

Scarborough's Reading Rope Model: Basis for Reading Pamphlet Development

Jose Ganiel M. Pizarra^a, Cecilia Q. Velasco^b, Reyna B. Angeles^c

^a joseganiel.pizarra@deped.gov.ph, ^bcecilia.velasco@lspu.edu.ph, ^creyna.angeles@lspu.edu.ph

^aDepartment of Education, Lutucan Integrated National High School, Sariaya, Quezon, 4322, Philippines

^bLaguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo Campus, 4000, Philippines

^cLaguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo Campus, 4000, Philippines

Abstract

Reading difficulties among secondary learners remain a significant concern, particularly in the development of language comprehension skills necessary for academic success. This study aimed to identify the reading difficulties of Grade 8 students at Lutucan Integrated National High School and develop a targeted reading pamphlet based on their identified needs. Using a descriptive-developmental research design, the study assessed learners' performance in phonological awareness, decoding skills, vocabulary, and grammar and syntax through a diagnostic reading test. Findings revealed that while students demonstrated strong decoding abilities, they experienced notable difficulties in vocabulary, grammar and syntax, and certain aspects of phonological awareness, particularly phoneme identification. These results indicated that the learners' reading challenges were more related to language comprehension than word recognition. In response, a targeted reading pamphlet focusing on phonological awareness, vocabulary development, and grammar and syntax was developed using explicit and structured instructional strategies. The material was evaluated by English education experts using the Department of Education Learning Resources Management and Development System standards and was found to meet the required evaluation criteria. The study concludes that the developed reading pamphlet is a valid instructional material for addressing the identified reading difficulties of Grade 8 learners.

Keywords: Scarborough's Reading Rope, reading, phonological awareness, vocabulary, grammar

1. Introduction

Education systems around the world were disrupted by the COVID19 pandemic, especially in the Philippines. The Department of Education (DepEd) had figured out several ways of delivering lessons so that the students may continue even in the event of school closures. Modular Distance Learning (MDL) became one of the widely used means to continue schooling, most especially in areas with limited access to the internet. Even though MDL permitted students to continue their studies, it also worsened the existing problems in reading, making it more visible.

Reading is a gateway skill that aids students' learning in all subjects. It is also vital for lifelong learning and to function in everyday life. However, recent reports from the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) highlighted that most of the students were reading at the frustration level. It means that they struggle to comprehend the material they read, have inadequate vocabulary, read slowly, and cannot read without assistance. This makes it tougher for them to learn and to develop higher-order thinking skills.

Since reading is an integral skill in learning, finding solution for these difficulties necessitates immediate and targeted intervention. This study aims to identify the causal influences contributing to reading difficulties among Grade 8 students in Lutucan Integrated National High School (LINHS). Moreover, these discoveries will serve as the basis for developing a reading pamphlet specifically intended to address the specific needs of the learners, foster reading engagements, and augment reading proficiency among the students in an attempt to purposely close the learning gap in Philippine education context.

2. Objectives of the Study

This study sought to identify the reading challenges of Grade 8 students at Lutucan Integrated National High School and to develop a targeted reading pamphlet based on their specific needs.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of reading performance of the respondents in terms of:
 - a. phonological awareness;
 - b. decoding skills;
 - c. vocabulary; and
 - d. grammar/syntax?
2. What components and strategies should be included in the targeted reading pamphlet to address the identified reading difficulties?
3. What is the evaluation result of the reading pamphlet based on the DepEd Learning Resources Management and Development System (LRMDs) standards in terms of:
 - a. content;
 - b. format;
 - c. presentation and organization; and
 - d. accuracy and up-to-datedness of information?

3. Methodology

This research used a descriptive-developmental design. The initial descriptive phase sought to determine what specific reading difficulties students from Lutucan Integrated National High School (LINHS) in Grade 8 had encountered through direct assessments of their reading ability. Phonological awareness, decoding, vocabulary and grammar were the four targets of consideration for this descriptive phase of research.

The targeted reading pamphlet that was developed was created based on the specific students identified as having reading difficulties in the initial descriptive research phase. Those students were identified based on the results of the needs assessment completed during the initial descriptive research phase as well as on established reading theory, specifically Scarborough's Reading Rope (2001).

The targeted reading pamphlet was developed in order to meet the unique needs of struggling readers and to support teachers in providing targeted reading instruction. This descriptive-developmental design has

provided an opportunity to expand the understanding of learner needs and has also produced a usable product to address those learner needs.

The respondents of this study were 157 purposely picked grade 8 students from LINHS, Sariaya, Quezon. The participants completed the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) and identified as having a reading level below the expected grade level. The criteria for the purpose of selection were based on their identified reading challenges, independent reading capabilities, and overall reading fluency as evidenced by the degree to which they generally struggle as independent readers at the frustration level. The sample also ensures the experimental group of readers selected have the characteristics associated with readers for whom reading intervention materials are intended.

The population for this study were all grade 8 students at LINHS, who were classified as being at the frustration level of reading, that is 854 students in total. For this study, purposive sampling was utilized to select 157 participants who have major difficulties in reading because of the limitations of the requirements and nature of the study.

There were three main phases to the data gathering for the study: identification of respondents, administration of diagnostic assessments, and development and evaluation of the reading pamphlet. Following the development of a research proposal and gaining approval from the principal and Division Office, the researcher selected a sample of 157 Grade 8 students whose initial Phil-IRI data showed them to be reading below grade level.

The diagnostic reading assessments that were administered measured various components of reading. Four types of reading sub-skills were measured: phonological awareness, decoding, vocabulary, and grammar/syntax. Three English Education specialists reviewed the diagnostic reading assessment tool to determine the reliability and validity of the tool.

Using the information generated from the diagnostic assessments, the researcher was able to identify which sub-skills were significantly deficient among the study participants. This information was used to create a reading pamphlet designed to help students with deficits in the identified sub-skills expected from Scarborough's Reading Rope.

After the reading pamphlet was developed, five Education specialists evaluated it using the DepEd Learning Resource Evaluation Tool. The feedback provided was incorporated into the final draft to ensure the resource was instructional appropriate, clear, and relevant.

