

RESEARCH ARTICLE



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

2395-2636 (Print);2321-3108 (online)

COMPARATIVE STUDY
IN READING METHOD PREFERENCES OF GRADE 7 STUDENTS

JOSEPH AGBUYA-VILLARAMA

Instructor I, University Science High School, College of Education,
Central Luzon State University, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

Corresponding email: villaramajoseph@gmail.com



JOSEPH AGBUYA-
VILLARAMA

ABSTRACT

It is identified that students may come from different places with their own principles brought by individual disparity. And it is a tough task for the reading teacher to handle these students considering their divergence. Meeting the students' need would lead to an interactive atmosphere of the reading class that would result to appreciation and comprehension of literature. The results of the study conducted by Haifa Al-Buainain (2010) "indicated that there was a significant difference on strategies between the high-achievers and low-achievers..." However, as reflected to Haifa Al-Buainain's (2010) findings, there were no significant differences between high-achievers and good students, and good and fair students. This study was anchored on the Low-road or High-road Theory on Transfer of Learning by Gavriel Salomon and David N. Perkins (1992) which implies that distinguishing student's preferred reading method requires distinguishing their improvement on mental function which explains the presence of the differences in teaching reading method preferences of the levels of proficiency of students as accorded by the DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012 Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum, the performance of the students will be described through a hierarchical ordering depending on the levels of their achievement as to developing, approaching proficiency, proficient level (excluding the beginning and advanced level). The students' level of proficiency is as well given an equivalent numerical value. This research aimed to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the reading method preferences namely top-down approach, bottom-up approach, dimensional ordinary and intensive approaches, gradual psychological unfolding (GPU) approach, directed reading-thinking activity (DRTA), dialogical-thinking reading lesson (D-TRL), sustained silent reading method (SSRM), whole word method, Gibson-Richards linguistic approach, and syllabic method among developing, approaching proficiency, and proficient students. It dealt on the same theses previously mentioned but with a different set of respondents: non-native speakers of the language. Completely enumerated 40 out of 46 Grade 7 students of Agricultural Science and Technology School participated in this study. Generally, based from the results, the levels of proficiency showed variances in terms of their reading method preferences as to where they showed mental augmentation.

Keywords: Reading methods preference, Levels of proficiency, Transfer of learning, Literary comprehension and appreciation, Mental function, Assessment and rating of learning outcomes

©KY PUBLICATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

Students easily comprehend any subject matter and grasp the topic if they are taught by the teacher using the methods most suitable to their reading preferences. Every individual is unique. That is why teachers' success and the students' understanding lie on the implemented reading methods and strategies. It is believed that good methods and strategies distinguish the differences among various levels of learners as stated by Dela Rosa, et.al. (2013), that "a good method provides students' learning; it facilitates growth and development; and it achieves the desired results of the teacher as reflected in his instructional objectives".

The researcher had his remedial instruction for English at the Agricultural Science and Technology School (ASTS) catering the least performing students. He hardly did the process because basically he did not know where students comprehend best. That is why the researcher tried to delve on the reading method preferences of Grade 7 students in ASTS based from their levels of proficiency such as developing, approaching proficiency, and proficient. He anchored the study to the Low-road or High-road Theory on Transfer of Learning by Gavriel Salomon and David N. Perkins (1992) which refers to developing some knowledge and skill to a high level of automaticity that involves cognitive understanding, purposeful and conscious analysis, mindfulness, and application of strategies that cut across disciplines.

Results of this study may become the bases of administrators, teachers, researchers, and students in restructuring the course syllabus or course outline in reading class. It is identically appropriate to consider whereas a learner acquires comprehension depending on his preference as bolstered by Dela Rosa, et.al. (2013) that "one must remember that there is no such thing as the best method, thus, there is no single correct way to teach a class; instead, there are many good ways of teaching the students".

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study aimed at describing the reading method preferences according to the levels of proficiency of Central Luzon State University-

Agricultural Science and Technology School Grade 7 students A.Y. 2015-2016. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

- 1.) How may the reading method preferences be described in terms of levels of proficiency?
- 2.) Is there a significant difference on the reading method preference among developing, approaching proficiency, and proficient students?

