

THE USE OF A READING LABORATORY APPROACH AS SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAM AND FRUSTRATION READERS' READING PERFORMANCE

Toribio G. Cruz Jr.

Ateneo De Manila University, Loyola Schools

IJASR 2021
VOLUME 4
ISSUE 4 JULY – AUGUST

ISSN: 2581-7876

Abstract: This study used laboratory approach as supplementary reading program to selected Grade 7 frustration readers. Using the SRA Reading Laboratory Kit II-a, the selected students attended reading session for 30 days. These selected students were given a pre-test and a post-test on phonics and decoding, vocabulary and reading comprehension. A t-test was used on the results to see significant differences on the reading performances before and after the use of the laboratory approach. This study found that using this approach as supplementary reading program influenced reading performances of students specifically on phonics and decoding, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Laboratory approach can therefore be used as a supplementary reading program and thus be used for grade 7 frustration readers.

Keywords: Reading laboratory, reading comprehension, supplementary reading materials

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading is the cornerstone of an effective education. Without this skill, there will be limited important life activities. There is no way to understand prints in a newspaper, read directions of a new recipe, enjoy a favorite novel, or read a prescription bottle of medication and many others. Lack of reading places individuals at a serious disadvantage in the society (Biancarosa& Snow, 2004).

Reading is one of the communication skills besides speaking, listening and writing. It is the way to understand written messages. *Reading* is the result of the interaction between the writer's mind and the reader's mind. In this process, the reader tries to get the message or the intended meaning from the writer. The reader tries to create and to understand the intended meanings, and then the writer's meaning makes sense. Reading, a complex mental operation where it forms with other language skills, is considered one of the most prominent and important language system (Albdour, 2015, p. 61).

According to Pang (2003), *reading* is understanding written texts. It consists of two related processes: *word recognition* and *comprehension*. *Word recognition* is defined as the process of getting how written symbols correspond to one's spoken language while *comprehension* is the process of making the meaning of words, sentences and connected text. Background knowledge, vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, experience with text and other strategies can help understand written texts (Pang, 2003 p.6). Reading includes instantaneous recognition of various written symbol with existing knowledge (Anderson, 1994).

Reading comprehension has essential components that contribute to effective reading instruction. The National Reading Panel Report (2000) summarized several decades of scientific research that clearly shows effective reading instruction addresses five critical areas which include *phonemic awareness*, *phonics*, *fluency*, *vocabulary*, and *comprehension*. *Phonemic awareness* is commonly defined as the understanding that spoken words are made up of separate units of sound that are blended together when words are pronounced. Another component is *decoding* which is used to describe how the reader translates "graphemes into phonemes and then blends the phonemes to form words with recognizable meanings" (Wren, 2000, p 15). *Phonics* is defined as a set of rules that specify the relationship between letters in the spelling of words and the sounds of spoken language (Wren, 2000, p 15). *Fluency*, on the other hand, is recognizing the words in a text rapidly and accurately and using phrasing and emphasis in a way that makes what is read sound like spoken language (Wren, 2000, p 16). *Vocabulary* refers to words one needs to know to communicate with others (Wren, 2000, p 17). Lastly, *comprehension* involves constructing meaning that is reasonable and accurate by connecting what has been read to what the reader already knows and thinking about all of this information until it is understood. It is the final goal of reading instruction (Wren, 2000, p 17).

The Department of Education (DepEd), as the primary institution in-charge of the education sector, has implemented initiatives toward reading development. It has launched the “Every Child A Reader Program,” which mandates all schools, school divisions, and regions to develop interventions addressing reading in schools based on the Phil-IRI or the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Cristobal, 2015).

The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) is an informal reading inventory composed of graded passages designed to determine the individual student's performance in oral reading, silent reading and listening comprehension. These three types of assessments identify independent, instructional and frustration readers. The data from this instrument may be used to design or adjust classroom, small group or individualized instruction to fit the students' needs and abilities (Alcazar, Diaz, Nava, Ongtengco, Pado, & Salvador, 2018).

The Phil-IRI does not provide a comprehensive assessment of student reading performance. Results are only approximation of the students' abilities and could be used in combination with other reliable tools of assessment. The data also serve as one of the bases in planning, designing/redesigning the reading programs or activities in the school to improve the overall school reading performance abilities (Alcazar, et al., 2018).

It can be said that developing reading is a challenging but important skill for students. It can also be said that the reading program implemented in school is an important initiative that support reading development. The participant school has its reading program as mandated by the DepEd commitment to promote reading development. The reading program of the participant school “Word Bucket Challenge” aims to develop Grade 7 students' vocabulary. The program focuses on the least mastered skills which include synonyms, antonyms, idiomatic expression and context clues. Meaningful activities and strategies on vocabulary development are provided to students to increase storage of words and utilize in daily interaction with peers, parents and teacher (MNHS Reading Program Proposal, 2017).

