

TEACHING LETTER SOUND TO GRADE 1 PUPILS THROUGH ORTON-GILLINGHAM APPROACH

Claire A. Emboscado, Ar Mark John V. Madenancil, Jilla Mae D. Susada

Department of Elementary Education, Davao Oriental State University- Cateel Extension Campus, Cateel Davao Oriental, Philippines, 8205

ABSTRACT

Many students have experienced reading difficulties, their inability to use their phonological knowledge. Teaching young kids how to crack the code by teaching systematic phonics is the most proven way to make sure that they learn how to read words and this will lead to an equally creating a strong reading foundation. Thus, this study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of Orton Gillingham Approach in letter sound recognition. The respondents was the the Grade 1 Pupils particularly the section 2 in Cateel Central Elementary School, comprising 27 pupils. The 26 item letter sound checklist was utilized to assess the performance of the pupils in letter sound recognition. The result showed a significant difference between pre and post-test scores in terms of letter sound recognition. It has been presented that the Orton-Gillingham Approach was effective and improved the letter sound recognition of the Grade 1 pupils. The result of this study was beneficial to the teachers, students, curriculum planners and future researcher in teaching letter sound fluency.

Keyword: *phonological knowledge, systematic phonics, reading foundation, letter sound, alphabets, language based, phonemic awareness, phonemic prescriptive, sequential*

1. INTRODUCTION

Many students who have experienced reading difficulties in their first year of schooling have displayed problems with phonological awareness and their inability to use their phonological knowledge effectively (Antonio et al., 2020). They have difficulties reading words accurately, fluently, and automatically (Bus et al., 1999). A possible reason for this could be due to their inability to use their phonological knowledge effectively. They cannot detect, match, blend, segment, or manipulate speech sounds. The efforts of general education teachers to provide student-specific support can significantly impact struggling learners (Rasinski et al., 2016).

What is the best way to teach children how to read is a question that many educational researchers have argued over for almost a century. Some assume reading is a natural process, similar to learning how to speak (Hapke et al., 2019). However, learning to read is not as natural or as hard-wired as speaking and listening. Our brains are not fully developed for processing written language as they are for processing spoken language; learning to read and write is more difficult than learning to speak (Schwartz et al., 2019). Therefore, as the author and researcher explained, reading must be taught directly to most children through formal education over several years (Moats, 2020). Certain combinations of letters predictably represent certain sounds. For the last few decades, the research has been detailed in teaching young kids how to crack the

code by teaching systematic phonics is the most proven way to ensure they learn how to read words (Schwartz et al., 2019). With effective instruction and relatively small doses of additional support to help students decode the printed word, as many as 98 percent of students could read on grade-level reading researchers (Richard, 2013). Improving literacy rates should include instruction that will help children succeed. It includes but is not limited to, systematic instruction in phonological and phonemic awareness.

Although many factors contribute to reading struggles, children's phonological and phonemic awareness levels can be enhanced (Patel et al., 2022). This action research will address the need for phonological and phonemic awareness using Orton-Gillingham Approach as the principle in teaching letter sound. This approach is based on the close association of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic. Orton Gillingham's Approach will be used in teaching letter sound fluency to the Grade 1 Pupils in Cateel Central Elementary School. Using this intervention in teaching letter sound is advantageous to students. It can increase their interest in a particular topic (Nikolopoulou et al., 2019).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of pre-test scores in terms of letter-sound recognition of Grade 1 Pupils in Cateel Central Elementary School?
2. What is the level of post-test scores in terms of letter-sound recognition of Grade 1 Pupils in Cateel Central Elementary School?
3. Is there any significant difference in pre-test and post-test scores in terms of letter-sound recognition of Grade 1 Pupils in Cateel Central Elementary School?

1.2 Scope and Limitation

The researcher employed a pure experimental design. The action research was conducted in Cateel Central Elementary School at Castro Avenue, Cateel Davao Oriental. One section of Grade 1 Pupils enrolled in the school year 2022-2023 is the subject of this research for an experimental group. The data gathered in this study was focused only on the objectives mentioned above. The researchers implemented the intervention for 30 minutes over 14 consecutive days.

This study was delimited only to the Grade 1 Pupils who can identify the letter name but need help to produce the sound of the letter correctly. The study focused on Multi-sensory Principle as part of the Orton Gillingham Approach in the intervention application.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presented a review of the related literature of the present study. The review of related literature is a compilation of literature related to the topic of the study.

2.1 Teaching Phonemic Awareness

Schools and teachers are implementing strategies to help students become stronger and more confident readers (Moats & Tolman, 2019). Districts look to many curriculums and approaches to boost reading scores, but teachers are still ill-prepared to support their readers, and student test scores are still lower than districts would like them to be. Teaching phonological awareness to all students is an instructional approach that all teachers can turn to to help their students in their reading instruction (Arrow et al., 2018). The extent of phonological awareness (PA) substantially affects children's reading ability (Hoff, 2014). Research shows that all students need phonological awareness skills to successfully read and spell (Khan et al., 2021). Good readers look at every letter within a word, even if they are unaware of it.