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research design, participants, instruments, data gathering procedures, and data analysis.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive-comparative research design. A questionnaire was developed to determine the reading method preferences of Grade 7 ASTS students, A.Y. 2015-2016. The data were analyzed through the use of a statistical tool, SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions), specifically, One-Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance).

Since the objectives of the study were to describe the students' reading method preferences in terms of their levels of proficiency and to distinguish the significant difference of the reading method preferences between students in different levels of proficiency, it included descriptive-comparative design to establish significant differences and relationships between the students' level of proficiency and their reading method preferences.

Participants

The respondents of the study were Grade 7 students of CLSU- Agricultural Science High School (ASTS), A.Y. 2015-2016. The researcher used Complete Enumeration. All the forty-six (46) members of the class were taken. But during the actual data gathering, only forty-one (41) students were present. When the researcher determined their levels of proficiency, nobody was classified as beginning, and only one (1) student was classified as advanced. Since one (1) cannot represent a whole population, through the guidance and approval of expert consultants, the researcher decided not to include it.

The remaining 40 respondents were classified as follows; nine (9) are developing,

nineteen (19) are approaching proficiency, and twelve (12) are proficient.

Instruments

A questionnaire-checklist was used by the researcher to identify the reading method preferences of grade 7 students at ASTS. It primarily focused on the reading method preferences of developing, approaching proficiency, and proficient students among top-down approach, bottom-up approach, dimensional ordinary and intensive approaches, gradual psychological unfolding approach, directed reading-thinking activity, dialogical-thinking reading lesson, sustained silent reading method, whole word method, Gibson-Richards linguistic approach, and syllabic method.

As cited by Felipe (1997), Treece and Treece (1982) pointed out that this kind of instrument is a sheet of written questions usually consisting of one or more scales to which respondents make written response.

Intentionally, a space for students' names was included in the questionnaire to identify their levels of proficiency based from the list of grades given by their teacher and the school registrar.

In addition to that, a Rating Scale is included to determine if how much the students prefer the reading method and/or approach.

Rating Scale

- 5- Preferred very much
- 4-Preferred much
- 3-Preferred moderately
- 2-Preferred a little
- 1-Not preferred at all

The instrument was tested for reliability and validity. The reported reliability and validity coefficients were 0.82 and 0.31, respectively.

Data Gathering Procedures

The researcher did a remedial instruction for English in Agricultural Science and Technology School (ASTS), to easily gather data. He gathered information from the respondents through a questionnaire checklist.

First, the researcher asked permission and approval from the school principal, class adviser, and English teacher of Grade 7 students. Then, he asked the respondents to answer the questionnaire. While answering, the researcher explained each

approaches and methods used by their teacher so that it would be easier for them to answer the given questionnaire.

Methods of Data Analysis

- i. To describe the respondents' characteristics specifically on their levels of proficiency, descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviation were utilized.
- ii. To determine the extent to which the students' levels of proficiency are compared to their reading method preferences, comparison was computed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part contained and discussed the results obtained from the study such as the different reading method preferences of the students from different levels of proficiency.

Table 1 shows that among the three groups of levels of proficiency, two manifest significant differences. The Developing and Approaching Proficiency groups show significant difference in Directed Reading- Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Linguistic methods with 4.56* and 4.78* for L1 and 3.53* and 3.95* for L2 mean respectively which are significant at .05 level.

These imply that among the ten reading methods, the two groups prefer the Directed Reading- Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Linguistic Approach.

The findings coincide with the description of the students reflected in the DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012 Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum that fall under Developing and Approaching Proficiency which state that with the minimum knowledge, skill, and core understanding, they can perform and acquire the desired comprehension and only need a little guidance from the teacher to transmit the acquired understanding into authentic and or performance tasks.

The Proficient group or level three did not show any significant difference. This is understandable considering that students who fall under this category have already developed the fundamental knowledge, skill, and understanding so they could also transfer these into authentic performance tasks. It does not matter anymore to

them what particular reading approach and/or method the teacher will use because they could still cope with the topic.