There are numerous approaches in developing reading skills. Reading laboratory is hinged on the idea that a person only becomes a proficient reader through reading. Exposure to wide variety of reading materials develops not only content schemata but also schemata for different types of text structure, and an ever more sophisticated vocabulary. This means that the more a person reads the better reader he becomes. The reading laboratory is described as a room containing a large variety of printed materials to suit a variety of remedial and developmental reading needs. Most reading researchers agree that before working on speed of reading, a student must develop good comprehension (Stoller, 1994). The reading laboratory is intended to develop students' reading and study skills, i.e., to prepare students for reading, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating texts, as well as to teach them learning strategies needed in college courses (Tagbieler, 1990).

The Regional Office of the Department of Education awarded the SRA Reading Laboratory Kit IIa, IIb and IIc to the participating school when they won a regional contest in speech choir in 2015. Utilizing the instructional materials given by the DepEd, the researcher took advantage of the reading kit and investigated how the reading materials can supplement to the needs of the identified frustration readers of the participant school. Thus, it is with this background that the researcher focuses on the reading performance of Grade 7 students and how the Reading Laboratory Approach supplements in the students' reading and comprehension needs.

Conceptual Framework

The frameworks used in this study include the Reading Laboratory approach, the SRA Reading Laboratory Program, and the typology of readers based on the Phil-IRI.

Educators are continuously searching for more effective means of teaching students to read. Much is known about the nature of learning and the necessity of providing for individual differences. Before teachers can design and provide appropriate reading instruction for students, information about students' current reading levels and abilities should be available. This must describe how children read, and embraces inclusionary principles that emphasize the need for education that is learner-oriented, responsive and culturally sensitive. In response to the need to gather pertinent information about the reader, the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) was created to provide classroom teachers a tool for measuring and describing reading performance. It is an assessment tool composed of graded passages designed to determine a student's reading level. The development of the Phil-IRI is one of the initiatives put in place in support of the “Every Child A Reader Program” (Alcazar, et al., 2018).

The Phil-IRI provides information about the student's reading level, which is useful in helping teachers identify materials that are suitable to the reader's level. It is important to know the kind of text the child is already able to read as this may be a good starting point for instruction

Based on the Phil-IRI, readers may be classified into three types – *independent reader*, *instructional reader* and *frustration reader*. An *independent reader* can read on his/her own without any assistance. The pupil is free from tension and can read with rhythm and with conversational tone and interprets punctuation correctly. The pupil scores 97 -100% in word recognition and 80% -100% in comprehension (Alcazar, et al., 2018).

An *instructional reader* can read with the support of a teacher. This is the level where students make the most progress in reading. The pupil's oral reading is rhythmical with conversational tone and correct interpretation. The pupil scores 90 to 96% in word reading and 59 to 79% in comprehension. It is the level at which the pupil can profit from instruction (Alcazar, et al., 2018).

A student identified as *frustration reader* means that the child is not able to read and understand on his own. At the frustration level, a pupil shows withdrawal from reading situations by crying or refusing to read. The pupil commits error in reading such as reversal, repetition, substitution, insertion, mispronunciation and inability to interpret punctuation. The pupil scores 89% & below in word recognition or 58% & below in comprehension (Alcazar, et al., 2018).

Reading Laboratory Approach

There is a variety of theoretical approaches to comprehension as well as to how to teach or promote the skills involved in reading. The Don H. Parker's SRA Reading Laboratory (2010) is underpinned by *individualized instruction* (Parker, 2010). Stoller (1994) elaborated the significance of Parker's Reading Laboratory to Stoller's Reading Laboratory approach.

Individualized instruction refers to differentiation of instruction according to individual differences in learners. These differences have full impact on instructional methods and procedures in teaching reading (Murdock, 1966). No consideration of the development of reading competence is complete without the careful attention to the matter of specific reading skills without formal instruction while other children require specific instruction (Murdock, 1966).

In the individualized reading instruction, the following general concepts were used as guides: (1) learning to read is an individualized accomplishment; (2) skill development in reading is a continuous and cumulative process; (3) selection of materials and methods of instruction are influenced by each child's personality, interest, ways of learning and needs for reading guidance; (4) guidance is provided to help each child choose reading material to meet his needs and widen his experiences within his individual reading skill level; and (5) audience reading and oral reading activities are important in the individualized reading program (Murdock, 1966).

Anchored in the individualized reading instruction is Don H. Parker's laboratory program (Parker, 2010). Conceived in 1973, it depicted a distinction between the skill-training and skill-using aspects of schooling and specified the lack of individualized training in skills as a major limiting factor for student (Parker, 2010). It identified the need to accommodate all levels of learning at the same time (Brennan & Robinson 1998, 2). Parker (2010) defined *learning* as a multilevel process. With laboratory program system, it acknowledged that student may start where he or she is, experience success with effort, and move ahead as fast and as far as one's learning rate and capacity will allow (Parker, 2010).