Advocates of the whole language reading approach still understand that phonological and, more specifically, phonemic awareness needs to be taught. However, they do not believe these skills should be taught explicitly or without the richness of contextual books. Instead, these skills should be taught as needed (Zammit, 2019). Phonics instruction is beneficial for students who demonstrate a need for the skill and all students in the classroom. Dozens of studies prove that students who receive explicit instruction in phonemic awareness from kindergarten through grade two score higher on average than those who do not (Barshay, 2020).

Using a systematic phonics approach allows teachers to utilize direct instructional practices in teaching phonics. Using phonics instruction to teach reading focuses on 15 letter-sound correspondences in reading and spelling. When learning letter-sound correspondence instruction, students learn that letters are connected to the sounds or phonemes that are attached to those letters (Panel,2000). Teachers who believe in phonics look for decodable texts in curriculums and teach from a controlled vocabulary (Rasinski et al., 2020). The National Reading Panel reports significant advantages and benefits for elementary-aged students from kindergarten through grade six who have received phonics instruction. The students that received systematic phonics instruction demonstrated the ability to read and spell words at a more successful level beginning at as young of a grade as kindergarten (M Brown, 2022).

Furthermore, across all grade levels, the National Reading Panel reports that when good readers receive explicit, systematic phonics instruction, their spelling improves (Khan et al.,2021). This data supports the argument that phonics and phonemic instruction are beneficial to all students in the classroom. On the other hand, Balanced Literacy instruction was supposed to bring together the best of the whole language approach and the phonics instruction approach.

The Balanced Literacy approach incorporates multiple reading and writing strategies with various teacher support and student effort; in the classroom, this looks like different shared reading lessons (Chai et al., 2020). It includes the whole language approach as it has interactive read-aloud and writing activities and incorporates the idea of reading the environment or soaking in all literacy contexts around a student. On the contrary, this also includes the phonics approach as it allows some phonics instruction and guided reading time, thus creating the idea of the balance of the two approaches. Skeptics of Balanced Literacy instruction have similar arguments as skeptics of the whole language approach (Lorimor-Easley, 2019). Exposing young students to rich literature and unfamiliar texts will not teach them to decode words naturally. However, it will only lead to them practicing compensatory strategies such as looking at images that do not help their reading skills (Adams, 2020). Furthermore, studies have shown that a lack of foundation in phonics and weak decoding skills ultimately lead to compromised reading comprehension.

Describe Balanced Literacy as teachers and learners plan, direct, and travel their routes toward literacy. They use multiple tools and texts to read their environment, chart their route, and adjust their sails when necessary. They blend theory and practice, reception and expression of information through the language arts, and thinking, doing, and becoming in a seamless way (Parr. et al.,2012)

Teaching phonics and phonological awareness is an essential part of instruction. By implementing an explicit phonological awareness instruction curriculum and teaching all concepts to students, every student in a classroom benefits, and no student is harmed. There is not a one size fits all approach that will benefit every classroom and every student. However, phonics and phonological awareness instruction are necessary in every classroom and for every student (Moats et al., 2019). Moats and Tolman define phonics and phonological awareness in their LETTERS text as two different skill sets. Phonics is "the study of the relationships between letters and the sounds they represent." Phonological awareness is "the conscious awareness of all levels of the speech sound system, including word boundaries, stress patterns, syllables, onset-rime units, and phonemes."

Phonological awareness is included within the phonological processing system. When students listen for and produce speech sounds, they combine them into chunks of meaning, activating the meaning-processing system (Burkins et al., 2021).

Students of all backgrounds, including ethnicity, race, socioeconomics, and early childhood experiences, enter Kindergarten together (Coll et al., 2021). They come into one classroom with this diverse magnitude of strengths and areas to grow, and one foundational skill that each student must be strong to be a strong reader is phonological awareness. Later problems and struggles with reading can be prevented if all of our students are taught early in their education with letter-sound phonological awareness (Kilpatrick,2016). Teaching phonological awareness in a straightforward, systematic approach is accessible to all students, creating a strong reading foundation. Phonological awareness is an umbrella term encompassing many different skills that all directly involve levels of the speech sound system (Alhums, 2020).

The letter of the word follows the process of spelling where students base their orthographic structure on adapting the resonances from spoken words into print is an approach to spelling phonemically (G Genelza, 2022). He also emphasizes that if learners learn to 'spell' words based on phonemic dispensation, then there is a gentle improvement in their spelling ability. Some English words are spelled in a way that differs from how they sound. Second language learners find these words critical and confusing hence, difficult to spell. Moreover, some

English words have an established inconsistent symbol-sound relationship (Woore, 2022). He also acknowledged that spelling is a key sub-skills of efficient written correspondence in English. Both the reading and writing processes rely on it. He also stated that a student's right to written representation of his or her language is how-to-spell. As a result, he recommended the six foundations for spelling success and ways to improve spelling skills. He said in his sixth foundation that English spelling is specific and difficult. As a result, precise spelling can be difficult, necessitating memorizing which spelling patterns are employed in specific terms (Gagen, 2013).