Frequency counts, percentages and mean frequency of correct responses were utilized to determine the level of reading performance of the respondents in terms of phonological awareness, decoding skills, vocabulary and grammar/syntax. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the total number and percent of respondents who answered correctly each item and frequency mean was computed to summarize the average number of correct responses per indicator.

The results obtained from the reading performance assessment were analyzed to identify the least and most developed reading skills of the respondents. The identified areas of difficulty served as the basis for selecting appropriate components and strategies in the development of the reading pamphlet.

A researcher-adapted mastery level interpretation scale with corresponding instructional needs was used to interpret the performance level of the respondents. This scale is anchored on Mastery Learning Theory, which holds that ‘all learners can learn the learning objectives provided that such learning is approached with sufficient time, appropriate instruction, and corrective feedback’ (Bloom, 1968; Bloom, 1971). Therefore, performance-based classification is used to determine the degree to which learners have attained instructional objectives and to determine follow-up instructional decisions.

The interpretation scale used is presented below:

Percentage Range	Mastery Level	Needs Interpretation
90–100%	Mastery	Low Need
75–89%	Proficient	Minimal Need
60–74%	Basic	Moderate Need
Below 60%	Below Basic	High Need

Note: The interpretation scale is researcher-adapted and anchored on Mastery Learning Theory (Bloom, 1968; 1971), which emphasizes mastery of learning objectives through appropriate instruction, feedback, and corrective learning interventions.

This researcher-adapted scale was developed to provide a clearer and more meaningful interpretation of learner performance in relation to the learning objectives of the study. It also served to translate quantitative scores into instructional implications, consistent with the principles of mastery learning, which emphasize continuous improvement through feedback and corrective instruction

The results obtained from the reading performance assessment were analyzed to identify the least and most developed reading skills of the respondents. The identified areas of difficulty served as the basis for selecting appropriate components and strategies in the development of the reading pamphlet.

To determine the evaluation result of the reading pamphlet, expert ratings were analyzed using the DepEd Learning Resources Management and Development System (LRMDs) evaluation tool, in terms of content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-datedness of information.

For each factor (content, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and up-to-datedness of information), the mean scores per indicator were summed to obtain the total score. The total scores were then compared with the prescribed LRMDs cut-off scores to determine the evaluation result:

Indicator	Cut-Off Scores
Content	minimum of 21 out of 28 points
Format	minimum of 54 out of 72 points
Presentation and Organization	minimum of 15 out of 20 points
Accuracy and Up-to-datedness of Information	must obtain 24 out of 24 points

A factor was deemed as PASSED if it achieved or exceeded the cutoff score, and as FAILED otherwise. The overall rating of the reading pamphlet was determined by whether or not all of the criteria were rated PASSED.

4. Results and Discussion

Level of Reading Performance of the Respondents

Table 1. Level of Reading Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Phonological Awareness

Indicator	Mean Frequency (Correct Responses)	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
Phoneme Identification	61.3	39.5	Below Basic / High Need
Phoneme Deletion	147	93.6	Mastery / Low Need
Syllable Segmentation	108.3	69	Basic / Moderate Need
Average/ Overall	105.5	67.2	Basic / Moderate Need

Legend: 90–100% = Mastery/Low Need; 75–89% = Proficient/Minimal Need; 60–74% = Basic/Moderate Need; Below 60% = Below Basic/High Need.

Table 1 highlights the reading performance of the respondents in the three indicators of phonological awareness: phoneme identification, phoneme deletion, and syllable segmentation. The indicator with the highest mean frequency of 147 or 93.6% was phoneme deletion, interpreted as Mastery or Low Need, while syllable segmentation followed with a mean frequency of 108.3 or 69%, which is under the Basic or Moderate Need level. Lowest is phoneme identification, with a mean frequency of 61.3 or 39.5% for the indicator, which is classified in the Below Basic or High Need level. The overall average mean frequency of 105.5, or 67.2%, puts the respondents at the Basic or Moderate Need level of phonological awareness.

If there is one thing that the results imply, it is an imbalance in the phonological awareness of the respondents. The high performance in phoneme deletion implies sound manipulation, mainly by working with words in a structured and familiar context. But, seeing the lowest in phoneme identification demonstrates difficulty in isolating and recognizing distinct sounds in spoken words. Phoneme awareness is a core phonological skill and is essential to readers' decoding development. Performance that is moderate in syllable segmentation suggests that students may have more strengths in larger units but falter when they go down to smaller, individual units. There is a tone of unevenness in their phonological development pattern, wherein certain subskills are developed while others remain weak. Such imbalance will hinder their reading development. It is difficult to recognize words if one is incompetent at the phoneme level.

Such findings lead back to the study of Milankov et al (2021), wherein the authors acknowledge phonological awareness as a major foundation for reading acquisition, even in totally transparent orthographies, while they emphasize that deficits in specific components, especially phoneme identification, disrupt a learner's decoding process. Weaknesses in phonological awareness are correlated with persistent word-reading difficulties, says the same author in another study (Peng and Goodrich, 2020).

Veríssimo et al (2021) affirm that phonological awareness is the most studied skill for reading and writing success, and Effects of explicitly producing phonological awareness “through fun and creative targeted games and activities have been plentiful.” In the Philippines, Dela Cruz (2022) and Reyes (2021) reveal that consistent exposure to phonemic awareness activities, specifically, blending, segmenting, and rhyming, improve the reading fluency and pronunciation among secondary learners. Reading interventions in Grade 8 ought to include more of such kind of structured phonological activities targeting the identified weakness in phoneme identification.

Table 2. Level of Reading Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Decoding Skills

Indicator	Mean Frequency (Correct Responses)	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
Reading Aloud	151.8	96.7	Mastery / Low Need
Decoding Pseudowords	143	91.1	Mastery / Low Need
Average/ Overall	147.4	93.9	Mastery / Low Need

Legend: 90–100% = Mastery/Low Need; 75–89% = Proficient/Minimal Need; 60–74% = Basic/Moderate Need; Below 60% = Below Basic/High Need.

