

# DEVELOPING ENGLISH READING LITERACY THROUGH INTERACTIVE READ-ALOUD STRATEGY

Frenzl Mae P. Maghinay<sup>1</sup>, Dhan Timothy M. Ibojo<sup>2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Student, English Language Teaching, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Philippines

<sup>2</sup> College Professor in English Language Education, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Philippines

## ABSTRACT

*The study investigates the effectiveness of Interactive Read-Aloud (IRA) compared to Traditional Read-Aloud (TRA) strategies in enhancing English reading literacy among seventh-grade students at Coronobe Integrated School. Using the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) Assessment Tool, control and experimental groups underwent pretests and posttests to gauge their reading proficiency. The experimental group received IRA while the control group received TRA. Results indicated a significant improvement in the experimental group's competency levels post-intervention, suggesting the effectiveness of IRA in developing reading literacy. IRA was found to actively engage students, promote comprehension skills, and nurture critical thinking. Both strategies showed effectiveness, but IRA yielded a slightly higher mean, indicating its superiority. Hence, the study recommends IRA for teachers aiming to implement engaging reading strategies that foster collaboration and confidence among students. This finding suggests that in conducting reading remediation, educators should explore strategies that empower students rather than solely relying on teacher-led approaches. By incorporating IRA, students can interact with peers, enhancing their learning experience. The positive outcomes of the study advocate for the adoption of IRA by reading teachers seeking to enhance students' reading proficiency and overall literacy skills.*

**Keyword :** Assessment Tool, Pen-and-Paper Test, IRA Strategy

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Literacy in reading is essential for learning and understanding the world, and it is a must for someone to develop reading skills (Smith et al, 2000). In order to engage in society, to accomplish one's goals, and to expand one's knowledge and potential, one must be able to comprehend, evaluate, use, and interact with written material (OECD, 2019b).

There has been significant progress in literacy, as seen by the most recent statistics from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, which shows that more than 86% of the world's population can read and write, up from 68% in 1979. Despite this, 250 million children fail to learn basic literacy skills, and at least 763 million adults—2/3 of whom are women—still lack the ability to read and write. There were 617 million children and teenagers who had not attained the necessary reading levels prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the largest disruption to schooling in a century (UNESCO, 2023). According to UNESCO (2018), inequalities remain stark in the world, particularly when it comes to sub-Saharan Africa and the rest of the globe. Niger, South Sudan, and Burkina Faso are the three African countries at the bottom of the list with literacy rates that remain below 30% (Roser & Ospina, 2016).

Reading difficulties among Filipino students persist, as evidenced by low reading comprehension scores in international assessments like the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). In the Philippines, 80% of students fall below the minimum reading competency level. At Coronobe Integrated School, where the researcher teaches, struggling readers remain prevalent, exacerbated by disruptions from the pandemic and two years of modular learning. Seventh-grade students still exhibit frustration with reading, possibly due to word decoding, comprehension, or fluency issues. The shift to the new normal in education provides an opportunity to address these learning gaps, particularly in reading skills. Despite challenges, parents remain committed to their children's

education, believing it to be crucial despite life's adversities. Understanding the unique life experiences of slow and emerging readers underscores the importance of persistence in pursuing education. The researcher's observation of poor reading literacy motivates further investigation into remedial strategies.

### 1.1 Research Questions

1. What is the reading level of the students in graded passages pretest scores?
2. What is the reading level of the students in graded passages posttest scores?
3. Is there a significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the control group?
4. Is there a significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the experimental group?
5. Is there a significant difference between mean posttest scores of the students in control group and experimental group?

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Research Design

The data for the study was gathered using a Quasi-Experimental Research Design. Donald T. Campbell devised the quasi-experimental approach to generalize casual inference. The research design was a pretest-posttest group design wherein both groups were given pretests in the beginning and posttests at the end of every period under consideration (Padua, 2000).

The students were separated into two groups, with group A being the control group and group B being the experimental group it was done by non-random selection. The information was acquired from the results of Phil-IRI Individualized Assessment Tool's pretest and posttest.

The class of 47 students had undergone Group Screening Test (GST), a paper-and-pen pretest. Both the control and experimental groups were from frustration reading level. After the pretest, students in Group B (experimental) were given an intervention in which they were taught through interactive read-aloud strategy while Group A (control) was taught through traditional read-aloud strategy. Both groups received a posttest via paper-and-pen assessment.