(O'Brien et al., 2022). Kindergarten children who received teacher-directed phonemic awareness instruction performed significantly higher on the end-of-the-year reading and spelling measure than those who continued with the regular classroom reading program. The results from this study contribute to existing research by demonstrating that a short, intensive period of teacher-led instruction in phonological awareness focused at the phoneme level during the first year of schooling has the potential to yield a considerable positive effect on reading and spelling development of children (Carson et al., 2013)

Phonological awareness is essential for student success to begin reading instruction for ELL students and not wait for their proficiency in the language (Dussling, 2018). Phonological awareness is the understanding that the English language contains units of sounds that vary in size. They report that some units have many sounds in a syllable, and others have just one sound. This study demonstrates that Children learn to distinguish the larger units of sound from the smaller units (Wilsenach, 2019). Caldwell and Leslie conclude that three levels of phonological awareness are important for reading development: the syllable, onset-rime, and phoneme. Current research reveals that children's phonological awareness should be developed before children start school (Caldwell et al., 2013)

Action research in English and Bengali medium schools found that pupils in their country have a limited comprehension of English phonic and spelling systems, necessitating effective supervision in word reconstruction during instruction. It has been noted that students mostly rely on memory and are prone to forgetting spelling and needing to learn how to reconstruct it (Naig, 2022). The students, therefore, tend to rely significantly on the teacher's pronunciation, which can lead them astray. Furthermore, it was argued that the educational system's tradition, in some ways, encourages these kids to pursue learning retention goals. These elements contributed to rote memory, and the situation persisted until the tertiary level, obstructing spelling skills (Hub,2015).

Phonemic awareness was more predictive of reading development than students' IQ (O'Connor, 2013). The phonological awareness skills children may work on are rhyming, alliteration, and syllable segmentation. Children in preschool may receive indirect training in these topics by reading stories and poems (Moody, 2022). The majority of phonological learning will take place in the primary classroom. However, educators must be aware that students coming into the classroom will be at different stages of learning phonological awareness (Groth, 2020). When educators can focus on the area Running Head Small Group Phonemic Awareness Instruction and Oral Reading Fluency 7 of phonological awareness that the students are struggling with and build up from there to phonemic awareness, both the teacher(s) and student(s) will begin to see success in reading fluency (Kilpatrick, 2013).

They made an interesting discovery when studies showed that "phonemic awareness was more predictive of reading development than students' IQ or socioeconomic level (O'Connor, 2014). Providing phonological awareness instruction as early as preschool using play-based methods such as nursery rhymes has been effective in developing phonemic awareness to help students understand the basic phonemes in the language. The goal of a student's mastery of phonemic awareness is that they will be able to successfully decode words and become fluent readers (Kilpatrick, 2013).

It investigated the relationship between the elements of phonological awareness of words, syllables, onset-rime, and phoneme and letter knowledge as necessary precursors to competent reading skills. The findings from this study suggested that growth in the skills of letter knowledge and PA shared a bi-directional influence on the growth of both skills at the 34 sublevels of words, syllables, and onset-rime pairs in the growth rates of PA for children and was a replication and extension of previous studies (Hodgins et al., 2021). The lack of influence observed for letter-sound acquisition could have resulted from providing only eight items for this skill (Lerner et al., 2016).

2.2 Assessing Letter Sound Fluency

A phoneme is the first task a student will become fluent in phonemic awareness. The student will be able to identify a word's beginning, middle, and end sounds. Next, a student will begin to segment phonemes in single-syllable words into their sounds. Once students can segment sounds, they blend the phonemes to produce a word. The most difficult part of phonemic awareness is being able to manipulate the sounds of a word. To do this, the student will replace, take away, or add sounds to a word to produce a new word (Minnesota Center for Reading Research, 2016).

It may be challenging to teach preschoolers to blend letters and sounds fluently. Due to their young age, these students might need help understanding some letter-sound correspondences and may incorrectly represent sounds with letters (Block et al., 2015). Background studies show that young children's sensitivity to letter-sound patterns significantly impacts their ability to read accurately. Finding methods to improve kindergarteners' letter-sound fluency is the challenge of the current endeavor, according to Deacon (2012). There have been many discoveries about cognitive development and what linguistic skills children need to become successful readers. Phonological awareness has existed for many years, but connecting research to colleges and schools has been slow. In the mid to late 1900s, phonological awareness was popular. Despite that, many educators still need to be taught about phonological awareness in college (Kilpatrick, 2013).

Letter-name fluency (LNF), in which students say the names of alphabet letters, has also proven effective. However, differences emerge when one compares letter-name knowledge to identify a student's LNF and letter-sound knowledge to identify a student's LSF. The most notable difference between the two is that letter-sound knowledge requires a deeper understanding of the alphabetic principle. The alphabetic principle comprises two parts: alphabetic understanding, or the knowledge that words are made up of letters that represent different sounds, and phonological recording, or the relation between those letters and the sounds to pronounce and spell words (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [NICHD], 2000, p 107). Therefore, LNF provides a more surface-level understanding of a student's knowledge. At the same time, LSF is more comprehensive because LSF tasks require students to have a deeper phonological awareness than LNF tasks. The letter-sound fluency is intriguing for study because LSF can predict future reading fluency and skill (Cooper et al., 2012).