Table 2 displays the results of the respondents' reading performance on the area of decoding skills on the two indicators, "read aloud" and "decode pseudowords", with the results showing a mean frequency of 151.8 (96.0%). On higher level scores again, this performance can be interpreted as Mastery or Low Need. Similarly, decoding pseudowords yielded a mean frequency of 143, or 91.1%, which can also be interpreted as Mastery or Low Need. The overall mean frequency of 147.4, or 93.9%, indicates that the respondents have gained a Mastery or Low Need level in decoding skills, and again, is the highest performance across the domains identified in this study.

As shown in the results, the respondents maintained a consistently high performance across both of the decoding indicators. Decoding pseudowords is an interesting indicator because to do well on the task one must use a strategy that relies solely on grapheme-phoneme correspondence, as opposed to word memory or contextual clues to decode them. This indicates automatic and accurate application of phonics rules, and reflects an important part of reading since accurate word recognition provides fluent reading. However, such decoding mastery does not guarantee comprehension. The students can accurately read both familiar and less familiar words, but the skill does not result in text comprehension. Perhaps the main constraints in reading are not at the word level, but instead at the level of higher order language processing skill in the area of vocabulary.

Consistent with this, Washburn (2022) found that decoding fluency, although essential, is not enough for comprehension because the reader must also have adequate knowledge of language for constructing meaning. Kim et al. (2021) found that while decoding and oral reading fluency contribute to comprehension in the early grades, the contributions of the measures are reduced in the upper grades suggesting that comprehension is facilitated more by language factor skills.

In the same manner, Gebremariam and Weldeyohannes (2025) observed that reading proficiency encompasses more than accurate word reading and recognizes that vocabulary, comprehension and linguistic processing are also crucial in reading.

Table 3. Level of Reading Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Vocabulary

Indicator	Mean Frequency (Correct Responses)	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
Understanding Word Meaning	101.4	64.6	Basic / Moderate Need
Fill-in-the-Blanks	120.3	76.6	Proficient / Minimal Need
Sentence Creation	58.5	37.3	Below Basic / High Need
Average/ Overall	93.4	59.5	Below Basic / High Need

Legend: 90–100% = Mastery/Low Need; 75–89% = Proficient/Minimal Need; 60–74% = Basic/Moderate Need; Below 60% = Below Basic/High Need.

Table 3 shows results based on reading performance of the respondents in vocabulary as measured by understanding word meaning, fill-in-the-blanks, and sentence creation. Of the three, fill-in-the-blanks had

the highest mean frequency of 120.3 or 76.6%, Proficient or Minimal Need. Understanding word meaning is next with a mean frequency of 101.4 or 64.6%, Basic or Moderate Need. Finally, sentence creation is the lowest mean frequency 50.3 or 37.3%, Below Basic or High Need, and average mean frequency is 93.4 or 59.5%, probable Below Basic or High Need.

There is apparently a gap between respondents' receptive vocabulary and productive vocabulary. By this measure they seem to know what it is, with a relatively high level of fill-in-the-blanks, but do not have the knowledge flexible enough to use word relatively well in sentence formation. Filling in a blank requires recognition of meaning, but requires only knowledge of word meaning. It provides a great deal of support for word to be used. When asked to use a word in communicating with others, an area of reading comprehension, the same learner has difficulty applying or stretching existing knowledge of word meaning to that context. To comprehend is to grasp, and to move meaning through language requires that one understands clearly the original meaning of every word.

The Basic or Moderate Need level in understanding word meaning suggests that students have a shallow depth of vocabulary knowledge. They may recognize certain words, but the understanding fails to go deep enough that it is flexible. The mismatch between recognition and production is consistent with vocabulary learning patterns, where receptive knowledge arises first.

Since vocabulary knowledge is a major contributor to reading comprehension skill (Dong et al., 2020), the overall Below Basic or High Need performance indicates a large limitation in literacy development (Wilde, 2018). When students lack depth and flexibility, the quantity of vocabulary knowledge may not be enough to decipher ideas of others or make clear sense in their thoughts.

The findings are echoed by Allal-Sumoto et al (2023), which state that learners can sometimes acquire word meanings through exposure without the corresponding skill of using those meanings purposefully. Snoder and Laufer (2022) also find that learners can recognize many words in texts read but regularly fail to use them when speaking or writing. In addition,

Dong et al (2020) point out that vocabulary knowledge accounts for a large portion of the variance in reading comprehension scores, particularly in the secondary samples used in their meta-analysis. Lawrence et al. (2022) found that proficient readers exhibit greater knowledge and more flexible use of academic vocabulary, suggesting that lack of vocabulary limits how well students continue to progress through the grades in their reading abilities.

Table 4. Level of Reading Performance of the Respondents in Terms of Grammar and Syntax

Indicator	Mean Frequency (Correct Responses)	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
Identifying Grammatical Error	49.4	31.5	Below Basic / High Need
Arranging the Sentence	89.2	56.8	Below Basic / High Need
Average/ Overall	63.9	44.1	Below Basic / High Need

Legend: 90–100% = Mastery/Low Need; 75–89% = Proficient/Minimal Need; 60–74% = Basic/Moderate Need; Below 60% = Below Basic/High Need.

The mean frequencies of the respondents' grammar and syntax performance, in identifying a grammatical error and arranging the sentence, are presented in Table 4. The identifying a grammatical error indicator had the lowest performance level of any indicator examined throughout this study, with only a mean frequency of 49.4 and an overall percentage of 31.5%, which is classified as Below Basic or High Need. The mean frequency of respondents when arranging the sentence was slightly higher at 89.2, as reflected by their

percentage of 56.8%, but both of these indicators remain classified as Below Basic or High Need. With a total overall mean frequency of 63.9 or 44.1% for both indicators, it is evident that grammar and syntax represent the weakest domain of the four examined during this study and will therefore require the most amount of instructional support.

The overall performance results indicate that the respondents struggle significantly with grammatical and syntactical processing. In particular, the extremely low performance level for identifying a grammatical error indicates limited metalinguistic awareness, or the ability to recognize and reflect on language structure. Without this skill, the students may have a difficult time monitoring correctness and meaning while reading.

The performance results for arranging the sentence also represent a struggle to make meaning due to not understanding how word order and syntactic relationships contribute to meaning. This skill is critical to interpreting the meaning of a sentence, especially when reading more complex academic texts. Together, these results demonstrate that the students have not yet developed sufficient control of the grammatical structures needed to support their ability to comprehend what they read.