Results revealed that the reading method most preferred by developing level was Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach with a mean of 4.78 as described preferred very much however they least preferred the Top-Down Approach with a mean of 3.44 described as preferred much. Meanwhile, the reading method most preferred by the approaching proficiency was Syllabic Method with a mean of 4.42, preferred very much, while they least preferred the Top-Down Approach with a mean of 3.11 described as preferred moderately.

The reading method most preferred by the proficient level was the Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach with a mean of 4.58 described as preferred very much, and they least preferred Whole Word Approach with a mean of 2.92 described as preferred moderately.

Based on the results, developing and proficient levels have the same most preferred reading method which is the Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach whereas according to Hammad (2012) this is one of the structured ways on how to ensure each student's equal opportunity to comprehend and understand which also covers and provides the students with an immediate feedback and observations.

The approaching proficiency level most preferred the Syllabic Method as Thomas and Reinders (2011) have said in their research that Syllabic Method makes use of syllabic units, as an outgrowth of phonic method. Through this method, syllables are learned and taught thoroughly. They are preferred to letters because many consonants and vowels can be pronounced accurately when combined with other letters. With this method, a reader can transfer learning into more complex situations.

The developing and approaching proficiency levels least preferred the Top-Down Approach for they grasp the subject matter of a story or its concept individually at their own pace without the assistance of the teacher which coincided with the description of the students reflected in the DepEd order No. 73, s. 2012

Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K 10 12 Basic Education Curriculum that the students under this level still need the guidance of the teacher in applying what they have read or learned, while the proficient level least preferred Whole Word Method.

TABLE 1. The Mean and Standard Deviation of Levels of Proficiency and Reading Methods

Reading Methods and Approaches	Levels of Proficiency								
	Developing			Approaching Proficiency			Proficient		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description	Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Top-Down Approach	3.44	1.014	PMU	3.11	0.737	PMO	3.08	0.9	PMO
Bottom-Up Approach	3.89	1.054	PMU	4.05	0.911	PMU	4.08	0.996	PMU
Dimensional Ordinary and Intensity Approaches	3.78	0.833	PMU	3.37	1.012	PMO	3.33	0.651	PMO
Gradual Psychological Unfolding (GPU) Approach	3.89	0.782	PMU	3.79	0.855	PMU	4.08	0.669	PMU
Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA)	4.56	0.726	PVM	3.53	0.964	PMU	4	0.739	PMU
Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL)	4.33	0.866	PVM	3.58	0.961	PMU	4.33	0.778	PVM
Sustained Silent Reading Method (SSRM)	3.89	1.167	PMU	3.63	0.955	PMU	3.5	0.905	PMU
Whole Word Method	4	1.118	PMU	3.37	0.895	PMO	2.92	1.24	PMO
Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach	4.78	0.441	PVM	3.95	0.911	PMU	4.58	0.515	PVM
Syllabic Method	4.11	1.167	PMU	4.42	0.838	PVM	4.5	0.798	PVM

Legend:
 4.21-5.00 - Preferred very much (PVM)
 3.41-4.20 - Preferred much (PMU)
 2.61-3.40 - Preferred moderately (PMO)
 1.81-2.60 - Preferred a little (PL)
 2.00-1.80 - Not preferred at all (NP)

Results revealed that the reading method most preferred by developing level was Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach with a mean of 4.78 as described preferred very much however they least preferred the Top-Down Approach with a mean of 3.44 described as preferred much. Meanwhile, the reading method most preferred by the approaching proficiency was Syllabic Method with a mean of 4.42, preferred very much, while they least preferred the Top-Down Approach with a mean of 3.11 described as preferred moderately.

The reading method most preferred by the proficient level was the Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach with a mean of 4.58 described as preferred very much, and they least preferred Whole Word Approach with a mean of 2.92 described as preferred moderately.

Based on the results, developing and proficient levels have the same most preferred reading method which is the Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach whereas according to Hammad (2012) this is one of the structured ways on how to ensure each student's equal opportunity to comprehend and understand which also covers and provides the students with an immediate feedback and observations.

The approaching proficiency level most preferred the Syllabic Method as Thomas and Reinders (2011) have said in their research that

Syllabic Method makes use of syllabic units, as an outgrowth of phonic method. Through this method, syllables are learned and taught thoroughly. They are preferred to letters because many consonants and vowels can be pronounced accurately when combined with other letters. With this method, a reader can transfer learning into more complex situations.

