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“ Any kind of education is a matter of training the brain. When poor readers are learning to read, remedial instruction helps to shape that area up.” Heineman (2009) stated that it’s not enough to say, “ These kids can’t read.” Not being able to read can mean a variety of things and we need to be more specific in order to help each student. Remedial instruction is designed to help students who fall behind academically to catch up to a desired level. It has become “ an indispensable component of higher education” in countries such as the United States, Canada, or Japan (Zhang, Shou, & Ishino, 2008, p. 331). Basically, remedial instruction is a type of clinical teaching. It is a “ spiral process of assessment—instruction—re-assessment” (Tseng, 2008, p. 9). The subjects are targeted at low achievement learners, or under-prepared students. After the teacher diagnoses students’ learning difficulties, a remedial course will be designed in accordance with students’ needs. And then the teacher takes initiative in offering the instruction, and an evaluation will be conducted during and after the implementation of the remedial instruction to examine the actual effectiveness of the course. Minor adjustments would be made based on the results of the evaluation to ensure that students are able to catch up in regular classes. (Huang, 2009)

Through the result of Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (PHIL-IRI), it showed that Sun Valley Elementary School has a large number of non-reader pupils and there is an has an existing 77% frustrating result in terms of pupils’ reading level, comprehension and speed. Intervention must really be done to save two hundred six lives who can’t read and assist those pupils leading to such extent if not properly guided. Department of Education has done their part in promoting reading and literacy among the pupils and students. Based on Memorandum No. 244, s. 2011, it was stated there that must be a Pull-Out Remedial Class / Reading Assistance Program/ Remediation Classes / Intensified Remedial Reading to children in the frustration reading level by teachers or class advisers. There is a need to conduct this study to assess the reading abilities of the pupils in SVES, to identify the reasons why they were left behind and determine the impact of Reading Remediation Instruction/ Program to their lives. Statement of the Problem

This study was undertaken to determine the Impact of Reading Remediation Instruction to the Non-reader pupils of SVES (S. Y. 2012-2013). Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following problems: 1. Why is there a need to conduct a Reading Remediation Instruction to the pupils of Sun Valley Elementary School? 2. What are the factors affecting them?

3. How can you assess the Reading Remediation Instruction of SVES? How was it done? 4. What is the impact of Reading Remediation Instruction to the Non-Reader pupils of Sun Valley Elementary School?

Scope and Limitations
The researcher concentrated on Impact of Reading Remediation Instruction to the Non-Reader pupils of Sun Valley Elementary School. This study was limited this School Year 2012-2013.

The respondents of this study include a total number of two thousand four hundred twenty four (2424) pupils; which concentrated on one thousand eight hundred seventy (1870) pupils in the frustration reading level and two hundred six (206) non-reader pupils (from Grades two to six).

Definition of Terms
The terms below were conceptually defined and explained to indicate how they were used in the study. Fast Readers.
Focal Factors.

Frustration Level. This is too hard for the reader/s. Unfortunately, teachers sometimes allow this to happen, especially when the words missed are basic vocabulary sight words, such as “ was” for “ saw” and “ what/that.” The practice of having young children work in frustration level reading materials is not professionally sound. It is, however, all too often observed in the classrooms of well-meaning teachers. Remedial Instruction.

Slow Readers.
Non-Reader pupils.

Review of Related Literature
The goal of remedial instruction is to provide low-achieving students with more chances to reinforce the basic knowledge in common subjects so that they can meet minimum academic standards. Thus, some of the students are unable to comprehend the materials in class and even end up giving up the learning opportunities. To ensure these students were not left behind, additional support such as remedial instruction is necessary and effective (Sheu, Hsu, & Wang, 2007; Yu, 2008). Remedial programs are provided to help these students compensate for the insufficient learning in previous academic settings so that they can “ gain the skills necessary to complete college-level courses and academic programs successfully” (Weissman, Silk, & Bulakowski, 1997, cited in Zhai & Skerl, 2001, p. 1).

Remedial instruction just means you get extra help to catch up to where others in your grade are in a certain subject. The means are usually a class ( not necessarily spec ed) that does easier work than the regular English, math, or whatever class. But most schools do not call the classes by a special name, and usually only the school knows it’s a “ remedial” class.

Remedial Reading Teacher’s Manifesto.
1. Teachers want diagnostic assessments that will pinpoint individual reading strengths and deficiencies. But, they don’t want assessments that will eat up excessive amounts of instructional time or cause mounds of paperwork. 2. Teachers want teaching resources that specifically target the reading deficits indicated by the diagnostic assessments. Teachers don’t want to waste time by starting each learner from “ scratch” with hours of repetitive practice. Teachers don’t want to teach what students already know. 3. Teachers want program resources that will enable them to establish a clear game plan, but also ones which will allow them to deviate from that plan, according to the needs of their students. Teachers want to be able to integrate writing, grammar, and spelling instruction and include real reading in their remedial reading programs. 4. Teachers want resources that won’t assume that they are reading specialists. However, they don’t want resources that treat them like script-reading robots. Teachers are fast learners.

