

FACTORS AFFECTING THE READING PERFORMANCE OF ELEMENTARY PUPILS OF SAN RAFAEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, CABANGAN, ZAMBALES, PHILIPPINES: A BASIS FOR PROPOSED READING REMEDIATION MODULES

Author's Name: Chona D. Cabasal¹

Affiliation:

1. San Rafael Elementary School, Teacher III, San Rafael, Cabangan, Zambales, Philippines.

Corresponding Author Name: Chona D. Cabasal, chona.cabasal@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to determine the factors affecting the reading performance of 101 elementary pupils of San Rafael Elementary School, Cabangan, Zambales for school year 2020-2021 which served as basis for proposed reading remediation module. The researcher made use of descriptive correlational research design. The majority of the respondents were males belonging to age nine (9) years old having three (3) to four (4) siblings with normal nutritional status and belonging to families with P9,999 and below monthly income. Most of them perceived that home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor had high effect to the reading performance of the respondents. Most of them were classified as can read and can comprehend. There was no significant correlation between age and home factor, environmental factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor but there was significant correlation between age and health and nutrition factor. There was no significant correlation between gender and home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-based factor, and study habit factor.

Keywords: Reading Performance, Elementary Pupils, Reading Remediation Module

INTRODUCTION

Reading is a rewarding process and can be enjoyed by learners and the teacher alike. Teachers need to approach reading with the intention of having fun in the learning process and their intention will be mirrored by their learners (Braddock, 2016).

Pronunciation, accuracy, and fluency are important in reading. But they have no value without comprehension. Countries around the world are paying increasing attention to reading comprehension, as indicated by improving results in international literacy tests (Rule, 2017).

Reading teachers like to teach. For most of us, that means that we need to have something to share with our students: some concept, some skill, some strategy. To teach content, teachers must be able to define what the content is and is not (Pennington, 2018).

Reading comprehension is the understanding of what a particular text means and the ideas the author is attempting to convey, both textual and sub textual. In order to read any text, your brain must process not only the literal words of the piece, but also their relationship with one another, the context behind the words, how subtle language and vocabulary usage can impact emotion and meaning behind the text, and how the text comes together as a larger, coherent whole. Reading comprehension involves many processes happening in the brain at once, and thus it can be easy for some aspects of a text to get lost in the muddle. But the good news for anyone who struggles is that reading comprehension is a skill just like any other. It must be learned through practice, focus, and diligence, but it absolutely can be learned (Montgomery, 2016).

A new study has shown that the more children participate in back-and-forth interactions with their parents or caregivers, the more activity they have in the part of the brain responsible for language production and processing. The study also showed a strong connection between the number of turns children take in conversation and the scores they received on standardized language tests. The more children are involved in back-and-forth exchanges, the greater the impact of their language skills (Koochi, 2018).

The best way to boost students' reading comprehension is to expand their knowledge and vocabulary by teaching them history, science, literature, and the arts using curricula that guide kids through a logical sequence from one year to the next. That approach enables children to make sense of what they're learning, and the repetition of concepts and vocabulary in different contexts makes it more likely they'll retain information. Not to mention that learning content like this can be a lot more engaging for both students and teachers than the endless practice of illusory skills (Wexler, 2018).

Research has shown that when children are engaged in conversations while reading books, we see growth in their understanding of what's read, language skills including the number of words they know and say, and reading abilities when they are older. Children benefit from interactive book reading because they are more engaged when they play an active role and talk about their interests. They are introduced to new ideas and more advanced language that they do not hear in everyday conversations such as new interesting words which has great impact on reading skills later on, and complex sentences. They can connect new information to what they already know. They are exposed to the building blocks of literacy. These building blocks are the knowledge and skills that children learn before they start to read and write like understanding and using new words, story structure, and what the writer means but has not specifically stated (Da Silva, 2016).

RESEARCH PROBLEM

This study aimed to determine the factors affecting the reading performance of elementary pupils as basis for proposed reading remediation modules in San Rafael Elementary School, Cabangan, Zambales, Philippines for School Year 2020-2021.

OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The study aimed to determine the factors affecting the reading performance of 101 elementary pupils of San Rafael Elementary School, Cabangan, Zambales for school year 2020-2021 which served as basis for proposed reading remediation module. Most of them perceived that home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor had *high effect* to the reading performance of the respondents.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational method of research. Descriptive because it described the factors affecting the reading performance of the elementary pupils. Correlational because it tested the relationship of the profile of the respondents and the factors affecting their reading performance. Likewise, it also tested the relationship between the factors affecting the reading performance of the pupils and their reading performance.

Descriptive research seeks to describe the characteristics or behavior of an audience. Its purpose is to describe, as well as to explain or to validate some sort of hypothesis or objective

when it comes to a specific group of people. Specifically, this research employed survey that involved interviews or discussions with larger audiences and are often conducted on more specific topics (McNeill, 2018).

Furthermore, descriptive research is a study designed to depict the participants in an accurate way. It is all about describing people who take part in the study. Survey is defined as a brief interview or discussion with an individual about a specific topic (Kowalczyk, 2018).

Moreover, descriptive research is a type of research that studies the participants that take part in the research or a certain situation. It does not limit to either of quantitative or qualitative research methodologies, but instead, it uses elements of both often within the same study (Upen, 2018).

Since the study was concerned with the factors affecting the reading performance of the elementary pupils as basis for proposed reading remediation modules in San Rafael Elementary School, Cabangan, Zambales, Philippines wherein data were collected, classified, summarized, and presented in percentages, averages, and with the given number of respondents, the descriptive-correlational method of research was considered as the most appropriate method used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of age. The table shows that of the observed number of respondents, there were 25 or 25% who aged 10 years old, 23 or 23% who aged nine (9) years old, 22 or 22% who aged 11 years old, 16 or 16% who aged eight (8) years old, 11 or 11% who aged seven (7) years old, and three (3) or three (3)% who aged 12 years old and above. The average age of the respondents was 9.40 or nine (9) years old.

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents in terms of Age		
Age	Frequency	Percentage
7 years old	11	11.00
8 years old	16	16.00
9 years old	23	23.00
10 years old	25	25.00
11 years old	22	22.00
12 years old and above	3	3.00
Total	100	100.00
Mean Age	9.40	

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of gender. The table shows that of the observed number of respondents, there were 58 or 58% males and 42 or 42% females.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents in terms of Gender		
Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	58	58.00
Female	42	42.00
Total	100	100.00

Table 3 shows the frequency distribution of respondents in terms of number of siblings. The table shows that the observed number of respondents, there were 39 or 39% who had three (3) to four (4) siblings, 32 or 32% who had one (1) to two (2) siblings, 21 or 21% who had no sibling, five (5) or five (5)% who had five (5) to six (6) siblings, and three (3) or three (3)% who had seven (7) and more siblings.

Table 3

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents in terms of Number of Siblings		
Number of Siblings	Frequency	Percentage
None	21	21.00
1 to 2	32	32.00
3 to 4	39	39.00
5 to 6	5	5.00
7 or more	3	3.00
Total	100	100.00

Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of nutritional status. The table shows that of the observed number of respondents, there were 84 or 84% who had normal nutritional status, eight (8) or eight (8)% who had wasted nutritional status, five (5) or five (5)% who had overweight nutritional status, two (2) or two (2)% who had obese nutritional status, and one (1) or one (1)% who had severely wasted nutritional status.

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents in terms of Nutritional Status		
Nutritional Status	Frequency	Percentage
Severely Wasted	1	1.00
Wasted	8	8.00
Normal	84	84.00
Overweight	5	5.00
Obese	2	2.00
Total	100	100.00

Table 5 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of family monthly income. The table shows that of the observed number of respondents, there were 78 or 78% who belonged to families earning P9,999 and below; 14 or 14% who belonged to families earning P10,000 to P19,999 monthly; seven (7) or seven (7)% who belonged to families earning P20,000 to P29,999 monthly; and one (1) or one (1)% who belonged to a family earning P40,000 to P49,999 monthly.