### 2.2 Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the study were the Grade 7 Junior High School students of Coronobe Integrated School for the S.Y. 2022-2023. There was only 1 section of the above-mentioned year level, and it was Grade 7 Mercury.

For the purposes of the research, since grade 7 had only one section, they were screened through Phil-IRI initial screening test. Out of 47 students, there were 14 students in non-reader and frustration level of reading, with 7 in the control group and 7 in the experimental group.

Group A as control group and Group B as experimental group. A total of 14 students are subjects of the study, 50% of these belong to Group A, the experimental group, also 50% belong to Group B, the control group. A total of 14 students wherein 29.79% of the class are respondents of the study, belong to Group A and B.

### 2.3 Research Instrument

The students were divided into two groups, with group A serving as the control group and group B serving as the experimental group. The pretest was the same for both groups, which was conventional paper-and-pen testing. Students in Group B (experimental) were given an intervention after the pretest, in which they were given reading tasks through Interactive Read-Aloud strategy. Group A (control) was given tasks through Traditional Read-Aloud strategy. A posttest was administered to both groups using paper-and-pen assessment.

Students who were identified to be performing below level of expectation (those with a total Raw Score below 14 in the Phil-IRI GST) should undergo further assessment through the individually administered Phil-IRI graded passages. The Phil-IRI Graded Passages is an informal individualized assessment tool used to record the

student's performance in oral reading, silent reading and/or listening comprehension. The Phil-IRI Graded Passages Pre-Tests and Post-Tests have a total of four parallel sets (SETS A to D) that the test-administrator can choose from. The following test was a multiple choice with four choices for each item and as well as the questions were arranged in comprehension level: literal, inferential, critical, application, and creative respectively.

## 2.4 Research Procedure

The researcher provided a letter of authorization where they all signed granting for approval. First to the Davao de Oro Schools Division Superintendent office for the conduct of this research at Coronobe Integrated School. The letter will then promptly given to school principals: to the District Head of Maragusan East, then to Principal III of Coronobe Integrated School, where the researcher conducted the study.

After the approval of the heads of offices, the needed instruments such as the reading passages and pretest-posttest rating sheets/forms were prepared for the experiment. The following instruments had already passed DepEd's quality assurance since those were from Philippine Informal Reading Inventory Manual 2018 and carefully confirmed by the researcher's adviser and validators.

Grade 7 was chosen to be source of subjects in the study as the greatest number of struggling readers are in this grade level. Students with a score below 14, in their screening test were the subjects in the study. Those who got above-14 would no longer join the reading remediation. The administration of pre-test was given to the students who got 14 and below, reading intervention followed, and post-test was given to the subjects of the study.

## 2.5 Statistical Treatment/Data Analysis

The data were structured and compiled in order to produce readable findings. In order to accurately analyze and interpret the various data collected in this study, SPSS was utilized and the following statistical tests were used:

*Mean and Class Proficiency.* These were used to determine the competency level of the two groups according to their pretest and posttest result.

*Independent Sample T-test.* This was used to compare the means of two groups.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the collected and the subsequent analyses in a sequence corresponding to the problems presented. Data and preliminary information were also provided as basis of the computation and interpretations of the results.

### 3.1 Competency Level of the Pretest Scores of the Groups

Figure 1 shows the results of the competency level of the pretest scores of the control and experimental group.

Pretest	No. of students	Mean	Class Proficiency	Competency Level
GROUP A (CONTROL)	7	7.71	24.09%	Did Not Meet Expectation
GROUP B (EXPERIMENTAL)	7	7.57	23.66%	Did Not Meet Expectation

**Fig -1:** Competency Level of the Pretest Scores of Control and Experimental Group

The figure above shows the level of performance of the students before the study of the two groups. Each group has 7 learners as subjects of the study. The class proficiency shows that the experimental group got 23.66%, and the control group which is 24.09%, but both groups did not meet expectation in the competency level. Group A and Group B have a mean score of 7.71 and 7.57, respectively. The two groups have almost equal mean score with 0.14 difference. This means that the groups are comparable.

Both the control and experimental groups scored below 50% on the pretest, indicating a low mastery level in reading. This underscores the need for alternative reading intervention strategies that not only aid comprehension but also engage students. Various strategies exist to enhance reading literacy and ensure effective outcomes. Vygotsky emphasized the pivotal role of language in learning, suggesting that thought is shaped and clarified through verbal expression. Interactive read-aloud strategies facilitate this process, allowing students to articulate ideas, refine understanding, and receive feedback through group interactions (Sipe, 2008; Wiseman, 2003). Skillful encouragement from teachers can enhance students' comprehension, expression, and interpretation of texts, fostering collaborative learning environments where students support each other's understanding and learning techniques (Hoffman, 2011).