LSF has also been found to be essential for the skill of decoding. Decoding text is another phonological awareness task that is critical to reading fluency. In decoding, students must be able to manipulate and identify sounds in spoken language. Not only has letter-sound instruction been identified as a critical skill related to phonemic awareness (Peterson et al., 2014).

ELL students often need extra reading support and intervention for reading in the primary grades. Therefore, the small group format also works well for instructing ELL students. Many ELL students struggle with letter-sound identification and general reading fluency tasks because they are used to sounds and letters from their native language (Cooper et al., 2012). Even though it is widely accepted that ELL students often need additional literacy support, little research on early literacy interventions with ELL students is available (Peterson et al., 2014). However, (Peterson et al., 2014) found in a study that a method of incremental rehearsal (IR) was an effective intervention for ELL reading fluency.

Another strategy of targeting reading instruction well suited for the small group format is phonics-based, systematic, and explicit. The strategy is called Structured Literacy and was devised by Orton and Gillingham. Structured Literacy instruction uses multi-sensory elements to help learners retain the concepts that eluded them (Cameron, S. 2016). Structured Literacy and multi-sensory activities can fit into the general education classroom as an intervention for struggling students falling behind in reading. Teachers in each tier can use the same curriculum to scaffold learning and intensify instruction as necessary, using more repetition, smaller group sizes, or longer instructional times, thanks to a unified Structured Literacy approach within a school's Response-to-Intervention (RTI) framework (Hamman, 2018).

Multi-sensory activities like the ones used in structured literacy approaches are intriguing in working with struggling readers. Struggling students need extra repetition with skills such as letter sounds to gain phonemic awareness (Bursuck, 2015). Students with special needs are often struggling readers. Students with special needs, much like ELL students, are at risk of falling behind in reading fluency and often need intervention in the early grades. Multi-sensory interventions and activities benefit students with special needs and are well-documented (Sayed Obaid, 2013).

In a first-grade classroom, simple drill and recall activities need to be more stimulating to hold students' attention for an extended period and, thus, are less likely to impact learning. Other tasks could be more challenging for first-grade students, such as sounding out letters as one reads text (Evans et al., 2020). Multi-sensory LSF activities, however, can hold first-grade students' attention and make practice meaningful. Many students in the first-grade age group struggle with sitting still, while others are developing fine motor skills related to writing, such as holding their pencils and controlling their hands. Providing multi-sensory activities might help ease some of these struggles for students. Children have been shown to have the most development in fine motor skills before they enter the first grade, and the development of these skills has been shown to grow through activities and experiences (Ratcliffe et al., 2013).

A study conducted in which literacy was taught in a multi-sensory format to first-grade students showed that due to the multi-sensory activities, students were better able to segment and decode nonsense words.

Multi-sensory intervention is all about repetition and practice. It has been found that for a student who is meeting standards in literacy and is not struggling with reading, it takes them exposure to master a concept, but for a struggling student, it may take a lot more exposure. Multi-sensory activities allow students to make gains in literacy by increasing their skills through repetition and practice in enjoyable and engaging ways (Hamman, 2018).

Have proven a direct correlation between a student's cognitive development of phonemic awareness and their ability to read fluently. A fluent reader can read words with automaticity, accuracy, expression, phrasing, and passing. When students can easily identify and read a word and read more fluently, they can direct their attention to higher-level thinking skill sets such as comprehension (Kim et al., 2015).

Mastering the decoding process is a large task that good readers have accomplished, giving them the knowledge to decode text accurately to be efficient readers. These correlations provide evidence that a student with a strong phonemic awareness background will be more successful in their oral reading fluency (Park et al., 2015).

Scholars and educators have long acknowledged the issue of letter-sound misunderstanding. A successful answer has yet to be identified, despite many research studies on this problem. However, researchers approach the issue from many perspectives, providing enough information to analyze the current feature (Deacon et al., 2015).

It analyzes the confusion brought on by letter names and how it affects reading literacy. The authors of both research stress how important it is for early learners to be sensitive to letter-sound patterns as reading progress. They stated that the most important thing for instructors to remember is to teach the letter names and the sounds associated with each letter with similar amounts of time and attention (Block et al., 2015).

Scholars point out that understanding these fluencies can improve instructional judgments. There are independent effects of both LNF and LSF on text reading skills as evidenced by the beginning status of LNF and LSF and progress in them being uniquely predictive of children's reading fluency. Both a direct dependence and an indirect relationship between these indicators are obvious. The authors conclude that kindergarten students are routinely tested on their letter and sound fluency, a key indicator of developing subsequent reading skills. The importance of these evaluations for improving reading skills is emphasized by academics (Clemens et al., 2017).

The best approaches to help dyslexic students read more fluently are being researched. Although the study is focused on children with dyslexia, some of their approaches can be applied to a regular class where students struggle to distinguish between letters and sounds (Gonzalez et al., 2015). Researchers have applied the method of training letter-speech sound integration and found that this approach results in an increased reading speed rate and decreased spelling mistakes (Schneebeli et al., 2018).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Locale and Duration

This study was conducted at Cateel Central Elementary School at Castro Avenue, Poblacion Cateel, Davao Oriental. The Grade 1 classrooms are in Building 8, in front of Building 7 and at the right of Building 6. The researchers implemented the intervention for 30 minutes a day within 14 days.