The Reading Laboratory system eliminates lock-step education and provides schooling for individual excellence. It is a complete system that offers individual reading instruction to all students. The student who reads "below grade level" finds material which he or she can read right away. This cuts down the frustration of overchallenge. At the same time, the more advanced child can find the material suited to his or her abilities (Parker, 2010). This eliminates much of the boredom that comes with underchallenge. Students' progress according to their own abilities and at whatever pace is appropriate for each individual (Parker, 2010).

Stoller (1994) characterized Reading Lab model as an effective way to focus on reading which address reading directly and explicitly, permitting students to practice reading as well as receive instruction in strategies which will help them become more successful reader. The reading lab provides instructors with an open forum to promote the importance of reading as one of the keys to academic success (Stoller, 1994). In the lab setting, instructors guide

students through a variety of reading activities that help students develop the habits of more skilled readers who are capable of regulating strategies to best meet their own purposes for reading (Stoller 1994, p. 34). On-going opportunities for individualized reading, in particular, allow students to concentrate on reading strategies with which they are having difficulties. As a result of lab activities, students develop a positive attitude towards reading; at the same time needed to develop academic reading abilities (Stoller, 1994).

As Stoller (1994) discussed, the Lab allows instructors to transition students from learning to read framework to reading to learn orientation. As an integral part of the lab, the focused approach permits students to monitor their reading progress easily, which in turn, enhances concentration and build student's confidence. Stoller (1994) identified four major reading activities in the laboratory approach; *sustained silent reading*, *teacher-guided reading instruction*, *systematic individualized reading* and *out-of-class pleasure reading*.

Sustained Silent Reading. Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) component provides students and instructor with an opportunity to read whatever they would like without interruption (Stoller, 1994, p. 35). During this time, which can range from 10 to 20 minutes, there is no reading instruction, no instruction intervention or evaluation, only reading for pleasure (Stoller, 1994, p. 36). Students can read or skim reading materials, a school or local newspaper, magazines, or any other material that they bring with them to class (Stoller 1994, 36). There are many benefits in the use of SSR including student autonomy, improved identification and interpretation skills, vocabulary gains, as well as improved spelling and an enjoyment of reading (Stoller 1994, 36).

Teacher-Guided Reading Instruction. With diverse reading proficiencies and varied attitudes toward reading, the teacher guided reading instruction can benefit the class in word recognition, rate development and contextualized strategy training (Stoller, 2014). Based on various reading research, rapid and accurate word/phrase recognition skill is important in determining strong readers to the weak ones. Word/phrase recognition process deficiencies can be part of comprehension deficiencies based on researches (Stoller, 2014).

Word/phrase recognition exercises are intended to help students develop the ability to react rapidly and accurately to the appearance of English words and phrases. From these exercise, students develop a sense of visual image of key words and phrases. These exercises, which in actuality take up very little instructional time, should not be viewed as opportunities for vocabulary development; they are simply exercises that help students develop speed and perceptual accuracy in distinguishing among words that look alike (Stoller, 1994, p.37). Students can keep track of their progress by timing themselves and then recording both their times and number of correct answers at the end of each exercise (Stoller, 1994, p.37).

One of the major obstacles that L2 readers face is related to reading rate. Stoller (1994) stated that a slow reading pace not only affects how much students can read in a given period of time, but it also adversely affects comprehension. Instructors can help students improve their reading speed by integrating timed and paced reading practice into the reading lab. With timed reading, students read as quickly as they can, attempting to improve both their speed and comprehension over time. With paced readings, a reading pace is established by the instructors (e.g. 200 words per minute) and students are obliged to read at the imposed rate (Stoller, 1994, p.37). In this way, students get a sense of what reasonable rate "feels like" and then have a more realistic goal for timed- reading practice. Timed and paced reading exercises are most effective when students keep record of their progress in comprehension and speed (Stoller 1994, p.37).

Contextualized Strategy Training. It is said that readers learn to read by reading (Stoller, 1994, p. 35). However, explicit reading that focuses on strategy training can also benefit student. With this, the instructor can build deliberate and purposeful strategies to construct meaning, remove blockage, and read critically (Stoller, 1994). Although one purpose of Reading Lab is to promote student independent application of strategies, students can only self-regulate strategies use after being exposed to different strategies, with regular practice and modeling and learning which strategies will serve its own purpose (Stoller, 2004, p. 35). In the contextualized strategy training, there are four keys to use to make it successful (Stoller, 1994). These include the reading passages that will stimulate student's interest, introduce metacognitive strategies, use pre-, during and post-reading framework, and strategies associated to critical thinking (Stoller, 2004, p. 35).