The developing and approaching proficiency levels least preferred the Top-Down Approach for they grasp the subject matter of a story or its concept individually at their own pace without the assistance of the teacher which coincided with the description of the students reflected in the DepEd order No. 73, s. 2012 Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K 10 12 Basic Education Curriculum that the students under this level still need the guidance of the teacher in applying what they have read or learned, while the proficient level least preferred Whole Word Method.

most preferred reading method of the Grade 7 ASTS students across their levels of proficiency.

Results revealed that levels of proficiency have no significant difference in Top-Down Approach, Bottom-Up Approach, Dimensional Ordinary and Intensive Approaches, Gradual Psychological Unfolding (GPU) Approach, Sustained Silent Reading Lesson (D-TRL), Whole Word Method, and Syllabic Method of reading whether they are Developing, Approaching Proficiency, and Proficient level they have the same preferences in terms of the aforementioned reading methods and preferences. This implies that students regardless of the levels of proficiency, they can adjust with the variety of the reading methods namely Top-Down Approach, Bottom-Up Approach, Dimensional Ordinary and Intensive Approaches, Gradual Psychological Unfolding (GPU) Approach, Sustained Silent Reading Method (SSRM), Whole Word Method, and Syllabic Method being implemented to them.

However, levels of proficiency significantly differ on Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA), Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL), and Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach. The results matched with how these students showed their mental capabilities with how they adjust with the reading methods being implemented to them. It has been found out that developing students preferred very much the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) for it is said to be a strategy which gives readers the opportunity to enjoy the adventure of reading a story by unfolding it to them bit by bit through a manner of sequenced questioning. Meanwhile, both approaching proficient and proficient preferred this much.

Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL) is a presentation that engages students in reasonable reflective thinking in order to judge what they believe about a story and its specific issue, which is found to be preferred very much by the developing and proficient students and preferred much by the approaching proficiency students.

Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach is one of the ways emphasize the meaning of words in the story through using them in sentences that is why for developing and proficient students they preferred very much this approach. Meanwhile,

TABLE 2. Results of One-Way ANOVA of Levels of Proficiency and Reading Method Preferences

Reading Methods and Approaches	DF	Mean Square	F value
Top-Down Approach			
Between Groups	2	0.423	0.582
Within Groups	37	0.728	
Total	39		
Bottom-Up Approach			
Between Groups	2	0.111	0.118
Within Groups	37	0.939	
Total	39		
Dimensional Ordinary and Intensive Approaches			
Between Groups	2	0.628	0.812
Within Groups	37	0.774	
Total	39		
Gradual Psychological Unfolding (GPU) Approach			
Between Groups	2	0.318	0.513
Within Groups	37	0.621	
Total	39		
Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA)			
Between Groups	2	3.32	4.557*
Within Groups	37	0.729	
Total	39		
Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL)			
Between Groups	2	2.838	3.585*
Within Groups	37	0.792	
Total	39		
Sustained Silent Reading Method (SSRM)			
Between Groups	2	0.395	0.403
Within Groups	37	0.981	
Total	39		
Whole Word Method			
Between Groups	2	3.019	2.702
Within Groups	37	1.117	
Total	39		
Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach			
Between Groups	2	2.678	5.102*
Within Groups	37	0.525	
Total	39		
Syllabic Method			
Between Groups	2	0.427	0.518
Within Groups	37	0.825	
Total	39		

Legend: * - significant at $p \leq 0.05$

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to further look into the difference across the Levels of Proficiency. This gave additional analysis on the

approaching proficiency concluded to have preferred this much.

Generally, based from the results, the levels of proficiency showed variances in terms of their reading method preferences as to where they showed mental augmentation.