Figure 1. Research Locale Map of Cateel Central Elementary School

3.2 Research Design

The research design used was a true experimental design. This type of research design is motivated by a desire to expand knowledge and aspires to acquire knowledge with no other motive but to learn (Famunyan, 2020). It is an effective research design to determine the cause-effect relationship between different variables.

3.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were the Grade 1 Pupils, particularly section 2 in Cateel Central Elementary School. The respondents are those students who can identify the alphabet completely but cannot sound more than 20 letters of the English alphabet. They were the experimental group, comprising 27 pupils; their ages ranged from 6-7 years old. This grade level was chosen because this level was observed to be prominent with the problem observed by the researchers in terms of recognizing the sound of the letters.

3.4 Research Instruments

This study was solely based on the researcher-made Letter Sound Checklist comprising 26 items. The Orton-Gillingam Approach instruction was used to capture the fullest range of its effect in the letter sound recognition of the pupils.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter emphasizes the results of the study's pre-test and post-test based on the study's statement of the problem.

4.1 Level of Pre-test Scores of Letter Sound Recognition

The Pre-test was conducted for Grade 1, section Punctuality of Cateel Central Elementary School, the study's respondents to determine the number of scores of letter-sound recognition through a frequency count. Table 1 presents the result of the Pre-test score of sound-letter recognition.

Table 2. Pre-test performance of respondents

| Score Interval | Frequency | Percent | Standard Deviation | Mean | Grade Percentage | Interpretation |
|----------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|-------|------------------|----------------|
| 8 and below | 2 | 7.41 | 4.25 | 12.96 | 74.92 | Did Not Meet |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|----|-------|--|--|--|--------------|
| 9 to 14 | 13 | 48.15 | | | | Expectations |
| 15 to 20 | 12 | 44.44 | | | | |
| 21 to 26 | 0 | 0.00 | | | | |
| Total | 27 | 100 | | | | |

Table 2 presents the pre-test performance of participants in terms of letter-sound recognition of Grade 1 Pupils in Cateel Central Elementary School. These scores were collected before implementing the Orton Gillingham Approach as the intervention and served as a baseline measurement of the respondent's letter sound recognition. The table provides the standard deviation, mean, and grade percentage. The test results show that among 27 respondents, 2 pupils got 8 and below scores, 13 got 9 to 14 scores, 12 got 15 to 20, and none got 21 to 26. The group, comprising 27 respondents, achieved a grade percentage of 74.92, also within the needs improvement range.

The result revealed that the students have difficulty recognizing letter sounds. Moreover, two recent studies conducted with Hebrew-speaking students have provided some experimental evidence supporting the letter name facilitation effect showed an advantage in pseudo letter learning when associated names and sounds were taught. (Thomas, et.,2022) demonstrated that children taught letter names attempt to use this knowledge in extrapolating letter sounds. If certain letter combinations were more likely to be learned, and if phonological development in children affected this learning. Only letters whose names give clues to their sounds should exhibit the letter name-to-sound effect. (Sanders, et al., 2019).

4.2 Level of Post-Test Scores of Letter Sound Recognition

Table 3 displays the results of the post-test performance for letter-sound recognition of grade 1 Pupils in Cateel Central Elementary School after the intervention. These scores demonstrate a significant improvement compared to their pre-test scores, indicating the positive impact of the intervention in letter sound recognition. As seen in the results, it pertains to the outstanding level of proficiency after the intervention.

Table 3. Post-Test Performance Test

| Score Interval | Frequency | Percent | Standard Deviation | Mean | Grade Percentage | Interpretation |
|----------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|-------|------------------|----------------|
| 8 and below | 0 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 25.04 | 98.15 | Outstanding |
| 9 to 14 | 0 | 0.00 | | | | |
| 15 to 20 | 0 | 0.00 | | | | |

The standard deviation is 1.01, and the mean is 25.04, achieving a grade percentage of 98.15 within the outstanding level of sound-letter recognition, implying that the intervention, the Orthon-Gillingham Approach, has contributed much to students' letter sound recognition. The result increased after the intervention was conducted. Educational methods improved students' letter sound recognition (Kalliris et al., 2019). Students can strengthen their long-term memory by connecting verbal and visual signals to the sound of the letters through the Orton Gillingham Approach's physical engagement (Jaramillo, 2020). Teaching the sound of the letters includes feeling and seeing the position of the mouth, lips, and tongue while producing each sound. (Ernst, 2022).

Moreover, this characteristic helps the student achieve a high literacy level. Subsequently, lots of research has been done to address teaching the students phonemic awareness skills learned through mastering sound-letter correspondence (Kuo, 2023). The national reading panel found that by manipulating sounds and realizing the relationship between letters and their sounds, they can blend these sounds later to read word skills of letter-sound correspondence like the Direct instruction method (Lund, 2020). Learning letter sound must be supplemented with materials relevant to their expertise and assistance from the teacher and student's families.

4.3 Difference between Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Participants

Table 4 displays the comparison of pre-test scores with the post-test scores of the respondents. These results suggest that the intervention, which involved the implementation of the Orton-Gillingham Approach, had an eminent positive impact on the respondent's letter sound recognition abilities. The respondents' performance significantly improved from the pre-test to the post-test, highlighting how effective the intervention was in developing their letter sound recognition abilities.

