of pupils at risk using standardized testing tool during the pretest of oral reading test and silent reading test?

Table 1 - The Level of Performance of the Pupils in Grade 3 during the pre test in oral reading

Respondents	Score	Percentage	Description
Student 1	2	40	Frustration level
Student 2	2	40	Frustration level
Student 3	1	20	Frustration level
Student 4	2	40	Frustration level
Student 5	2	40	Frustration level
Student 6	1	20	Frustration level
Student 7	1	20	Frustration level
Student 8	1	20	Frustration level
Student 9	2	40	Frustration level
Student 10	1	20	Frustration level

Table 1 – continuation

Respondents	Score	Percentage	Description
Student 1	2	40	Frustration level
Student 2	3	60	Frustration level
Student 3	1	20	Frustration level
Student 4	3	60	Frustration level
Student 5	2	40	Frustration level
Student 6	1	20	Frustration level
Student 7	3	60	Frustration level
Student 8	1	20	Frustration level
Student 9	2	40	Frustration level
Student 10	3	60	Frustration level

Table 1 – continuation

Respondents	Score	Percentage	Description
Student 1	1	20	Frustration level
Student 2	2	40	Frustration level
Student 3	2	40	Frustration level
Student 4	1	20	Frustration level
Student 5	2	40	Frustration level
Student 6	1	20	Frustration level

<b>Student 7</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 8</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 9</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Weighted Meann</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>Frustration level</b>

Table 1 – continuation

The Level of Performance of the Pupils in Grade 3 during the pre test silent reading

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 2</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 3</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 4</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 5</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 6</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 7</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 8</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 9</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	2	40	Frustration level

Table 1 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 2</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 3</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 4</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 5</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 6</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 7</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 8</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 9</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	1	20	Frustration level

Table 1 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 2</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 3</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 4</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 5</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 6</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 7</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 8</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 9</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	2	40	Frustration level

<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>36.67</b>	<b>Frustration level</b>
----------------------	--------------	--------------------------

Table 2 – Post test or oral and silent reading

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 2</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 3</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 4</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 5</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 6</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 7</b>	1	20	Frustration level
<b>Student 8</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 9</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	4	80	Instructional level

Table 2 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 2</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 3</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 4</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 5</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 6</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 7</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 8</b>	4	40	Instructional level
<b>Student 9</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 10</b>	3	60	Frustration level

Table 2 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 2</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 3</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 4</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 5</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 6</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 7</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 8</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 9</b>	2	40	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	3	60	Instructional level
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	<b>68.67</b>		Instructional level

Table 2 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 2</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 3</b>	4	80	Instructional level

<b>Student 4</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 5</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 6</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 7</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 8</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 9</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 10</b>	4	80	Instructional level

Table 2 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 2</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 3</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 4</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 5</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 6</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 7</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 8</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 9</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 10</b>	4	80	Instructional level

Table 2 – continuation

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Student 1</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 2</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 3</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 4</b>	5	100	Independent level
<b>Student 5</b>	5	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 6</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 7</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 8</b>	3	60	Frustration level
<b>Student 9</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Student 10</b>	4	80	Instructional level
<b>Weighted Mean</b>	79.33		

Table 3

Significance of Difference between the Pre and Post test in Oral and Silent Reading

<b>Reading Competencies</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>t-computed value</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>Oral Reading</b>	Pretest	34.00	14.04	29		0.000	Reject Ho	Significantly different
	Posttest	68.67	23.30					
<b>Silent Reading</b>	Pretest	36.67	18.26	29		0.000	Reject Ho	Significantly different
	Posttest	79.33	15.29					



**REFERENCE**

- Ervin, Ruth A. "Considering Tier 3 Within a Response-to-Intervention Model." *RTI Action Network*. The National Center for Learning Disabilities, Inc., Web. <http://www.rtinetwork.org/essential/tier3/redinstruction/tier3/consideringtier3>
- United States. Department of Education. *Building the Legacy: IDEA 2004*. US Department of Education, Web. <http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/root statute.I.B.614.b.6>.
- Musgrove, Melody. Memorandum. *US Dept. of Education*, 21 Jan. 2011. PDF. <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/memosdcltrs/osep11-07rtimemo.pdf>
- Hauerwas, L.B., R. Brown, and A.S. Scott. "Specific Learning Disability and Response to Intervention: State-Level Guidance." *Exceptional Children* 80.1 (2013): 101–20. Print.
- Topor, David R., Susan P. Keane, Terri L. Shelton, and Susan D. Calkins. "Parent Involvement and Student Academic Performance: A Multiple Mediation Analysis." *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community* 38.3 (2010): 183–97. Taylor and Francis Online. Web. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10852352.2010.486297#.U69voPldXzw>
- Orgunsiyi, Y. & O, F. D. (2009). English Language Proficiency as a predictor of Academic Achievement among EFL students in Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 37(3), 490-495.
- M.D. Coyne|E.J. Kami'enui|D.W. Carnine. (2010). *Effective Teaching Strategies that Accommodate Diverse Learners*, by M.D. Coyne, E.J. Kami'Enui, D.W. Carnine, 2010 edition, p. 80-82.
- Eeds, M. & Wells, D. (2013). Grand conversations: An Exploration of Meaning Construction in Literature Study Groups. *Research in Teaching of English*, 23, 4—29