In addition, the above results further emphasize the importance of grammar and syntax, within both domains of reading comprehension. Scarborough's Reading Rope states that language structures, like grammar and syntax, are foundational constructs within the language comprehension strand that contribute to being a skilled reader. Readers who do not have a strong understanding of grammar may have difficulty with processing the meaning of sentences, understanding relationships between ideas, and comprehending increasingly complex academic materials. This indicates that explicit instruction in grammar and syntax must occur to enhance students' comprehension skills and overall reading performance.

These results are consistent with numerous recent studies emphasizing the role of grammar in reading comprehension. Zheng et al. (2023) completed a meta-analysis of 86 studies evaluating the relationship between grammatical knowledge and reading comprehension across all grade levels and indicated a statistically significant and moderate-to-strong relationship, that is, syntax represents a critical component in the construction of meaning. Marjokorpi (2024) similarly noted that grammatical knowledge is a significant influence on reading comprehension for secondary students, even when other factors are taken into consideration.

Nielsen et al. (2025) described syntactic comprehension as a unique contributor to overall reading performance, separate from vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, given all of the abovementioned results, it can be concluded that there is a considerable need for explicit instruction in grammar and sentence structure for the purpose of helping students to identify errors and understand how syntax affects the production of meaning.

Table 5. Overall Level of Reading Performance of the Respondents Across All Domains

Indicator	Mean Frequency (Correct Responses)	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
Phonological Awareness	105.5	67.2	Basic / Moderate Need
Decoding Skills	147.4	93.9	Mastery / Low Need
Vocabulary	93.4	59.5	Below Basic / High Need
Grammar and Syntax	63.9	44.1	Below Basic / High Need
Overall Reading Performance	102.6	65.3	Basic / Moderate Need

Legend: 90–100% = Mastery/Low Need; 75–89% = Proficient/Minimal Need; 60–74% = Basic/Moderate Need; Below

60% = Below Basic/High Need.

The four key areas of reading skills for the study are presented in Table 5, and the reading performance of the participants is classified in the four areas of reading skills. Respondents perform best in decoding skills (93.9%), which fall into the Mastery/Low Need category of reading performance. The next best performance area is Phonological Awareness (67.2%), which classifies respondents as having Basic/Moderate Need for Phonological Awareness to improve their reading skills; both Vocabulary and Grammar & Syntax classify the respondents as Below Basic/High Need (59.5% and 44.1% respectively). Based on these results, the respondents' overall reading performance is at the Basic/ Moderate Need level because the overall mean frequency for which they read was 102.6 or 65.3% of respondents.

Across the four areas of reading skills, the results indicate that respondents have strong decoding skills and can accurately read words, but as the skills shift to language-based skills such as vocabulary and grammar and syntax, they perform more poorly in reading comprehension. The low scores in Vocabulary as well as grammar and syntax indicate that respondents have difficulty understanding the meaning of a word, creating sentences and understand the relationship among the words within the text. These results suggest that although respondents can accurately read words, they may have difficulty deriving meaning from what they read as well as constructing meaning from what they read.

This difference between the skill of decoding, which is a lower-level skill, and the skills of vocabulary and grammar and syntax, higher-level skills, is indicative of the gap between lower- and higher-order reading skills. Decoding is the foundation of reading. However, comprehension depends on vocabulary and syntactic awareness. As such when either or both of these higher-order skills are lacking, reading will be mechanical instead of meaningful. Therefore, the overall Basic/ Moderate Need classification masks a more specific issue, which is that the deficiency is found within the language achievement categories rather than the decoding category.

These results replicate what Washburn (2022) found regarding adolescent struggling readers on the Test of Silent Reading Comprehension Subtest (2003), who had typically adequate decoding skills but poor comprehension skills as a result of weakness in vocabulary and syntactic knowledge. Gebremariam and Weldeyohannes (2025) concluded that reading achievement involves more than just phonics instruction because reading achievement also requires vocabulary development and grammatical awareness.

Within the Philippine context, the Programme for International Student Assessment 158 National Report in 2018 identified low reading proficiency on the part of Filipino learners and cited comprehension difficulties as a result of limited vocabulary and a lack of grammatical awareness of how to use language as one structure. The present finding that the lowest reading performance was in Vocabulary and Grammar & Syntax aligns with the results of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2018 study.

Taken together, these results support the need for reading interventions specifically focused on developing vocabulary and grammar awareness in order to improve comprehension skills of respondents. Improving these areas of weakness will help respondents move from mechanically reading words correctly to understanding meaning from text.

Components and Strategies of the Targeted Reading Pamphlet in Addressing the Identified Reading Difficulties

Needs Basis of the Pamphlet

The results of the diagnostic assessment show a lopsided reading profile with decoding at the mastery level, indicating word recognition and phonics application are intact, but performance drops off in the language-based areas. Phonological awareness is at the moderate level, but critical weakness is located in phoneme/percentage. Vocabulary and grammar and syntax are more pronounced weaknesses, and both are below basic level. Students struggle with productive vocabulary, such as using vocabulary in sentences, with recognizing and constructing grammatically correct sentences, with organizing ideas in a break within a sentence, with using language structures that correspond with the meanings of the text or information and situations in school to convey the impressions gained from all those experiences in an act of academic reading.

These results indicate that the main obstacle to reading development is no longer decoding, but making the processing and constructing of meaning through language. The results thus warrant a need for a specific instructional material focusing on strengthening phoneme level awareness, growing vocabulary knowledge toward productive use, as well as grammatical and syntactic capabilities.

Components of the Reading Pamphlet

The assessment identified three areas of need, which were used to develop the following contents of the reading pamphlet: phonological awareness, vocabulary development, and grammar/syntax. Each area was directly related to the lowest performing areas in the assessment to ensure that the instructional material provided a targeted approach to instruction. The material is based upon the Scarborough Reading Rope (Scarborough, 2001), which indicates that children become proficient readers when they integrate two different types of reading skills: word-recognition and language-comprehension skills. The sub-skills outlined in this reading pamphlet will assist the reader in developing skilled reading through their ongoing development of reading through the development of the subskills that will lead to proficient reading.