Table 4. Mean comparison between pre-test scores and post-test scores

| Types of Test | Mean | Standard Deviation | t-value | p-value | Interpretation |
|---------------|-------|--------------------|---------|---------|---|
| Pre-Test | 12.96 | 4.25 | 14.454 | 0.000 | Pre-test and post-test scores differ significantly. |
| Post-Test | 25.04 | 1.01 | | | |

The test results show that the mean comparison of pre-test and post-test scores before and after the implementation of the intervention was 12.96, while after the intervention, it increased to 25.04. The standard deviation of the comparison of pre-test and post-test scores before the intervention was 4.25, and after the intervention, 1.01. The t value is 14.454, indicating that the mean difference between the pre-test and post-test was statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05. The p-value for the two-tailed test was 0.000 less than 0.05, which can be proved to reject the null hypothesis and can be explained by observing the effectiveness of the Orton-Gillingham Approach in teaching the letter sound.

The significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores indicates an eminent positive impact on the respondent's letter sound recognition abilities after the intervention. This improvement can be attributed to several factors, including the effectiveness of the Orton Gillingham Approach in teaching letter sound recognition.

Overall, implementing Orton Gillingham's Approach in teaching letter sound to the respondents proved beneficial in enhancing letter sound recognition skills (Bautista, 2019). This approach engaged multiple senses and created an interactive and realistic learning experience. Visual aids, auditory cues, and kinesthetic movement facilitated better understanding and retention of letter-sound recognition concepts, improving post-test scores (Mendieta, 2023). The engaging and enjoyable nature of the multisensory activities, as the principle of Orton Gillingham's Approach to teaching letter sound, boosted the participants' motivation and participation, contributing to their overall progress (Pérez et al., 2022).

5. CONCLUSION

The researchers can conclude the following based on the data findings throughout the study.

1. The pre-test scores revealed significantly low in terms of letter-sound recognition of the respondents, which means that the students have difficulty recognizing the sound of the letter.
2. The post-test scores revealed a successful improvement in letter recognition, surpassing the expected passing score, and had already developed satisfactory letter sound recognition abilities before the intervention.
3. The pre and post-test scores revealed a significant difference in terms of letter-sound recognition indicating improvement in performance during and after the intervention implementation. It suggests that implementing the Orton Gillingham Approach had a notable positive impact on the respondent's letter sound recognition abilities.

6. REFERENCES

[1].Adams, J. (2020). Measuring the Effects of Jan Richardson’s Next Steps in Guided Reading versus Reading Plus on Third-Grade Students’ Guided Reading Level, Comprehension, and Standards Mastery (Doctoral dissertation, Union University).

- [2]. Adams, M.J., Fillmore, L.W., Goldenberg, C., Oakhill, J., Paige, D.D., Rasinski, T., & Shanahan, T. (2020). Comparing reading research to program design: An examination of Teachers College units of study. *Student Achievement Partners*, 1–64.
- [3]. Aiken, H.H., Bratsch-Hines, M., Amendum, S., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2021). Targeted Reading Instruction: Four Guiding Principles. *The Reading Teacher*, 74(5), 505– 515
- [4]. Alhumsi, M. H. (2020). THE INFLUENCE OF PHONEMIC AWARENESS INSTRUCTION ON EFL EMERGENT READERS' WORD RECOGNITION. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 4(1), 1-14.
- [5]. Antonio, M. B., & Santillan, J. P. (2020). Use of Phono-Graphic Method to Improve the Phonological Awareness Skills of a Student with Reading Difficulty. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(12), 6706-6714.
- [6]. Baker, S., Beattie, T., Nelson, N. & Turtura, J. (2018). How we learn to read: The critical role of phonological awareness. <https://improvingliteracy.org>.
- [7]. Bautista, M. B. (2019, November). Orton-gillingham approach and grade I pupils' reading ability. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1254, No. 1, p. 012016). IOP Publishing.
- [8]. Bdeir, M., Bahaous, R., & Nabhani, M. (2020). Improving readiness in kindergarten children through early phonological awareness interventions. *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, 50(3), 348-360.
- [9]. Boltron, M. T., & Ramos, A. L. (2021). Improving beginning reading literacy through Marungko approach. *ASEAN Journal of Basic and Higher Education*, 5(1), 1-12.
- [10]. Brown, M. (2022). Phonological Awareness in the Elementary Classroom.
- [11]. Buckingham, J. (2020). Systematic phonics instruction belongs in evidence-based reading programs: A response to Bowers. *The Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 37(2), 105-113.
- [12]. Burkins, J., & Yates, K. (2021). *Shifting the balance, 6 ways to bring the science of reading into the balanced literacy classroom*. Stenhouse Publishers.
- [13]. Cameron, S. (2016). *Best Practices for Teaching Children with Dyslexia: A Presentation for Educators*.
- [14]. Cardoso-Martins, C., Mesquita, T. C. L., & Ehri, L. (2011). Letter names and phonological awareness help children to learn letter–sound relations. *Journal of experimental child psychology*, 109(1), 25-38
- [15]. Caron, J. G., O'Brien, M., & Weintraub, R. (2022). Online training to improve service provider implementation of letter–sound correspondence instruction for individuals who use augmentative and alternative communication. *American journal of speech-language pathology*, 31(3), 1114-1132.
- [16]. Chai, H., Elston, A., & Kramer, T. (2020). Focus on literacy needs: Partnering to support balanced literacy instruction. *Reading Improvement*, 57(3), 117-130.
- [17]. Chapman, J. W., Greaney, K. T., Arrow, A. W., & Tunmer, W. E. (2018). Teachers' use of phonics, knowledge of language constructs, and preferred word identification prompts in relation to beginning readers. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 23(1), 87–104.
- [18]. Christ, T., B. Monaghan, M. White, M. Martin, E. Van Norman, A., Pike-Balow, G. Fenske, and G. Clark. *EarlyReading Kindergarten Progress Monitoring Student Material*. N.p.: FastFormative Assessment System, 2013.
- [19]. Cochrane, G., & Brooks, G. (2022). Where should phonics teaching start? 'satpin' and its origins, rivals and implications. *British Educational Research Journal*, 48(6), 1198-1215.
- [20]. Coll, C. G., & Ferrer, K. L. (2021). Zigler's conceptualization of diversity: Implications for the early childhood development workforce. *Development and Psychopathology*, 33(2), 483-492.