### 3.2 Competency Level of the Posttest Scores of the Groups

Figure 2 shows the results of the competency level of the posttest scores from the control and experimental group.

Posttest	No. of students	Mean	Class Proficiency	Competency Level
Group A (Control)	7	16.71	75%	Fairly Satisfactory
Group B (Experimental)	7	24.57	85%	Very Satisfactory

**Fig -2:** Competency Level of the Posttest Scores of Control and Experimental Group

Figure 2 shows the level of performance of the students after the study of the two groups. The competency level shows that the control group has the Fairly Satisfactory level with 75% class proficiency and the experimental group has 85% class proficiency, Very Satisfactory level. Groups A and B improved its level of competency however, Group B attained Very Satisfactory, which means this group met the competency requirement. This result proves that, the Interactive Read Aloud (IRA) strategy is more effective than the conventional strategy.

Both the control and experimental groups achieved satisfactory levels of proficiency in the posttest, with class proficiency exceeding 50%. However, the experimental group outperformed the control group, indicating the significant impact of the interactive read-aloud strategy on students' performance compared to traditional read-aloud methods. Interactive read-aloud, as described by Fountas & Pinnell (2006), offers advantages beyond conventional approaches, as noted by (Delacruz, 2019).

### 3.3 Significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and posttest mean scores of the students in control group

Figure 3 shows the results of the paired t-test use to compare the achievements of the students in the control group.

	Mean	P-Value	Decision
PRETEST	7.71	0.001	Significant
POSTTEST	19.29		

**Fig -3:** Competency Level of the Posttest Scores of Control and Experimental Group

The figure shows the comparison of the achievements of the students belonging in the Group A (control). The mean indicates that pretest got 7.71 and posttest got 19.29. As a result, the P-Value is 0.001 less than 0.05, indicating that the decision was significant. There is a strong evidence against the null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it proves there was a significant difference between the achievements of the students when using traditional read-aloud strategy in developing reading literacy.

The comparison of student achievements in the control group led to rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating a significant difference in achievement levels with the traditional read-aloud strategy. This method was found less effective, potentially due to its teacher-centered nature. This suggests that reliance solely on teacher-centered instructional strategies may not ensure student success. While such methods facilitate performance



comparison, they may limit student potential and fail to foster participatory, interactive learning. Effective instructional approaches, as advocated by Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde (2012), are student-centered, cognitive, and participatory.

### 3.4 Significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and posttest mean scores of the students in the experimental group

Figure 4 shows the results of the paired t-test use to compare the achievements of the students in the control group.

	Mean	P-Value	Decision
PRETEST	7.57	0.000	Significant
POSTTEST	24.57		

**Fig -4:** Comparison of the Achievement of the Students in the Experimental Group

The figure shows the comparison of the achievements of the students belonging in the Group A (control). The mean indicates that pretest got 7.57 and posttest got 24.57. As a result, the P-Value is 0.000 less than 0.05, indicating that the decision was significant. There is a very strong evidence against the null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and there was a significant difference between the achievements of the students when using Interactive Read-Aloud (IRA) strategy in developing reading literacy.

The achievements of students were positive when utilizing either the traditional read-aloud or interactive read-aloud strategies for developing reading literacy. However, educators often rely on conventional methods, which may not be optimal for 21st-century learners, necessitating alternative approaches to enhance learning engagement. According to Dela Cruz (2009), reading aloud to children can significantly improve their reading skills, but the effectiveness depends on the teacher's approach. Interactive read-aloud, as highlighted by Delacruz (2009), fosters understanding, independent thought, and critical thinking through dialogue. Wiseman (2011) emphasizes that interactive read-aloud allows students to engage with the text, interact with peers, and develop knowledge and skills through meaningful dialogue and interactions.

### 3.5 Significant difference between the posttest mean scores of the students in control group and the experimental group

Figure 5 shows the results of the computations to compare the achievements of the students between the control and experimental groups as reflected on their posttest scores.