Systematic Individualized Reading. Fifty percent of every Reading lab session is allotted to individualized reading where student can systematically work with reading materials and corresponding activities that fits their proficiency level and reading needs (Stoller, 2004). Also, students can solicit assistance to areas of greatest need and

provide instructors with input to guide students toward reading performance. The Reading Lab Kits, which include multi-level reading materials, are effective for individualized reading enabling students to move ahead as fast and as far as his/her reading rate and capacity will allow (Stoller, 1994). Self-instruction materials give students opportunities to choose reading strategies and evaluate their choices as they progress (Stoller, 2004).

Out-of-Class Pleasure Reading. Reading Lab provides easy access to pleasure reading materials and encourages students to read outside of class. When interesting materials are made available, students are more likely to check them out and read them on their own (Stoller, 1994, p.44). The additional reading that results from this voluntary reading will have the effect of improving students' reading skills, their confidence, and self-identification as reader (Stoller, 1994).

Science Research Associates, Inc. Reading Laboratory Program (SRA)

SRA Reading lab is an example that uses the reading lab approach. It recognizes the student's differences in the rate and how much they learn (Parker, 2010, 6). This attempts to accommodate the differences in level of leaning inside a typical classroom at the same time (Parker, 2010, 6).

The SRA Reading Laboratory program meets the need of slow, average and superior learners by providing multilevel learning materials in one classroom package. It is a complete system of individualized reading instruction to student's different levels of learning. No additional materials or teaching assistance are needed to operate it. Students can manage their own learning provided with initial training (Parker, 2010). Students will work independently by grading their own work and keeping accurate account of their own progress (Parker, 2010).

SRA Reading Laboratory Program provides each student the opportunity to increase, through independent work, his or her learning power that applies to all areas of learning. It is designed to develop analytical, sequential, comparative, relational, referential skills as well as the integrative skills vital to creative thinking (Parker 2010). The development of these skills produces maximum reading power (Parker, 2010).

The SRA learning materials aims to (1) develop comprehension, vocabulary, word analysis and study skills, (2) provide reinforcement of specific skills in which student may show weakness, (3) improve reading rate, (4) give practice in discriminating listening, (5) provide practice in independent work, and (6) encourage a sense of personal responsibilities for one's own progress. (Parker, 2010, p. 3). The basic unit in the SRA Reading Laboratory program is the Power builder. The four-page folder contains a high interest reading selection as well as exercise material to develop comprehension, work attack and language skills. The 150 power builder folders in the box are arranged in levels in increasing difficulty identified for the students by colors – Brown level, Lime level, Blue level, and so on (Parker, 2010, p.3).

The exercise material in each Power builder falls into three main division: (1) "How Well Did You Read?" tests comprehension abilities of the reading selection like identifying the main ideas, making inferences, understanding cause and effect, predicting outcomes, drawing conclusion, sequence, identifying literary elements, recognizing problems and solutions, comparing and contrasting (Parker, 2010). (2) "Learn About Words" section deals with story vocabulary, a practice in essential word analysis and related language skills and includes types such as giving reasons, real or make-believe, predictions, story map, classification, character feelings, fact or opinion, story structure (Parker, 2010). (3) "Use Your Imagination" is a non- scorable section designed to stimulate the child's creativity and encourage students to think and imagine beyond the limits of his imagination (Parker, 2010).

SRA lab program lets students choose freely from the color-coded reading materials which they are assigned in. This promotes self-selection aligned with Stoller's concept of self-selected materials. This makes choices unlimited and not "required" through having variety of options available that can help students particularly those who are not habitual readers or who do not live in an environment with a lot of reading materials at their disposal (Stoller, 1994, p. 37)

Stoller's four component of reading lab (1994) includes teacher-guided reading instruction, specifically, the rate development. This is also showcased in the SRA reading lab Rate Builders which helps students read faster and with comprehension. In Stoller's proposition, slow reader pace not only affect how much students learn over a given period of time, but also adversely affects comprehension. With timed readings, students read as quickly as they can, attempting to improve both speed and comprehension over time (Stoller, 1994, p. 37).

Aligned with Parker’s (2010) reading laboratory which recognizes that learning is a multilevel process and deviate from the lock-up education, Stoller’s systematic individualized reading, 50% of the Reading lab session is devoted to individualized reading. In this way, students can work systematically with reading materials and corresponding activities that complement their own proficiency level and reading needs (Stoller, 1994, p. 41).

This study aimed to examine the use of the SRA Reading Laboratory in developing frustration readers’ skills in phonics and decoding, vocabulary and reading comprehension. Table 1 shows specific components of the SRA Reading Laboratory program that develop phonics and decoding, vocabulary and reading comprehension.