5. Teachers want resources that they can grab and use, not resources that require lots of advance preparation. Teachers want to do a great job with their students and still maintain their own sanity. 6. Teachers want reasonable class sizes that are conductive to effective remedial instruction. 7. Teachers understand that remedial readers frequently have behavioral problems; however, their behaviors can’t interfere with other students’ rights to learn. Administrators have to buy-in to this condition and support teacher judgment. 8. To summarize, teachers want to be free to teach their students, not a program, per se. Teachers want their students to see direct benefit and pay-off in each lesson and learn quickly in what social psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, termed their “ zone of proximal development.” If teachers get what they want in their Remedial Reading Teacher’s Manifest, they will achieve their goal to help their students become fluent readers who understand what they read.

When we say a student can’t read, that might mean he or she…
• has a limited sight word vocabulary
• has few/no strategies for recognizing unknown single or multi-syllable words
• has difficulty spelling
• says reading is “ boring” and “ dumb”
• reads haltingly, one word at a time
• does not visualize the text
• does not reread to clarify meaning

• reads to finish rather than to understand
• cannot keep events of text in correct order
• does not predict without prompting
• cannot answer literal level questions about the text
• does not easily make inferences
• cannot state the main idea of a text or summarize it
• has trouble recalling information from a text

• reads very slowly, paying no attention to punctuation
• reads very fast, blurring words, rushing through punctuation
• does not recognize when comprehension is not taking place
• has trouble comparing and contrasting characters, events, and settings
• stops reading at first sign of difficulty and thinks “ good” readers understand without effort
• knows when comprehension is not occurring but does not know how to adjust reading to help
• has a difficult time expressing thoughts or ideas about a text in small- or large-group settings

WHAT GOOD READERS DO
To understand specifically what struggling readers need to work on, it helps to know exactly what it is that good readers do when they read. We need to convince struggling readers, like this one, that reading is an active process that requires their involvement. In fact, skilled readers do the following:

• They recognize that reading is done for a purpose, to get meaning, and that this involves the reader actively participating. • They use a variety of comprehension strategies such as predicting, summarizing, questioning and visualizing the text. • They make inferences about the text.

• They use prior knowledge about their lives and their world to inform their understanding of a text. • They monitor their understanding of a text, identify what is challenging, and have strategies to improve their understanding. • They evaluate their enjoyment of a text and why it did or did not appeal to them. • They know many vocabulary words and how to use the context, word parts, and roots to help understand new words. • They recognize most words automatically, read fluently, vary their reading rate, and “ hear” the text as they read.

Conceptual Framework
Below is a paradigm illustrating the conceptual framework and explaining the flow of the study:
Teachers Reading Remediation
Instruction
Reading Remediation
Instruction
Family Social Environment

Results and Discussion
1. Why is there a need to conduct a Reading Remediation Instruction to the Pupils of Sun Valley Elementary School? Results of the Pre-Test Phil-IRI Oral Reading and Silent Reading administered last July 10-14, 2012 at Sun Valley Elementary School revealed that out of 2424 pupils from Grades II- VI, it showed that only 142 or 6% were independent, 206 or 8% were instructional, and 1870 or 78% were in frustration stage. It shows that pupils cannot comprehend or has no reading comprehension. Out of 2424, 206 or 8% were non-reader and only 16 pupils are fast readers.

2. What are the factors affecting them?
a. Poverty
Most of the pupils in public schools came from a family with low socially economic status. Most of their parents don’t work and just accept the reality that life just goes on. Commonly, pupils in SVES strive hard just to attain something, just to earn for a living…that they evenly become scavengers. Since they can’t attend the class regularly, they were left behind that they eventually stop on their studies. Some can’t comprehend, have no retention and most of their parents just rely to the teacher. b. Accomodation of Pupils

There are only 80 teachers in SVES accommodating almost 3000 pupils. There are two (2) shifts, morning session from 6am to 12nn and afternoon session from 12nn-6pm. Most of the students can’t concentrate since there is a large number of pupils in a class with a ratio of 1: 60 or more. Some will not really listen to their teachers, some will just draw on their seats, will distract and talk to their seatmates, will make noise and some will just roam around. c. Teacher Factor

There is no perfect teacher in terms of nurturing children with different kinds of attitude. Still, it’s the responsibility of a teacher to satisfy the needs of a child especially in terms of educating them. A child who was motivated enough and loved will love school whether he wants to learn or not. With the teachers of SVES, we can’t evenly say that they are not teaching. Some are still engaged on what they are doing. Some were no longer motivated. The researcher has interviewed a very valuable source and she revealed that teachers in SVES don’t teach well because of the salary that they receive each month. Though they want to teach with complete devices, it’s the money that matters most. Their budget was affected; and the quality of teaching could not be as good as what we expect from them. d. Contact Time

There is a great need for pupils of Sun Valley Elementary School to conduct remedial instruction since they have short span of attention. They would love to roam around rather than to listen. Most were physically present but mentally absent. They were easily distracted. They are not interested especially if the topic doesn’t mean anything to them. Their attention must be caught; the teacher must be active. e. In-house Factor