Posttest	Mean	P-Value	Remarks
Group A (Control)	16.71	0.009	significant
Group B (Experimental)	24.57		

**Fig -5:** Comparison of the Achievement of the Students between the Control and Experimental Group

Figure 5 shows the level of performance of the students after the study of the two groups. An independent t-test was used to determine the difference between the posttest of both groups. The mean indicates that Group A (Control) got 16.71 and Group B (Experimental) got 24.57. The P-Value is 0.009 less than 0.05, indicating that it is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and there was a significant difference between the achievements of the students in the control and experimental group as reflected on their posttest scores.

Comparing the achievements of students in the control and experimental groups, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a significant difference in their posttest scores. The experimental group, which utilized interactive read-aloud strategy as intervention, performed better academically. Factors influencing student participation in literacy include standards, teamwork, reading and writing proficiency, and decision-making. Students are more likely to engage in reading when they anticipate interest, collaborate with peers, and have the autonomy to improve their skills. Interactive read-aloud facilitates student communication and expression of

opinions, promoting perspectives from peers and teachers (Tompkins, 2006). Beyond traditional discourse practices, Interactive Read-Aloud Strategy allows educators to foster collaboration, problem-solving, reasoning modeling, and pacing adjustments tailored to student needs (Pappas et al., 2012; Varelas & Pappas, 2006 as cited in McClure et al., 2017).

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The competency level of both the control and experimental groups at the beginning of the experiment were equivalent as shown in the computation of their class proficiency in their pretest scores.

The competency level of the students in the experimental group after the experiment was significantly different. Therefore, the interference of using interactive read-aloud strategy as intervention in developing reading literacy was effective. The interactive read-aloud strategy can be used to actively involve students during development of knowledge, increase comprehension skills, and foster critical thinking. Achievements of the students in both the control and experimental groups in developing reading literacy improved using the traditional read-aloud and the use of interactive read-aloud strategy, as interventions, respectively. The results showed that both approaches were effective in teaching reading, but interactive read-aloud strategy resulted higher mean than the other. Interactive Read-Aloud Strategy was more effective than Traditional Read-Aloud Strategy.

Based on the conclusions derived from the findings of the study, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. There is a need for English language teachers to explore reading strategies to be engaging and not monopolized by the teacher. This could be done through interactive read-aloud strategy so that students can collaborate with other learners, and develop confidence as well.
2. The process of reading instruction should be between teachers and learners to arrive at or construct an elusive meaning from the text.
3. Just as other activities, the work of teachers depends on the school community. By sharing the administrator's resources to developing rich literacy experiences to students, the School Administrators should encourage, support, and strictly implement reading program.
4. The use of interactive reading-aloud strategy, as reading intervention is recommended for future researchers to implement for it has relevant effect to the achievement level of the students.

#### 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors offer heartfelt appreciation to their families for the unwavering support, the Department of Education Head of Offices who gave an early response to conduct a study, experts' guidance, and to all respondents.

#### 6. REFERENCES

- [1]. Delacruz, S. (2009). Using interactive read-alouds to increase K-2 students reading comprehension (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- [2]. Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, S. (2006). Teaching for comprehending and fluency. Ports Mouth, NH: Heinemann
- [3]. Hoffman, J. L. (2011). Coconstructing meaning: Interactive literary discussions in Kindergarten read-alouds. *The Reading Teacher*, 65(3), 183-194.
- [4]. McClure, E. L., & Fullerton, S. K. (2017). Instructional interactions: Supporting students' reading development through interactive read-alouds of informational texts. *The reading teacher*, 71(1), 51-59.
- [5]. OECD (2019b). PISA 2018 results volume I: What students know and can do. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- [6]. Padua, Roberto M. (2000), Elements of research and statistical models. MMM Books, Inc. Cubao, Quezon City
- [7]. Roser, Max and Ospina, Esteban (2016) - "Literacy". Published online at OurWorldInData.org.

- [8]. Sipe, L. R. (2008). *Storytime: Young children's literary understanding in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- [9]. Smith, M. C., Mikulecky, L., Kibby, M. W., Dreher, M. J., & Dole, J. A. (2000). RRQ Snippet: What Will Be the Demands of Literacy in the Workplace in the Next Millennium?. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(3), 378-383.
- [10]. Tompkins, G. (2006). *Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach*. (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [11]. UNESCO (United Nations Educational , Scientific, and Cultural Organization) (2023). *What you need to know about Literacy?*
- [12]. Wiseman, A. (2011). Interactive read alouds: Teachers and students constructing knowledge and literacy together. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38, 431-438.
- [13]. Zemelman, S., Daniels, H.S. & Hyde, A. (2012). *Best practice: Bringing standards to life in America's Classrooms*. (4th ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