Table 1. SRA Components and the target Reading Skills to be Developed

Reading Skills	SRA Reading Laboratory Program		
	Power Builder	Skill Builder	Rate Builder
Phonics and Decoding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> beginning consonants blends short and long sounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> beginning consonants blends short and long sounds 	
Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> word meaning from context using word in new context compound words words classification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> word meaning from context using word in new context compound words words classification 	
Reading Comprehension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cause and effect sequence problem/solution comparison and contrast getting main idea Character Setting mood understanding purpose/conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cause and effect sequence problem/solution comparison and contrast getting main idea Character Setting Mood understanding purpose/conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cause and effect sequence problem/solution comparison and contrast getting main idea Character Setting Mood understanding purpose/conclusion.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a case study design. According to Heale and Twycross (2017) *case study* is an intensive study about a person, a group of people or a unit, which is aimed to generalize over several units. It is an intensive, systematic investigation of a single individual, group, community or some other unit in which examines in-depth data related variables (Heale& Twycross, 2017). This study examined the influence of SRA reading laboratory program on the phonics and decoding skills, vocabulary and reading comprehension of Grade 7 students who are considered frustration reader based on the PHIL-IRI test given by the DepEd.

The research was conducted in one public high school in the Division of Malabon located at Malabon City. It is the biggest public high school in the city that caters to several surrounding barangays. It aims to provide quality education to students ready to continue education at the tertiary level. The school offers well-balanced curricula including the Enhanced Basic Education, Special Program in Science, Mathematics and Engineering, Special Program in the Arts, Special Program in the Foreign Language, and Senior High School. Anchored in the DepEd Vision and Mission, it aims to develop holistic individual whose values and competencies enable them to realize their full potential ready to serve the nation (School Improvement Plan, 2016, p.2).

To gather data for the study, the researcher used three instruments for pre-test and post-test: (1) Really Great Reading Diagnostic Decoding Surveys was used to measure phonics and decoding; (2) Critchlow Verbal Language

Scales was used to measure vocabulary; and (3) Leveled of Passage: Grade K-8 was used to measure reading comprehension. The study also used the SRA Reading Laboratory Mark IIa.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Comparison of the Pre-Test and Posttest Reading Performance Scores of the Frustration Readers on Phonics and Decoding

Group	Mean	Df	T	sig. (2-Tailed)	Interpretation	Decision
Pre-test	52.60	29	-19.728	0.000	Significant	RejectHo
Post-test	65.40					

Table 3. Comparison of the Pre-test and Posttest Reading Performance of the Frustration Readers on Vocabulary

Group	Mean	Df	T	sig.(2-Tailed)	Interpretation	Decision
Pretest	23.70	29	-19.709	0.000	Significant	RejectHo
Posttest	32.20					

Table 4. Comparison of the Pre-test and Posttest Reading Performance of the Frustration readers on Reading Comprehension

Group	Mean	Df	T	sig. (2-Tailed)	Interpretation	Decision
Pre-test	15.30	29	-10.694	0.000	Significant	RejectHo
Posttest	23.33					

The results show that after undergoing the Reading Laboratory Program, there was an increase in participants’ mean performance score in phonics and decoding. This may be because of the practice drills on phonics and decoding found in SRA Reading Laboratory Kit. By repeating the same type of activity, the students may have developed the skills over time and was able to do more difficult tasks. The “Learn About Words” section provides students with practice drills on essential word analysis and related language skills such as beginning consonants, blends, compound words and words classification. Short and long sounds are also included.

In terms of combining CVC non-sense words, blends and digraphs, digraphs and short vowels, vowels + R non-sense words, and multi-syllable words, it can be noted that there is also significant difference on the pre-test and posttest of the frustration readers on the following components of decoding and phonics. This may indicate that the laboratory approach may be useful in enhancing these phonics and decoding skills.

As Adams (1990) emphasized in her work on vocabulary instruction, the primary goal of phonics instruction should be to direct a child’s attention to patterns so that they can be learned well enough that words may not lend adequate attention to these patterns to develop word recognition. Learners need to practice seeing and understanding decodable words in real reading situations and with connected text. This can be best done when phonics instruction is part of a reading program, that provides ample practice reading and writing connected text. Encouraging children with connected text can also show them the importance of what they are learning, making the lessons in phonics relevant and sensible (Adams, 1990). Evident on phonics and decoding activities provided in the SRA laboratory

program, this finding indicates that SRA as a supplementary program may be helpful in improving phonics and decoding skills of the frustration readers.

The results show that the vocabulary level of the frustration readers moved up by two grade levels (i.e. from Grade 4 to Grade 6). General language arts practice, focusing on vocabulary such as word meaning from context and using word in new context, is part of the SRA Power Builder. As a general guideline in the use of SRA Reading Laboratory program, it is important to note that consistency in reaching the 85 to 100 percent on three reading selection allows the student and the teacher to decide if the student can move up to the next color level. The SRA Reading lab provides skill builders when students failed to meet the score of 85 and above.