TABLE 3. Mean Differences of Levels of Proficiency

Reading Methods and Approaches	Levels of Proficiency		
	Developing	Approaching Proficiency	Proficient
Top-Down Approach	3.44 ^A	3.11 ^A	3.08 ^A
Bottom-Up Approach	3.89 ^A	4.05 ^A	4.08 ^A
Dimensional Ordinary and Intensive Approaches	3.78 ^A	3.37 ^A	3.33 ^A
Gradual Psychological Unfolding (GPU) Approach	3.89 ^A	3.79 ^A	4.08 ^A
Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA)	4.56 ^A	3.53 ^B	4 ^{AB}
Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL)	4.33 ^A	3.58 ^A	4.33 ^A
Sustained Silent Reading Method (SSRM)	3.89 ^A	3.63 ^A	3.5 ^A
Whole Word Method	4 ^A	3.37 ^A	2.92 ^A
Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach	4.78 ^A	3.95 ^B	4.58 ^{AB}
Syllabic Method	4.11 ^A	4.42 ^A	4.5 ^A

Legend: Means with the same letter are not significantly different

However, levels of proficiency significantly differ on Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA), Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL), and Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach. The results matched with how these students showed their mental capabilities with how they adjust with the reading methods being implemented to them. It has been found out that developing students preferred very much the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) for it is said to be a strategy which gives readers the opportunity to enjoy the adventure of reading a story by unfolding it to them bit by bit through a manner of sequenced questioning. Meanwhile, both approaching proficient and proficient preferred this much.

Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL) is a presentation that engages students in reasonable reflective thinking in order to judge what they believe about a story and its specific issue, which is found to be preferred very much by the developing and proficient students and preferred much by the approaching proficiency students.

Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach is one of the ways emphasize the meaning of words in the story through using them in sentences that is why for developing and proficient students they preferred very much this approach. Meanwhile,

approaching proficiency concluded to have preferred this much.

Generally, based from the results, the levels of proficiency showed variances in terms of their reading method preferences as to where they showed mental augmentation.

Table 3 shows that among the three groups of levels of proficiency, two manifested significant differences. The Developing and Approaching Proficiency groups showed significant differences in Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach with the mean and standard deviation of 4.56 and 4.78 for Developing level and 3.53 and 3.95 for Approaching Proficiency level respectively which are significant at .05 P value. This means that Developing Level more preferred the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) compared to Approaching Proficiency level, same as the result in Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach.

The findings coincided with the description of the students reflected in the DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012 Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum that fall under Developing Level, students have minimum knowledge, skill, and core understanding but they still need a thorough guidance from the teacher in order to transmit their learning understanding to authentic performance task.

While students fall under Approaching Proficiency had developed their fundamental knowledge, skills, and core understanding can comprehend, understand, and acquire the desired learning but they still need a little guidance from the teacher to transmit the acquired understanding into authentic and or performance tasks.

The Proficient level did not show any significant difference. This is understandable considering that students who fall under this category have already developed the fundamental knowledge, skill, and understanding so he could also transfer these into authentic performance tasks. It does not matter anymore to them what particular reading method the teacher will use because they could still cope with the subject matter.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The summary, conclusion, and recommendations of this study were discussed, and explained in this part.

Summary

The CLSU-Agricultural Science and Technology School Grade 7 students, A.Y. 2015-2016 are categorized into Developing, Approaching Proficiency, and Proficient levels.

First hand, Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach was the most preferred reading method of students in Developing level while they least preferred Top-Down Approach. Approaching Proficiency level most preferred Syllabic Method and they have the same least preference with Developing level.

On the other hand, Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approach was the most preferred by the Proficient level and Whole Word Method was their least preferred method.

Levels of proficiency have significant mean difference among Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA), Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson (D-TRL), and Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approaches.

Meanwhile, Developing and Approaching Proficiency level have significant difference in Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approaches.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, the conclusion was drawn:

- 1) The null hypothesis that there were no significant differences on the reading method preferences is rejected.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion, the following recommendations were formulated:

- 1) Reading teacher must use the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DRTA) and Gibson-Richards Linguistic Approaches as methods in conveying or discussing the story.
- 2) It is recommended that researchers must conduct the same study in a larger sample to verify and include the Beginning and Advance classification of levels of proficiency.

- 3) It is also recommended to include more types of reading approaches and methods to determine significant difference in such reading methods.