The phonological awareness component includes phonemic recognition as the least achieved skill as evident from the assessment, and will provide the learner with the opportunity to isolate, recognize and manipulate the sounds within the words of the English language, therefore, activities are included for the learners to reinforce their learning in syllable segmentation to further assist those learners who currently only possess moderate skills at this subskill level. In addition, the activities for phoneme deletion will be only minimally included due to the learners' ability to successfully complete this requirement. This component will assist the learners in developing the phonological awareness component of the Scarborough Reading Rope, therefore building their sound-processing skills to increase accurate decoding and fluent reading skills.

The vocabulary component addresses not only the depth of word knowledge but the ability to use the words independently of the learners in different contexts through the provision of opportunities to be able to perform the action verbs contained within each of the vocabulary words applied in the own context of the learner. In addition, the instructional methods used throughout the vocabulary component will provide contextualized examples and practice as well as provide learners with opportunities for guided sentence construction in order to develop the flexible and functional use of the words learned. Therefore, the vocabulary component of the reading pamphlet supports the language comprehension component of the Scarborough Reading Rope by providing the instructional tools required for learners to develop the necessary vocabulary for verbal reasoning and therefore, the development of the vocabulary for text comprehension.

The grammar/syntax component of the reading pamphlet provides explicit instruction and activities used in the development of the learners' ability to produce grammatically correct statements. Therefore, the learners will be given the opportunity to develop their construction of a sentence by providing explicit instruction and activities in relation to sentence structure, word order, and grammatical relationships as they

relate to readers' comprehension; thus, the grammar/syntax component of the reading pamphlet will support the learners in developing an understanding of the structural components of the English language, which will ultimately lead to the success of readers in obtaining comprehension from more complex text.

In addition, the sequence of activities in the Reading pamphlet follows Gagné's (1985) Hierarchical Learning Theory, which requires learners to develop their foundational skills so that they can progress to more advanced and complex skills. The reading pamphlet is sequenced to build upon foundational literacy skills from sound awareness to vocabulary use and sentence construction, like basic skills build upon one another, to allow learners to develop the skills necessary for reading comprehension.

Instructional Strategies

The effectiveness of the reading pamphlet is based on the use of research-proven instructional strategies that are matched to the identified learner needs. First, explicit instruction is used throughout all areas to provide clear modeling, guided practice, and structured progression. This approach is most effective with learners who have reading problems due to its reduction of ambiguity and gradual acquisition of skills (Archer & Hughes, 2011). Each activity in the pamphlet follows a scaffolded structure that progresses through demonstration, guided practice, and then independent performance.

Secondly, contextualized and interactive vocabulary instruction is integrated in order to build both receptive and productive vocabulary skills. Context creates meaning for the word by using it within meaningful sentences and brief passages. The activities, such as sentence construction, are included in order to help learners retain and use those words. Research has demonstrated that learners are better able to learn vocabulary when the vocabulary is used in context and actively used by them (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2013).

Thirdly, metalinguistic and sentence-level instruction is utilized in the grammar and syntax section. The activities require learners to analyze, construct, and manipulate different sentence types. This type of learning will help to develop syntactic awareness, which is a necessary component of reading comprehension (Zheng et al., 2023).

Overall, the reading pamphlet follows a scaffolded model in order to build a gradual transfer of responsibility from guided support to independence in applying the skills. All learners will have exposure to the skills and will be able to apply them successfully.

Structure and Organization of the Reading Pamphlet

The reading pamphlet follows this format quite intuitively, starting with orientation, and then heading towards more advanced skills, in this case involving phonological awareness, vocabulary, grammar and syntactic skill building.

The cover page is followed by an introduction, explaining what the material is for and giving learners advice on how to work through the pamphlet.

The body offers three sections of explicit instruction around the areas of need identified in the diagnosis. The phonological awareness section is five pages based almost entirely on phoneme identification activities which measure the most severely underdeveloped subskill in this domain. In these activities learner recognize, isolate, and manipulate sounds as they work to develop the phonological processing skills at the core of reading development.

Following this is a seven-page vocabulary section developing both word meaning and productive vocabulary practice, also through contextualized guided activities. Learners use new words in context as they build their vocabulary through sentence building and guided practice.

The grammar and syntactic skill building is also seven pages long, teaching learners about sentence mechanics through exercises on building sentences, identifying grammatical errors, and having syntactic awareness. Again, while five pages are provided for the phonological activities, clearly it is the severity of difficulty reflected in the scores, and not any other form of bias or judgment we hold, that leads us to devote fewer pages to phonological awareness, and more to vocabulary and grammar.

Clear instructions and learner centric activities guide learners in completing and adjusting tasks to their level, and to close this section is a two-page sample comprehension test that actually learners may utilize, applying skills developed and worked on throughout these other sections. Ending the materials is a page of tips for reading and revitalizing learner interest.

In total, the organization of this pamphlet is clear, orderly, and follows a developmental sequence intuitive and familiar to the learners.

Table 6. Evaluation Result of the Reading Pamphlet in terms of Content Based on DepEd LRMDs Standards

Content Indicators	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. Content is suitable to the student's level of development.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2. Material contributes to the achievement of specific objectives of the subject area and grade/year level for which it is intended.	3.8	Very Satisfactory (VS)
3. Material provides for the development of higher cognitive skills such as critical thinking, creativity, learning by doing, inquiry, problem solving, etc.	3.6	Very Satisfactory (VS)
4. Material is free of ideological, cultural, religious, racial, and gender biases and prejudices.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
5. Material enhances the development of desirable values and traits.	3.8	Very Satisfactory (VS)
6. Material has the potential to arouse interest of target reader.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
7. Adequate warning/cautionary notes are provided in topics and activities where safety and health are of concern.	3.2	Satisfactory (S)
Total Score/ Evaluation Result	26.4	PASSED

Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 = Very Satisfactory (VS); 2.51 – 3.25 = Satisfactory (S); 1.76 – 2.50 = Poor (P); 1.00 – 1.75 = Not Satisfactory (NS). The cut-off score for content is minimum of 21 out of 28 points.