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents in terms of Family Monthly Income		
Family Monthly Income	Frequency	Percentage
P9,999 and below	78	78.00
P10,000 to P19,999	14	14.00
P20,000 to P29,999	7	7.00
P40,000 to P49,999	1	1.00
Total	100	100.00

Table 6 shows the mean ratings and interpretations of factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents in terms of home factor. *My parents help me in learning reading lessons* had a 3.72 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *My siblings help me in learning reading lessons* had a 3.28 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has effect*; *I have sufficient references in reading lessons* had a 3.61 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *I have easy access in studying reading lessons* had a 3.59 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; and *Other people around me help me in understanding reading lessons* had a 4.00 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*. In terms of home factor, the general mean rating of respondents' factors affecting their reading performance was 3.64, and it was interpreted as *has high effect*.

Table 6

Mean Ratings and Interpretations of Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents in terms of Home Factor		
Home Factor Statements	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1. My parents help me in learning reading lessons.	3.72	Has High Effect
2. My siblings help me in learning reading lessons.	3.28	Has Effect
3. I have sufficient references in reading lessons.	3.61	Has High Effect
4. I have easy access in studying reading lessons.	3.59	Has High Effect
5. Other people around me help me in understanding reading lessons.	4.00	Has High Effect
General Mean Rating	3.64	Has High Effect

Table 7 shows the mean ratings and interpretations of factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents in terms of environmental factor. *I am with peers who find time to read* had a 3.70 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *I belong to a community of readers* had a 3.98 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *I find time to visit the barangay reading center* had a 3.17 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has effect*; *I read stories with my friends* had a 3.63 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; and *I am with friends who practice reading* had a 3.62 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*. In terms of environmental factor, the general mean rating of respondents' factors affecting their reading performance was 3.62, and it was interpreted as *has high effect*.

Table 7

Mean Ratings and Interpretations of Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents in terms of Environmental Factor		
Environmental Factor Statements	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1. I am with peers who find time to read.	3.70	Has High Effect
2. I belong to a community of readers.	3.98	Has High Effect
3. I find time to visit the barangay reading center.	3.17	Has Effect
4. I read stories with my friends.	3.63	Has High Effect
5. I am with friends who practice reading.	3.62	Has High Effect
General Mean Rating	3.62	Has High Effect

Table 8 shows the mean ratings and interpretations of factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents in terms of health and nutrition factor. *I eat three meals in a day* had a 4.37 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has very high effect*; *I eat nutritious food during break time* had a 3.98 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *i drink enough water* had a 4.25 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has very high effect*; *I exercise every morning* had a 3.52 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; and *I take enough sleep* had a 4.27 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has very high effect*. In terms of health and nutrition factor, the general mean rating of respondents' factors affecting their reading performance was 4.08, and it was interpreted as *has high effect*.

Table 8

Mean Ratings and Interpretations of Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents in terms of Health and Nutrition Factor		
Health and Nutrition Factor Statements	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1. I eat three meals in a day.	4.37	Has Very High Effect
2. I eat nutritious food during break time.	3.98	Has High Effect
3. I drink enough water.	4.25	Has Very High Effect
4. I exercise every morning.	3.52	Has High Effect
5. I take enough sleep.	4.27	Has Very High Effect
General Mean Rating	4.08	Has High Effect

Table 9 shows the mean ratings and interpretations of factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents in terms of school-related factor. *My teacher helps me in learning reading lessons* had a 4.44 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has very high effect*; *My teacher provides me with remedial instruction* had a 3.70 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *My classmates help me in learning reading lessons* had a 3.61 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *Remedial reading instruction helps me to understand the lesson* had a 4.09 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; and *Other school reading programs help me to understand the lessons* had a 4.09 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*. In terms of school-related factor, the general mean rating of respondents' factors affecting their reading performance was 3.99, and it was interpreted as *has high effect*.

Table 9

Mean Ratings and Interpretations of Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents in terms of School-Related Factor		
School-Related Factor Statements	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1. My teacher helps me in learning reading lessons.	4.44	Has Very High Effect
2. My teacher provides me with remedial instruction.	3.70	Has High Effect
3. My classmates help me in learning reading lessons.	3.61	Has High Effect
4. Remedial reading instruction helps me to understand the lesson.	4.09	Has High Effect
5. Other school reading programs help me to understand the lessons.	4.09	Has High Effect
General Mean Rating	3.99	Has High Effect

Table 10 shows the mean ratings and interpretations of factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents in terms of study habit factor. *I find time to study our reading lessons* had a 3.73 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *I work on the given exercises, activities, and homeworks in reading* had a 3.83 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *I go over my reading lesson before going to bed* had a 3.61 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; *I review my lessons in reading two weeks before the examination* had a 3.69 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has high effect*; and *I apply in real-life situations what I learned from reading* had a 4.24 mean rating, which was interpreted as *has very high effect*. In terms of study habit factor, the general mean rating of respondents' factors affecting their reading performance was 3.82, and it was interpreted as *has high effect*.