- [21]. Daniels, P. T. (1992). The syllabic origin of writing and the segmental origin of the alphabet. *The linguistics of literacy*, 21, 83-110.
- [22]. Development, 26(8), 1187–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2015.1015855>
- [23]. Eghbaria-Ghanamah, H., Ghanamah, R., Shalhoub-Awwad, Y., Adi-Japha, E., & Karni, A. (2020). Recitation and listening to nursery rhymes in the familiarization with a literacy language in kindergarteners: Not kids' stuff. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(12), 2195.
- [24]. Ehri, L. C. (2022). What teachers need to know and do to teach letter–sounds, phonemic awareness, word reading, and phonics. *The Reading Teacher*, 76(1), 53-61.
- [25]. Ernst, T. (2022). The Grapho-Phonemic Approach to Teaching Sight Words and Its Impact on First Grade Reading Fluency.
- [26]. Evans, M. A., & Hulak, L. (2020). Learning to read at home: Kindergarten children's report in relation to observed parent behaviour. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 50, 38-45.
- [27]. Fielding-Barnsley, R. (2010). Australian pre-service teachers' knowledge of phonemic awareness and phonics in the process of learning to read. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 15(1), 99-110
- [28]. Genelza, G., Babiano, S., Hilario, J., Corpus, D., Fernandez, M., & Naig, K. A. (2022). Phonological Awareness and Word Decoding Ability of Second Year BSED-English Students in USEP–Tagum Campus.
- [29]. Government, A. (2019). Phonological awareness. State Government of Victoria Australia.
- [30]. Groth, K. (2020). In What Ways Can Phonemic Awareness Skills be Targeted Strategically in Early Childhood Classrooms to Support Healthy Developmental Growth?
- [31]. Guilford Press. Park, Y., Chaparro, E. A., Preciado, J., & Cummings, K. D. (2015). Is earlier better? Mastery of reading fluency in early schooling. *Early Education*
- [32]. Hapke, H., Howard, C., & Lane, H. (2019). *Natural Language Processing in Action: Understanding, analyzing, and generating text with Python*. Simon and Schuster.
- [33]. Harrison, Michelle, "Increasing Phonemic Awareness in Kindergarten Students: Using iPads in Language Arts Centers" (2015). Graduate Master's Theses, Capstones, and Culminating Projects. 163.
- [34]. Hodgins, H., & Harrison, G. L. (2021). Improving phonological awareness with Talking Tables in at-risk kindergarten readers. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 115, 103996.
- [35]. Jaramillo, A. L. P. (2020). *Fostering Learning Strategies for ELLs with Special Learning Needs Related to Dyslexia*. Greensboro College.
- [36]. Karipidis, I. I., Pleisch, G., Brandeis, D., Roth, A., Röthlisberger, M., Schneebeli, M., ... & Brem, S. (2018). Simulating reading acquisition: The link between reading outcome and multimodal brain signatures of letter–speech sound learning in prereaders. *Scientific reports*, 8(1), 7121.
- [37]. Khan, M., & Khan, R. (2021). Phonological Awareness and Phonics Instruction: Inclusive practice that benefits all kinds of learners. *Asia Pac. J. Dev. Differ*, 8, 173-185.
- [38]. Kilag, O. K. T., Macapobre, K. A., Balicoco, J. R. M., Alfar, J. D., Peras, C. C., & Tapayan, A. A. S. (2023). Emergent literacy: A reading support program for preschoolers' successful phonological awareness in the home context. *Science and Education*, 4(2), 896-906.
- [39]. Kilpatrick, D. (2016). *Equipped for reading success*. Casey and Kirsch Publishers.
- [40]. Kilpatrick, D. (2020). How the phonology of speech is foundational for instant word recognition. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*,
- [41]. Kilpatrick, D. A. (2013). *Equipped for reading success: A comprehensive, step-by-step program for developing phoneme awareness and fluent word recognition*. Casey & Kirsch Publishers.