Table 6 presents the evaluation results of the reading pamphlet in terms of content based on the Department of Education Learning Resources Management and Development System (LRMDS) standards. Six out of seven content indicators received a Very Satisfactory rating, with mean scores ranging from 3.6 to 4.0. These include suitability to the learners' developmental level (4.0), freedom from ideological and other biases (4.0), ability to arouse interest (4.0), contribution to learning objectives (3.8), promotion of desirable values and traits (3.8), and development of higher-order thinking skills (3.6). The indicator on the provision of adequate cautionary notes received a Satisfactory rating (3.2). The total content score of 26.4 exceeds the required minimum of 21 out of 28, resulting in a PASSED evaluation.

The high ratings consistently received by the reading pamphlet indicate that it meets the standards of the curriculum and is suitable for its intended audience. The strong developmental appropriateness, interest, and lack of bias ratings received by the reading pamphlet are all essential to promoting engagement,

accessibility, and motivation, all of which are important for reading intervention materials. Therefore, the lower rating of cautionary notes does not greatly affect the overall rating by this evaluator and does not diminish from the overall rating of the reading pamphlet, because cautionary notes are less important than the overall purpose of the reading material itself.

The overall evaluations indicate that the reading pamphlet content is adequate to achieve the learning objectives for the Grade 8 student population demonstrating reading difficulties, and there is evidence of congruence between the intended instructional outcomes of the reading pamphlet and the needs of the learner, which is an important condition for effective intervention.

Support for these findings is reinforced by Agana (2023) in that teacher-created instructional materials evaluated with the same criteria can receive high content ratings when created to meet the needs of the learner and aligned to the curriculum. Furthermore, Gebremariam and Weldeyohannes (2025) indicated that effective reading materials must provide accurate, relevant, and meaningful content to support comprehension and language development.

Table 7. Evaluation Result of the Reading Pamphlet in terms of Format Based on DepEd LRMDs Standards

Format Indicators	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. Print		
1.1 Size of letters is appropriate to the intended user.	3.6	Very Satisfactory (VS)
1.2 Spaces between letters and words facilitate reading.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
1.3 Font is easy to read.	3.8	Very Satisfactory (VS)
1.4 Printing is of good quality (i.e., no broken letters, even density, correct alignment, properly placed screen registration).	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2. Illustration		
2.1 Simple and easily recognizable.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.2 Clarify and supplement the text.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.3 Properly labelled or captioned (if applicable).	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.4 Realistic / appropriate colors.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.5 Attractive and appealing.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.6 Culturally relevant.	3.8	Very Satisfactory (VS)
3. Design and Layout		
3.1 Attractive and pleasing to look at.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
3.2 Simple (i.e., does not distract the attention of the reader).	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
3.3 Adequate illustration in relation to text.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
3.4 Harmonious blending of elements (e.g., illustrations and text).	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
4. Paper and Binding		
4.1 Paper used contributes to easy reading.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
4.2 Durable binding to withstand frequent use.	3.6	Very Satisfactory (VS)
5. Size and Weight of Resource		
5.1 Easy to handle.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
5.2 Relatively light.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
Total Score/ Evaluation Result	70.8	PASSED

Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 = Very Satisfactory (VS); 2.51 – 3.25 = Satisfactory (S); 1.76 – 2.50 = Poor (P); 1.00 – 1.75 = Not Satisfactory (NS). The cut-off score for format is minimum of 54 out of 72 points.

Table 7 presents the format evaluation of the reading pamphlet across five sub-categories: print, illustration, design and layout, paper and binding, and size and weight. All 18 format indicators received

ratings in the Very Satisfactory range, with scores from 3.6 to 4.0. For print, letter spacing (4.0) and printing quality (4.0) obtained the highest ratings, while letter size (3.6) and font readability (3.8) were also rated Very Satisfactory. All six illustration indicators received high ratings, with cultural relevance obtaining the lowest score at 3.8. Design and layout, as well as size and weight, all received perfect scores of 4.0. Paper quality was rated 4.0, while binding durability obtained a rating of 3.6. The total score of 70.8 exceeds the minimum requirement of 54 out of 72, resulting in a PASSED evaluation.

Table 7 displays a rating of the five format characteristics of the reading pamphlet [Print (letter spacing, letter size, printing quality, font readability), Illustrations, Design/Layout, Paper/Binding, Size/Weight]. The 18 indicators of format received ratings in the Very Satisfactory range (3.6-4.0). The highest ratings for Print were obtained for letter spacing (4.0) and printing quality (4.0), but letter size (3.6) and font readability (3.8) were also rated Very Satisfactory. Cultural relevance received the lowest illustration rating of 3.8, while the remaining five illustration indicators received high ratings. Scores of 4.0 were awarded to Design/Layout and Size/Weight. Paper quality was rated 4.0 and binding durability was rated 3.6. The overall score of 70.8 exceeded the minimum score requirement for passing of 54 out of the possible 72.

The consistently high scores across all five format categories indicate that the reading pamphlet is visually well designed, is usable, and has good physical structure. The perfect scores for Design/Layout and Size/Weight suggest that the evaluators agreed strongly on the pamphlet's accessibility and ease of use. This is especially significant for those struggling to read, since the visual and physical design of instructional materials impacts their level of readiness to read and their perceived readiness to read.

Instructional materials that are visually suitable and well-structured reduce the cognitive load on the learner and support the learner's motivation to engage in literacy tasks. For students experiencing difficulty in reading tasks, this increased motivation can lead to more interaction with the text and ultimately more opportunities for learning. As a result, these strong format assessments support the pamphlet as both an instructional tool and an engaging learning resource.

Li and Gan (2022) also found that well-designed instructional materials could aid students' transition from decoding-focused reading to meaning-focused reading through increased engagement. For adolescent readers, it is particularly important to establish an element of motivation in order to achieve meaningful engagement with reading tasks.

Similarly, Gebremariam and Weldeyohannes (2025) reported that the use of well-designed instructional materials positively influences a reader's motivation to read. Additionally, according to the Department of Education LRMDs Evaluation Tool for Print Resources (2015), quality instructional materials will use readable fonts, appropriate letter sizes, clear illustrations, and effective layouts, as these elements affect the learner's engagement and function of use. The results of this evaluation demonstrate that the reading pamphlet meets these criteria.