In the study of Butler, et.al (2010), effective vocabulary instruction involves rich, robust opportunities for students to learn words, related concepts, and their meanings. Vocabulary instruction should cover many words that have been skillfully and carefully chosen to reduce vocabulary gaps and improve students' abilities to apply word knowledge to the task of comprehension. In another study research by Biemiller&Boote (2006) it was found out that repeated reading of a story resulted in greater average gains in word knowledge. By having students read stories with the same type of activities before moving to much difficult reading tasks, longer instructional time is given for children at-risk for reading difficulties. This gives opportunity to target specific vocabulary skills students need. This provides some evidence that the laboratory program enhances vocabulary skills of frustration readers.

The finding indicates that reading comprehension improves after using the SRA. As explained, this may be due to the drill "How Well Did You Read?" provides which test the comprehension of the readers. This indicates rich and repeated reading activities and instructional materials included in the program may further develop skills in comprehension and supplement the existing school reading program of the participant school. In the study of reading performance and satisfaction in SRA test, Tantarangsee (2012, 83) found out that SRA Reading laboratory interventions will be more effective in improving scores in reading comprehension, fluency and basic reading for grade students reading below grade level when compared to students receiving Guided Reading interventions. It is found that while using SRA Reading Laboratory, students often employ such reading strategies as surveying, using context clues to guess meaning of the unknown word, questioning and reading, and using background knowledge. It was suggested that SRA Reading Laboratory or some other kinds of external readings be assigned to students wishing to improve their reading comprehension (McGraw-Hill Education, 2012). It is both developmentally and individually an appropriate reading program. It is developmentally appropriate because the material is best suited at the child's current grade level. On the other hand, SRA is individually appropriate because the child will read stories based on the current reading level and progresses while in the program (Mabanés, 2012).

The SRA provides a lot of drills and practice exercises that develop the target skills. Findings show that as a supplementary program, the SRA may be useful in helping frustration readers improve reading skills specifically in phonics & decoding, vocabulary and reading comprehension.

Based on the results of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Share findings of study to the school. The results may be used as basis for adopting SRA as the supplemental program.
2. Other students who are identified as frustration readers may also undergo SRA Reading Laboratory program to improve phonics and decoding, vocabulary and reading comprehension skills.
3. The SRA Reading Laboratory program can be recommended as a supplemental after school program to students that need to develop phonics and decoding, vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. As DepEd entails public schools to develop its own reading program, the SRA laboratory kit can provide practice drills that may help students to build skills necessary for reading accordingly based on Phil-IRI reading levels such as instructional and independent readers.
4. Further study may employ students with various reading levels (proficient, advanced proficient, grade level instruction, advanced instruction, etc.) to see how a reading laboratory approach may influence their reading performance.
5. A teacher training program may be developed to help teacher facilitate the implementation of Reading laboratory program should the school decide to adopt a supplemental reading program. In particular,

teachers or volunteer tutor can be trained in the use of the reading lab kit and cooperate with other schools whose students need the most.

Acknowledgements

I owe and offer this work to God for making it possible. God works through people. In the course of completing this study, many people helped me to make this project a success. First, I am grateful to my ever-supportive adviser, Dr. Rhodora F. Nicdao who helped me in every aspect of thesis writing, from proposal, data collection and working on the final manuscript. She is a true example of excellence with genuine compassion. I would like to thank my panelist, Dr. Cornelia C. Soto, Dr. Hope Leyson, and Dr. Ma. Celeste T. Gonzales for thorough feedback given to me during my presentations. My heartfelt gratitude goes to Ms. Fe Mallillin, for always providing answers to my queries and assistance whenever I need it.

I am equally thankful to the students and parents, colleagues, head and Principal Dr. Ma. Victoria R. De Gulan for allowing me to conduct this study. This would not be complete without your permission and your support.

To my family and to the person who inspire me to pursue and finish graduate school, thank you.