Table 10

Mean Ratings and Interpretations of Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents in terms of Study Habit Factor		
Study Habit Factor Statements	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1. I find time to study our reading lessons.	3.73	Has High Effect
2. I work on the given exercises, activities, and homeworks in reading.	3.83	Has High Effect
3. I go over my reading lesson before going to bed.	3.61	Has High Effect
4. I review my lessons in reading two weeks before the examination.	3.69	Has High Effect
5. I apply in real-life situations what I learned from reading.	4.24	Has Very High Effect
General Mean Rating	3.82	Has High Effect

Table 11 shows the correlation between the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents and their nutritional status using chi-square test.

Since the chi-square statistic is lower than the chi-square critical value at five (5) percent level of significance, the null hypothesis is *accepted*; thus, there is *no significant correlation* between nutritional status and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor (-0.042 against 0.195), environmental factor (-0.005 against 0.195), health and nutrition factor (0.087 against 0.195), and school-related factor (-0.095 against 0.195).

On the other hand, since chi-square statistic is higher than the chi-square critical value at five (5) percent level of significance, the null hypothesis is *rejected*; thus, there is *significant correlation* between nutritional status and study habit factor (0.217 against 0.195) as one of the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents.

Table 11

Correlation between the Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents and their Nutritional Status		
Factors Affecting Reading Performance	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation
Home Factor	-0.042	Not Significant
Environmental Factor	-0.005	Not Significant
Health and Nutrition Factor	0.087	Not Significant
School-Related Factor	-0.095	Not Significant
Study Habit Factor	0.217	Significant
<i>The critical correlation coefficient at .05 level of significance and 98 degrees of freedom is .195</i>		

Table 12 shows the correlation between the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents and their monthly family income using the chi-square test.

Since the chi-square statistic is lower than the chi-square critical value at five (5) percent level of significance, the null hypothesis is *accepted*; thus, there is *no significant correlation* between monthly family income and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor (0.003 against 0.195), environmental factor (0.046 against 0.195), health and nutrition factor (0.025 against 0.195), school-related factor (-0.029 against 0.195), and study habit factor (0.022 against 0.195).

Table 12

Correlation between the Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents and their Monthly Family Income		
Factors Affecting Reading Performance	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation
Home Factor	0.003	Not Significant
Environmental Factor	0.046	Not Significant
Health and Nutrition Factor	0.025	Not Significant
School-Related Factor	-0.029	Not Significant
Study Habit Factor	0.022	Not Significant
<i>The critical correlation coefficient at .05 level of significance and 98 degrees of freedom is .195</i>		

Table 13 shows the correlation between the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents and their word recognition using the chi-square test.

Since the chi-square statistic is lower than the chi-square critical value at five (5) percent level of significance, the null hypothesis is *accepted*; thus, there is *no significant correlation* between word recognition and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor (-0.077 against 0.195), environmental factor (-0.034 against 0.195), health and nutrition factor (-0.007 against 0.195), school-related factor (-0.075 against 0.195), and study habit factor (0.001 against 0.195).

Table 13

Correlation between the Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents and their Word Recognition		
Factors Affecting Word Recognition	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation
Home Factor	-0.077	Not Significant
Environmental Factor	-0.034	Not Significant
Health and Nutrition Factor	-0.007	Not Significant
School-Related Factor	-0.075	Not Significant
Study Habit Factor	0.001	Not Significant
<i>The critical correlation coefficient at .05 level of significance and 98 degrees of freedom is .195</i>		

Table 14 shows the correlation between the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents and their reading comprehension using the chi-square test.