Table 8. Evaluation Result of the Reading Pamphlet in terms of Presentation and Organization Based on DepEd LRMDs Standards

Presentation and Organization Indicators	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. Presentation is engaging, interesting, and understandable.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2. There is logical and smooth flow of ideas.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
3. Vocabulary level is adapted to target reader's likely experience and level of understanding.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
4. Length of sentences is suited to the comprehension level of the target reader.	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)
5. Sentences and paragraph structures are varied and interesting to	4.0	Very Satisfactory (VS)

the target reader.

Total Score/ Evaluation Result	20.0	PASSED
<i>Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 = Very Satisfactory (VS); 2.51 – 3.25 = Satisfactory (S); 1.76 – 2.50 = Poor (P); 1.00 – 1.75 = Not Satisfactory (NS). The cut-off score for presentation and organization is minimum of 15 out of 20 points.</i>		

Table 8 contains the evaluation of the pamphlet regarding the presentation and the organization of the pamphlet. Five indicators received a mean rating of 4.0, which indicates a “very satisfactory” rating. There is an indicator that indicates the clarity and engagement of presentation, that there is logical flow of ideas, that the vocabulary used was suitable for the target reader, that the length of the sentences was appropriate and that the variety in the length of the sentences and paragraphs exhibited appropriate variety. The total score of 20.0 indicates that the pamphlet received the maximum possible score, which also exceeds the minimum requirement (15/20 – “pass”), therefore the pamphlet received a passing evaluation.

Excellent ratings for every indicator would support that the pamphlet was formatted properly and was very well aligned with the target user’s needs. The results indicate that the information presented in the pamphlet is easy to understand, logically presented, and is written in an accessible manner with language and sentence structures that are appropriate for Grade 8 boys and girls who have difficulty reading and/or have identified reading difficulties. The fact that there is a great deal of consistent ratings from experts would support that the way material was delivered was well aligned with the abilities of the recipients.

This particular finding is important when considering the demographic profile of the respondents, especially since the respondents were very low rated in their use of vocabulary and grammar. Students who have been classified in the below-basic category are very reliant on the clarity of the structure (organization), the controlled use of vocabulary, and the predictable organization to assist them with comprehending text. Students who have poorly sequenced, linguistically complex and structurally inconsistent materials will often experience difficulty in understanding text as well as may be disengaged from Quintiles. In contrast, students who are provided with well-organized materials will have been provided with the necessary scaffolding to provide important support during the comprehension process and minimize cognitive load.

Mackay et al. (2021) supported the findings in this study by suggesting that sentence structure and logical organization awareness is significant in reading comprehension, particularly when working with learners who have limitations due to poor grammatical skills. In a related manner, Hu et al. (2022) identified that vocabulary level and clarity of grammar in written text have a significant impact on the ability of the reader to comprehend text and that it is important to ensure that there is an alignment of text complexity with learner proficiency.

Agana (2023) also reported that materials evaluated by the Department of Education receive high scores in terms of presentation and organization may indicate the appropriateness of materials for the learners and may potentially assist in improving learning outcomes. The high consistency of Very Satisfactory scores in this study indicate that the presentation and organization of this pamphlet will support the target users to comprehend its content appropriately.

Table 9. Evaluation Result of the Reading Pamphlet in terms of Accuracy and Up-to-datedness of Information Based on DepEd LRMDs Standards

Accuracy and Up-to-datedness of Information Indicators	Mean Rating	Verbal Interpretation
1. Conceptual errors.	4.0	Not Present
2. Factual errors.	4.0	Not Present
3. Grammatical errors.	4.0	Not Present

4. Computational errors.	4.0	Not Present
5. Obsolete information.	4.0	Not Present
6. Typographical and other minor errors (e.g., inappropriate or unclear illustrations, missing labels, wrong captions, etc.).	4.0	Not Present
Total Score/ Evaluation Result	24.0	PASSED

Legend: 3.26 – 4.00 = Very Satisfactory (VS); 2.51 – 3.25 = Satisfactory (S); 1.76 – 2.50 = Poor (P); 1.00 – 1.75 = Not Satisfactory (NS). The cut-off score for accuracy and up-to-datedness of information must be 24 out of 24 points.

The reading pamphlet evaluation results, as presented in Table 9 for this investigation, are related to the level of accuracy and up-to-date accuracy of the materials. The six areas of assessment; conceptual, factual, grammatical, computational, typographical, and up-to-date; received a mean of 4.0. Not Present was assigned to all error categories. The total score was 24.0 out of 24, which is acceptable according to the DepEd Learning Resources Management and Development System (LRMDS) requirements, resulting in a PASSED evaluation.

The findings of this evaluation demonstrate that the reading pamphlet exhibits a high level of accuracy and reliability, in relation to the total number of areas assessed. Furthermore, the absence of conceptual errors, factual errors, grammatical errors, computational errors, typographical errors; and up-to-date errors demonstrates that the materials had been developed and validated with care. This is important in any situation, especially for students receiving reading intervention services, where errors or improper input will build misconceptions about the language and inhibit any learning.

The qualities of accuracy and up-to-date accuracy are critical components of an effective instructional resource because they enable learners to access accurate and current resources. Reading instruction is especially susceptible to this, as students often internalize the language patterns and structures of the materials they are exposed to. Errors in the content of those materials can have a direct impact on the development of language, as well as on comprehension.

In the LRMDS Framework (2009), the Department of Education states that the quality of accuracy should be considered when evaluating the instructional materials distributed to classrooms. According to Agana (2023), a high level of accuracy and completeness from an educational perspective indicates that the instructional materials are valid, up-to-date, and appropriate for learners.

Similarly, Gebremariam and Weldeyohannes (2025) emphasized that reading resources should contain accurate and up-to-date information to assist students in developing language and comprehension skills effectively. The results of this evaluation confirm that the reading pamphlet meets fundamental quality standards in the area of content reliability and is appropriate for use as an instructional resource.