References

1. Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning about Print*. The Reading Research and Education Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
2. Adre, M. (1970). *An Evaluation of SRA Reading Laboratory as Supplement to Basal Reading Program* (Master's Thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City).
3. Adriano, M.N (2015). *Evaluation of the Implementation and Effectiveness of Every Child a Reader Program (ECARP) in a Bulacan Public Elementary School*. Harvest Vol.11 No.1 Albdour, W.M. (2015). *The Difficulties that Seventh Grade Students Face in Comprehensive Reading Skill for English Curricula*. Journal of Education and Practice. Vol.6, No.27,61-75
4. Alcazar, M.Y., Diaz, L., Nava, F.J., Ongtengco M.H., Pado, E., & Salvador, M.A.M (2018). *The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory*. Department of Education – Bureau of Learning Resources (DepEd-BLR).
- Anderson, R. 1994. "Role of the Reader's Schema in Comprehension, Learning, and Memory." In Ruddell, Ruddell, and Singer 1994, 469–82.
5. Ayyoub, D. R. (1964). *An Evaluation of the SRA Reading Laboratory I-a Used as a Supplementary Reading Program in the First Grade*. (All Master's Theses. Central Washington University). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/388>
6. Biancarosa & Snow (2004). *Reading Next- A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: A Report to Carnegie Corporation* New York, New York. Alliance of Excellent Education
7. Biemiller, A. & Boothe, C. (2006). *An Effective Method for Building Meaning Vocabulary in Primary Grades*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 98:44-62. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.44>
8. Brennan, S. and Robinson G.L. (1998) *4 Approaches to Comprehension Instruction*. Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities. Vol. 3. No.4
9. Busick, T. J. (2013) *Effects of Reading Intervention Strategies for Elementary Students At-Risk of Reading Disabilities*. Michigan State University
10. Butler, S. Urrutia, K., Buenger, A. Gonzales, N., Hunt, M. & Eisenhart, C. (2010). *A Review of the Current Research on Vocabulary Instruction*, RMC Research Corporation. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/rmcfinal1.pdf>
11. Carrell, M., Devine, P. and Eskey, F. (1988). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Chiang, S. (2017). *Integrating Reading Intervention into Story Teaching – Comprehensive Writing in Storybook Report*. Retrieved from <http://englishcenter.ntpc.edu.tw/>
13. Chou, P.T. (2011). *The Effects of Vocabulary Knowledge and Background Knowledge on Reading Comprehension of Taiwanese EFL Students*, Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 108–115
14. Coyne, M.D., Simmons, D.C., Kame'enui, E. & Stoolmiller, M. (2010) *Teaching Vocabulary During Shared Storybook Readings: An Examination of Differential Effects* Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ682910>
15. Cristobal, L. (2015) *Literacy in the Philippines: The Stories behind the Numbers*. ILA News. Retrieved from <http://www.literacyworldwide.org/blogliteracy-daily/2015/08/06/literacy-in-the-philippines-the-stories-behind-the-numbers>

16. Critchlow, D. (2000). *Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE): Assessing Reading Multiple Measures for Kindergarten through Eighth Grade*. Diagnostic Assessment, McGraw-Hill Education
17. Cuerda, F. M. (2000). *Reading Performance of the Secondary Students Using the SRA Reading Laboratory* (Master's Thesis, Cebu Normal University, Cebu City)
18. Diagnostic Decoding Survey (2010) Really Great Reading Company LLC. <https://www.reallygreatreading.com/dds>
19. Denton, C., (n.d). *Classroom Reading Instruction That Supports Struggling Readers Key Components for Effective Teaching*, University of Texas Health Science Center Houston, Retrieved from http://www.rtinetwork.org/essential/tieredinstruction/tier1/____effectiveteaching
20. Downie, N.M. & Heath, R.W. (1984). *Basic Statistical Methods* (5th ed.). New York, NY. Harper Collins.
- Ewing, Linda A. (2004). *What is the Effectiveness of the SRA Direct Guided reading In Promoting Phonological Awareness Skills*. Rowan University
21. Gaw-Balanzat, A.F. (2008) *The Automaticity of the Reading Processes of Prep Pupils of the Ateneo De Manila Grade School* (Master's Thesis, Ateneo De Manila University)
22. Goodman, K. (1967). *Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game*, Journal of the Reading Specialist. Volume 6, Issue 4 Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19388076709556976>
23. Gough, P. & Hoover, W. (1990). *The Simple View of Reading*. Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, Volume 2 p. 127-60 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00401799>
24. Gunn, B. Smolkowski, S. Biglan, F. Black, & Blair, W. (2005). *Fostering the Development of Reading Skill through Supplemental Instruction: Results for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students*. J Spec Education.
25. Gunning, T.G. (2000). *Creating Literacy Instruction for All Children*. 3rd ed. MA. Allyn & Bacon Heale, K. & Twycross, A. (2017). *Research Made Simple*, Evidence-Based Nursing, BMJ Publishing Group
26. Ltd & RCN Publishing Company Ltd., Vol 21 Issue 1 Heilman, W. A., Blair, T., Rupley, W. (1993) *Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill, Inc.
27. Heyman, N. (2012) *Causes of Reading Comprehension Difficulties*. Retrieved from <http://nikkiheyman.co.za/2012/09/>
28. Hiser, E. (2010) *SRA in EFL: A Comparative Study of English Reading Difficulty for Japanese Tertiary EFL Students* Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079002.pdf>
29. Hyldgaard, S. E. (2015) *The Reading Profile of the Children in the Philippines*. George Lucas Educational Foundation. Edutopia. www.edutopia.org/discussion/reading-profile-children-philippines
30. Mabanes, K. (2012). Satisfaction in SRA Test in Relation to Reading Comprehension Performance. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/5292174/>
31. SATISFACTION_IN_SRA_TEST_IN_RELATION_TO_READING_COMPREHENSION_PERFORMANCE
32. Malabon National High School (2017). Word Bucket Challenge. Reading Program Proposal. Malabon City: Malabon National High School (2016). School Improvement Plan. Malabon City:
33. Malott R.W & Miller M.L. (2006) *Programmed Instruction: Construction Responding, Discrimination Responding, and Highlighted Keywords*. J Behavioral Education Volume 15, pp. 111–119
34. Marschark, M. & Spencer E. (2011) *the Oxford Handbook of Deaf Studies, Language and Education* (2nd Ed.) Oxford University Press. New York.
35. Marual-Gillaco, M. (2014). *Level of Word Recognition and Reading Comprehension: A Basis for a Reading Program*. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Vol. 1, No. 5, Calamba City, Laguna, Philippines
36. Mc Graw-Hill Education (2012). Reading Laboratory SRA. Retrieved November 22, 2018 from <https://www.mheducation.com/prek-12/program/reading-laboratory-sra2005/MKTSP-UEC12M0.research-success.html>
37. McKeown, M.G., Beck, I.L., Omanson, R.C. & Pople M.T. (1985) *Some Effects of the Nature and Frequency of Vocabulary Instruction on the Knowledge and Use of Words*. Reading Research Quarterly, Vol.20 No.5
38. Murdock, S. (1966). *Individualized Instruction in Reading*. Central Washington University.
39. Nation, K., Clark, P., Marshall, C.M., & Durand, M. (2004). *Hidden Language Impairments in Children: Parallels between Poor Reading Comprehension and Specific Language Impairment*. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 47, 199–211.
40. National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction*. Retrieved from <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/pubs/nrp/Documents/report.pdf>
41. Ng, T. (2011). *The Effectiveness of the Catch Them Early (CTE) Program in Developing the Literacy Skills of Grade Two Students: Implications for Improving the Implementation of the CTE Program* (Master's Thesis,

42. Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City) Ora'a, R. (1980). *The Ateneo de Naga SRA Reading Laboratory: An Evaluation University of Nueva Caceres.*
43. (Master's Thesis, Ateneo de Naga University, Naga, Bicol) Oyola, Tony (2015). *The Impact of the SRA Corrective Reading Program on Standardized Testing* (Doctoral Thesis,
44. Walden University) Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>Pang, E.; Muaka, A.; Bernhardt, B.E.; Kamil, L.M. (2003) *Teaching Reading*. International Bureau of
45. Education, Switzerland retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED481186> Pardede, P. (2011). A Review on Reading Theories and its Implication to the Teaching of Reading (Master's Thesis, Universitas Kristen Indonesia
46. Parker D.H. (2010) Mark II Reading Laboratory 2a. Teacher's Manual. (10th ed.)Quezon City. Abiva Publishing House (2010) Mark II Reading Laboratory 2a. Student Record Book. (10th ed.)Quezon City. Abiva Publishing House (2010) Mark II Reading Laboratory 2a. Teacher's Manual. (10th ed.)Quezon City. Abiva Publishing House
47. Quirk, M.P. &Schwanenflugel P.J. (2010). *Do Supplemental Remedial Reading Programs Address the Motivational Issues of Struggling Readers? An Analysis of Five Popular Programs*, Reading Research and Instruction: the Journal of the College Reading Association.
48. Shafiuddin, Sana (2013). "Importance of Early Reading Intervention," ESSAI: Vol. 10, Article 30.Savaşkan, V. (2017). *Investigating the Effect of Reading Types Used in Turkish Lessons upon 5th Grade Students' Reading Comprehension*. Journal of Education and Training Studies Vol. 5, No. 8
49. Stoller, F. .L. (1994) *Developing a Focused Reading for L2 Students*. *Reading in Foreign Language*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ527781>
50. Taglieber, L.K. (1990) The Reading Laboratory: An Attempt To Improve the Reading Skills of Students at College. Retrieved from <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/fragmentos/article/viewFile/2125/4085>
51. Tantarangsee, C. (2005). *The Impact of SRA Reading Laboratory on Reading Proficiency*. Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University. Retrieved from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol41/017-ICEMT2012-C00038.pdf>
52. Torgesen, J.K. (2005) *A Principal's Guide to Intensive Reading Interventions for Struggling Readers in Reading First Schools*, Eastern Regional Reading First Technical Assistance Center. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED498776.pdf> Wren, S. (2000) *The Cognitive Foundations of Learning to Read*. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Austin, Texas