Since the chi-square statistic is lower than the chi-square critical value at five (5) percent level of significance, the null hypothesis is *accepted*; thus, there is *no significant correlation* between reading comprehension and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor (-0.127 against 0.195), environmental factor (-0.088 against 0.195), health and nutrition factor (-0.027 against 0.195), school-related factor (-0.059 against 0.195), and study habit factor (0.065 against 0.195).

Table 14

Correlation between the Factors Affecting the Reading Performance of the Respondents and their Reading Comprehension		
Factors Affecting Word Recognition	Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation
Home Factor	-0.127	Not Significant
Environmental Factor	-0.088	Not Significant
Health and Nutrition Factor	-0.027	Not Significant
School-Related Factor	-0.059	Not Significant
Study Habit Factor	0.065	Not Significant
<i>The critical correlation coefficient at .05 level of significance and 98 degrees of freedom is .195</i>		

CONCLUSION

Most of the respondents were males belonging to age nine (9) years old having three (3) to four (4) siblings with normal nutritional status and belonging to families with P9,999 and below monthly income. Majority of the respondents perceived that home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor had high effect to the reading performance of the respondents. Most of the respondents were classified as can read and can comprehend. There was no significant correlation between age and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor. There was significant correlation between age and health and nutrition factor as one of the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents. There was no significant correlation between gender and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor. There was no significant correlation between number of siblings and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor. There was no significant correlation between nutritional status and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit

factor. There was no significant correlation between monthly family income and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, and school-related factor. There was significant correlation between monthly family income and study habit as one of the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents. There was no significant correlation between word recognition and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor. There was no significant correlation between reading comprehension and the factors affecting the reading performance of the respondents such as home factor, environmental factor, health and nutrition factor, school-related factor, and study habit factor.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Parents must find jobs or have income generating activities for additional budget of the family.
2. . Parents and teachers must be aware of the contributory factors that affect the reading performance of the pupils such as home, environment, health and nutrition, school, and study habit.
3. Parents, teachers, and learners must be oriented on the significance of having improved reading performance.
4. Parents, teachers, and learners must be aware that there are various factors that exist from time to time that may affect the reading performance of the pupils.
5. Parents and teachers must work together in motivating and inspiring the pupils to improve their reading performance.
6. Teachers must match their reading programs, projects, and activities according to the needs of the pupils.
7. Pupils must spare some of their time in improving their reading performance.
8. The reading performance of the pupils must be enhanced through the implementation of various reading programs, projects, and activities.
9. The school must strengthen the implementation of their reading programs, projects, and

activities for the benefit of the pupils.

10. The proposed reading module in improving the reading performance of the pupils must be used.
11. Other related studies may be considered to determine other factors affecting the reading performance of the pupils.

REFERENCES

1. Braddock, P. (2016, February). *Reading and young learners*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/reading-young-learners>
2. Da Silva, B. (2016). *Make book reading a time for conversations*. Retrieved from <http://www.hanen.org/Helpful-Info/Articles/Make-Book-Reading-a-Time-for-Conversations.aspx>
3. Koochi, A. L. (2018). *The power of turn-taking: How back-and-forth interactions help children learn language*. Retrieved from <http://www.hanen.org/Helpful-Info/Articles/power-turn-taking.aspx>
4. Kowalczyk, D. (2018, February 4). *Descriptive research design: definition, examples, and types*. Retrieved from <https://study.com/academy/lesson/descriptive-research-design-definition-examples-types.html>
5. Montgomery, C. (2018, November 4). *Howto improve reading comprehension: 8 experts tips*. Retrieved from <https://blog.prepscholar.com/how-to-improve-reading-comprehension>
6. Pennington, M. (2018, July 6). *Should we teach reading comprehension strategies?* Retrieved from <https://literacyworldwide.org/blog%2Fliteracy-daily%2F2018%2F07%2F06%2Fshould-we-teach-reading-comprehension-strategies>
7. Rule, P. (2017, December 9). *South Africa has a reading crisis: Why and what can be done about it?* Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/south-africa-has-a-reading-crisis-why-and-what-can-be-done-about-it-88711>
8. Upen (2018, June 21). *Difference between descriptive and experimental research*. Retrieved from <http://pediaa.com/difference-between-descriptive-and-experimental->



[research/](#)

9. Wexler, N. (2018, April 13). *What American students haven't gotten better at reading in 20 years?* Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/04/american-students-reading/557915/>