6. REFERENCES

- Adams, C. (2008). Whole word method. Retrieved from <http://bie.org/resources>.
- Al-Buainain, H. (2010). Reading strategies employed by english majors at qatar university: questions and queries. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/3002667/Reading_strategies_employed_by_English_majors_at_Qatar_University_Questions_and_queries.
- Al-Tamimi, A., & Shuib, M. (2009). Investigating the reading styles and preferences of esl learners: The case of english majors in universiti sains Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal Of ELT Research*, 5, pp. 56-107.
- Baker, J.C. (2009). Dialogical-Thinking Reading Lesson versus Directed Reading-Thinking Activity, ability, gender, and 5th grade reading/social studies achievement. Retrieved from <http://iweb.tntech.edu/jcbaker/Sample%20paper%201%20-%20INSL%206900.pdf>.
- Charlton, B.G. (2006). Lectures are an effective teaching method because they exploit human evolved 'human nature' to improve learning. *Medical Hypothesis*, 27. pp.61-65.
- De Guzman, J. & Antonio, M. (2016). *Compilation of Approaches and Methods in Teaching Literature to Children. (Unpublished instructional materials in Developmental Reading II)*. Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija, Philippines.
- Dela Rosa, R.I., Mendoza, F.A., & Torres J.M. (2013). *Manual in principles of teaching 1.Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija, Philippines: Central Luzon State University Center for Educational Resources Development and Services*. pp. 65-83.
- DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012. *Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum*. Enclosure No. 1, pp. 1-5.
- Felipe, M. V. (1997). Teachers effectiveness in teaching reading as a result of their

- professional growth: An analysis. (Unpublished master's thesis). Eulogio R. Dizon College of Nueva Ecija, Guimba, Philippines.
- Hammad, I.M. (2012). The performance of female students in the linguistics of the holy quran in the U.K. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(11), pp. 215-216.
- Havens, M. & Olson, E. (2013). Levels of proficiency. Retrieved from http://www.sunprairie.k12.wi.us/district/proficiency_levels.cfm.
- Hong-Nam, R., & Leavell, A.G. (2011). Reading strategy instruction, metacognitive awareness and self-perception of striving college developmental readers. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 37, pp. 1-14.
- Knapp, T.R. (2000). What do we know about effective fourth-grade teachers and their classrooms? Retrieved from <http://www.albany.edu/cela/reports/knapp4thgrade13010.pdf>.
- Lake, W. (2013). Dimensional Ordinary and Intensive approaches of teaching reading. Retrieved from <http://blog.about-esl.com/dimensional-approach-of-teaching-reading>.
- Ocampo, D.J. & Hermosa, N. (1997). EDR 210 Module: Trends in Reading Instruction. U.P. Open University, Diliman, Quezon City: Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services.
- Prince, M., & Felder, R. (2007). The many faces of teaching and learning. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 36(5), pp. 14-18. doi: 10.1.1.63.731.
- Shih, J.Y. (2008). Effects of top-down and bottom-up approaches in reading instruction for junior high school students of differing English proficiency. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com.ph/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CDsQFjAD&url=http%3A%2F%2F203.64.120.207%2FETD-db%2FETD-search%2FgetFile%3FURN%3Detd-0707108-013737%26filename%3Detd-0707108-013737.pdf&ei=2Ao1U7ioBM64yAHMuYGYCQ&usg=AFQjCNH5HozMvfFlg4yucugJOfAbHBIXg&bvm=bv.63808443,d.aWM>.
- Thomas, M., & Reinders H. (2006). Teaching reading and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research bases. *J. Engr. Education*, 95(2), pp. 123–138.
- Thomas, M., & Reinders H. (2011). Review of language learning and teaching with technology. *Language learning and technology*, 15 (3), pp.32-36.
- Zheleva, S., & Zhelev, T. (2010). Integrated approach for enhanced teaching and learning towards richer problem solving experience. Retrieved from <http://www.aidic.it/escape20/webpapers/526Zheleva.pdf>.
- Zhao, H. (2011). How far do the theories of learning succeed in combining communicative and from-focused approaches to l2 research? *Journal of Cambridge Studies*,6(1), pp.42-44.
- Zvavanhu. (2010). Reading approaches. Retrieved from <http://zvavanhu.chopper.blogspot.com/2010/10/reading-approaches.html>.