- [42]. Kim, Y.-S. G., & Wagner, R. K. (2015). Text (oral) reading fluency as a construct in reading development: An investigation of its mediating role for children from grades 1 to 4. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 19(3), 224–242.
- [43]. Konza, D. (2014). Teaching reading: Why the " Fab five" should be the " Big six". *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 39(12), 153-169
- [44]. Kuo, N. C. (2023). INSTRUCTING STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA THROUGH STRUCTURED LITERACY. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science*, 3(1), 110-124.
- [45]. Lane, H. (2020). How children learn to read words: Ehri's Phases
- [46]. Lee, Y. W. (2015). Diagnosing diagnostic language assessment. *Language Testing*, 32(3), 299-316.
- [47]. Long, S., Volpe, R. J., & Briesch, A. M. (2023). Evaluation of a computer-assisted letter sound tutoring program: An application to preschool English language learners.
- [48]. Lorimor-Easley, N. (2019). An explanation of structured literacy, and a comparison to balanced literacy. Iowa Reading Research Center.
- [49]. Lund, E. (2020). The relation between vocabulary knowledge and phonological awareness in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(7), 2386-2402.
- [50]. Melesse, S., & Enyew, C. (2020). Effects of reading strategies on grade one children's phonemic awareness performance. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 14(3), 385–392.
- [51]. Mendieta Bravo, K. J. (2023). The Orton-Gillingham Approach to improve students' reading skill in the English language (Bachelor's thesis, Quito: UCE).
- [52]. Minnesota Center for Reading Research. (2016). PRESS Intervention Manual. Regents 2of the University of Minnesota. Running Head: Small Group Phonemic Awareness Instruction and Oral Reading Fluency 37 Mills, G. E. (2018). Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher. Pearson.
- [53]. Moats, L., & Tolman, C. (2019). Letrs (3rd ed.). Voyager Sopris Learning.
- [54]. Moody, M. A. (2022). Examining the Relationships Between the Motoric, Phonological Awareness, Rapid Naming, and Speech Sound Abilities of Children (Doctoral dissertation, Valdosta State University).
- [55]. Nicolaou, C., Matsuola, M., & Kalliris, G. (2019). Technology-enhanced learning and teaching methodologies through audiovisual media. *Education Sciences*, 9(3), 196.
- [56]. Nikolopoulou, K., Akriotou, D., & Gialamas, V. (2019). Early reading skills in english as a foreign language via ict in greece: early childhood student teachers' perceptions. *Early childhood education journal*, 47, 597-606
- [57]. O'Brien, B. A., Seward, R., & Zhang, D. (2022). Multisensory Interactive Digital Text for English Phonics Instruction with Bilingual Beginning Readers. *Education Sciences*, 12(11), 750.
- [58]. O'Connor, R. E. (2014). Teaching word recognition: effective strategies for students with learning difficulties.
- [59]. Pashayeva, P. (2023, March). STUDIES ON TEACHING PHONETICS IN PRIMARY GRADES.
- [60]. Patel, P. , Torppa, M. , Aro, M. , Richardson, U. , & Lyytinen, H. (2022). Assessing the Effectiveness of a game-based phonics intervention for first and second grade English language learners in India:
- [61]. Pérez Quichimbo, S. M., Barrera Quimbita, E. D., Navas Moya, M. P., & López Chico, X. (2022). Eudufarmy: A Multisensory Educational Software System that Improves the Learning of Children with Dyslexia Using the Orton-Gillingham Approach. In *Innovation and Research-A Driving Force for Socio-Econo-Technological Development: Proceedings of the CI3 2021* (pp. 450-463). Cham: Springer International Publishing
- [62]. Ray, K., Dally, K., Colyvas, K., & Lane, A. E. (2021). The effects of a whole-class kindergarten handwriting intervention on early reading skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56, S193-S207.

- [63]. Sarudin, N. A. A., Hashim, H., & Yunus, M. M. (2019). Multi-sensory approach: How it helps in improving words recognition?. *Creative Education*, 10(12), 3186
- [64]. Sayeski, K. L., Earle, G. A., Davis, R., & Calamari, J. (2019). Orton Gillingham: Who, what, and how. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 51(3), 240-249.
- [65]. Tomas, M. J. L., Villaros, E. T., & Galman, S. M. A. (2021). The perceived challenges in reading of learners: Basis for school reading programs. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(5), 107-122.
- [66]. Tunmer, W. E., & Hoover, W. A. (2019). The cognitive foundations of learning to read: A framework for preventing and remediating reading difficulties. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 24(1), 75-93
- [67]. Vousden, J. I., Cunningham, A. J., Johnson, H., Waldron, S., Ammi, S., Pillinger, C., ... & Wood, C. (2022). Decoding and comprehension skills mediate the link between a small-group reading programme and English national literacy assessments. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 105-130.
- [68]. Wilsenach, C. (2019). Phonological awareness and reading in Northern Sotho—Understanding the contribution of phonemes and syllables in Grade 3 reading attainment. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*.