Table 10. Overall Evaluation Result of the Reading Pamphlet Based on DepEd LRMDS Standards

Indicators	Final Score	Evaluation Result
Content	26.4	PASSED
Format	70.8	PASSED
Presentation and Organization	20.0	PASSED
Accuracy and Up-to-datedness of Information	24.0	PASSED

The composite score of the reading pamphlet across all four criteria within the DepEd LRMDS evaluation system is summarized in Table 10. Content received an overall score of 26.4, which is above the minimum acceptable score (21 of 28). Format had an overall score of 70.8 which is above the minimum acceptable score (54 of 72). Presentation and organization scored a perfect score (20) out of 20 based upon the

minimum expectation (15 out of 20). Accuracy and currency of information also received a perfect score (24) meeting the required standard (24 of 24). Therefore, each criterion assessed received a rating of PASSED, validating the use of the reading pamphlet for classroom purposes.

The results indicate that the reading pamphlet meets DepEd's LRMDs standards set for use as instructional material. The two criteria that received perfect scores and the two criteria that exceeded their minimum required scores show consistency in quality across all LRMDs criteria. Thus, the reading pamphlet not only meets but exceeds the approved evaluation standards.

The overall findings of this study lend support for the reading pamphlet as a viable and appropriate resource for use in the classroom with Grade 8 students who have reading difficulties. The pamphlet has been designed to address the learning needs of students by providing resources to support learning in three critical areas; phonemic awareness, vocabulary, and grammar/syntax as identified through prior sections of this study. As a result of this alignment, the reading pamphlet may be considered an instructional response to the unique reading needs of each student.

The value of learner need-based instructional materials has been substantiated by Agana (2023) who stated that teacher-created learning materials reviewed through LRMDs scoring tend to receive higher scores when they have developed materials responsive to student learning needs, linked to curriculum competencies. Gebremariam and Weldeyohannes (2025) support this idea and note that providing structured and purposeful instructional materials has been shown to improve reading comprehension and increase student engagement, especially for young adults.

Based on having received a PASSED rating on each LRMDs criterion, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the reading pamphlet can be used as a viable classroom intervention for reading, as well as to serve as a guide for similar contextual instructional materials for secondary schools.

5. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the hypothesis stating that the developed reading pamphlet for Grade 8 students is not acceptable is not accepted since the reading pamphlet was found to be acceptable and appropriate for the target learners. The results revealed that the reading difficulties of the Grade 8 learners are primarily rooted in weak language comprehension skills, particularly in vocabulary and grammar/syntax, despite their ability to accurately decode words. Consequently, the reading pamphlet was designed to incorporate phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, and grammar and syntax instruction to address these identified learning needs. Furthermore, the evaluation results showed that the developed reading pamphlet met the DepEd LRMDs criteria, thereby establishing its validity and acceptability as an instructional material for improving the reading comprehension abilities of Grade 8 learners.

References

- Agana, G. (2023). Development and evaluation of an instructional module in Grade-8 Technical Drafting using DepEd LRMDs standards. *Lunday Research Journal*, 1(1), 1–15. <https://lunday.bulsu.edu.ph>
- Allal-Sumoto, N., Miyoshi, Y., & Mizuhara, Y. (2023). The effect of productive vocabulary knowledge on second language comprehension. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1144572. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1144572>

- Dela Cruz, M. (2022). Phonemic awareness activities and reading fluency among secondary students. *Philippine Journal of Literacy Education*, 9(2), 45–61.
- Gebremariam, H. T., & Weldeyohannes, M. Z. (2025). Cultivating students' reading skills: Inspiring reading comprehension and motivation through critical reading strategies. *SAGE Open*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251367189>
- Hu, T.-C., Sung, Y.-T., Liang, H.-H., Chang, T.-J., & Chou, Y.-T. (2022). Relative roles of grammar knowledge and vocabulary in the reading comprehension of EFL elementary-school learners: Direct, mediating, and form/meaning-distinct effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 827007. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.827007>
- Kim, Y. S. G., Petscher, Y., & Park, Y. (2021). Oral reading fluency, language comprehension, and reading comprehension: Grade-by-grade dynamic relations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(7), 1337–1355. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000554>
- Lawrence, J. F., Knoph, R., McIlraith, A., Kulesz, P. A., & Francis, D. J. (2022). Reading comprehension and academic vocabulary: Exploring relations of item features and reading proficiency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 57(2), 669–690. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.434>
- Li, C., & Gan, Z. (2022). Appropriate texts can motivate students to engage with reading. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(3), 310–330.
- Mackay, E., Lynch, E., Sorenson Duncan, T., & Deacon, S. H. (2021). Informing the science of reading: Students' awareness of sentence-level information is important for reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S313–S327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.394>
- Marjokorpi, J. (2024). Grammatical understanding predicts reading comprehension in secondary-level students: Insights from a Finnish national survey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 37(5), 924–943. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2376280>
- Milankov, V., Golubović, Š., Krstić, T., & Golubović, S. (2021). Phonological awareness as the foundation of reading acquisition in students reading in transparent orthography. *Brain Sciences*, 11(5), Article 641. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci11050641>
- Nielsen, J. L., Poulsen, M., & Vang Christensen, R. (2025). Syntactic comprehension—A separate source of individual variance in middle-school children's reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 60(1), e70003. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.70003>
- Peng, P., & Goodrich, J. M. (2020). The cognitive component skills of reading comprehension in children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(2), 394–418. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12307>
- Reyes, A. (2021). Phonemic awareness instruction and reading fluency in secondary education: A Philippine classroom study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(4), 78–90.
- Snoder, P., & Laufer, B. (2022). Receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge: Bridging the gap in second language writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(1), 127–150. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226312100038X>
- Veríssimo, L., Costa, M., Miranda, F., Pontes, C., & Castro, I. (2021). The importance of phonological awareness in learning disabilities prevention: Perspectives of pre-school and primary teachers. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 750328. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.750328>
- Washburn, J. (2022). Reviewing evidence on the relations between oral reading fluency and reading comprehension for adolescents. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 55(1), 22–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194211045122>
- Zheng, H., Miao, X., Dong, Y., & Yuan, D.-C. (2023). The relationship between grammatical knowledge and reading comprehension: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1098568. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1098568>