Parents just rely everything to the teacher. They don’t evenly exert time to teach their children at home. Some were busy chatting with their neighbors, some were addicted to gambling, some were so much busy with work and some were out of the country. Nobody was there to guide their child especially on their younger years. Nobody was there to remediate. The thought that their child complies with the requirements and has attained a passing grade was enough to them. They don’t really assist and assess their child whether he can comprehend, can speak well or can cope on their studies. f. Focal Person and Environment

Environment matters most. Since students of SVES live in an environment which is exposed to drugs, poverty, fight and disorderliness, children thought that what they see was right; that everything was just right. Some will just influence them to do this, to do that…without thinking of the consequences. Their attitude was so much influenced by their focal person. They were so much exposed to the extent that the teacher and parents surrender with their attitude. They will do whatever they want. If they have chosen to stop, they will stop. Once they have chosen not to review, they will not review. Teachers’ effort in teaching them were taken for granted.

5. How can you assess the Reading Remediation Instruction of SVES? How was it done? Pupils inside a class behave and answer the questions of the teacher if he does understand the lesson well. A pupil will not listen to a teacher if he couldn’t evenly recognize and read simple words. “ Reading Rescue Program” has provided an intensive, 30-minute one teacher to one pupil remedial reading daily. That was from 12: 00-12: 30pm and 12: 30-1: 00pm for am session teachers and 10: 30 to 11: 30 for the pm session teachers and pupils. The important aspect of that program was to build pupils’ strength in reading and to develop good reading habits. Assessment: Due to the busy schedule of teachers and pupils’ unwillingness to undergo remedial sessions, this program no longer exists. There was also another Special Program for Non-Readers. As assessed, it revealed that there were sixty three (63) non-reader pupils on the third grade. To solve such problem, the principal of Sun Valley Elementary School, Mr. Antonio B. Dorado, has proposed a new section catering fifty (50) non-reader pupils. They have undergone an intensive reading remediation instruction.

3. What is the impact of Reading Remediation Instruction to the Non-Reader pupils of Sun Valley Elementary School? As basis, the researcher will use a Grade 3 Class (Section: Mansanas) who has undergone a Reading Remediation Instruction. Out of fifty pupils who were non-readers (from July to December), only one was left behind. Upon listening to them, the way they read now was so much different when they have started with the program. The thought that they were already in Grade Three, they evenly started with sounds. They can’t evenly recognize simple words and phrases; especially sentences. The teacher had a hard time making them all readers. Different methods, strategies, and experimentation were done. Through that program, the teacher has saved fifty (50) lives who were mostly trouble makers and candidates for failure when they were in their original advisers. Pupils have gained confidence, improved their reading level and developed simple comprehension. That program couldn’t be perfect but still, changes and development were seen. Conclusion

Marcelo (2012) stated that there is no “ best program” in preventing pupils’ reading difficulties. Having early reading intervention program is just one of the possible solutions to lessen the number of those left behind and non-readers. Of course, collaborative efforts from parents, teachers and child’s willingness to learn could give a positive outcome.

Upon reviewing the results of the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory, though it was so dismaying, we can’t close our eyes to the fact that only few can read with comprehension and most were in frustration level having almost 78% of the entire population. There is a large number of non-readers who needs to be rescued.

Different factors affect the studies of the pupils such as poverty, population, teacher, environment and focal person, in-house factors and contact time. Still, since children spend longer time in school rather than at home, teachers must be conscious enough to fill in the needs of their pupils.

Recommendation
Based on the aforementioned findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered: 1. There must be a library with complete reading resources- accessible to all teachers and pupils. 2. Teachers must have a compilation and a variety of different reading and teaching materials. Extra efforts must be exceeded; concern must be shown. 3. Teachers must attend different seminars and trainings to enhance their teaching strategies. They must be able to catch the attention and interest of their students. They may also surf on the internet to get downloadable materials and related/ effective classroom activities to be adapted in their class.

4. Classroom must be colorful and conducive to learning. Whether the adviser is an English or Filipino teacher, all must help to resolve the longtime problem in reading. Once a while, there must be exercises that could enhance the reading skills of pupils; not just reading for nothing…but reading with understanding. 5. There must be an extended support from the parents. They must help in remediating their children at home especially those young ones. 6. There must be an advertisement encouraging pupils to love books and reading. Government must collect funds to air such advertisement for the benefit of the Filipino children. 7. Reading programs must be continuous, meaningful and interesting. It should be implemented because we are all concern; and not just for completion.

1. In support of the Ten-Point Basic Education Agenda of the Aquino Administration and the institutionalization of the “ Every Child a Reader” Program (ECARP), the Department of Education (DepED) is initiating programs that would: a. promote reading and literacy among the pupils and students; b. motivate our youth to learn from the lives and works of eminent Filipinos; c. uphold one’s own heritage and values; and

d. make reading a shared physical experience, specifically among the youth, thereby increasing its relevance amidst the growing reliance on the internet and inclination to on-line activities. In this light, DepEd declares the month of November of every year as National Reading Month. To celebrate this, schools and learning centers are enjoined to hold the following activities: a. Read-A-Thon. This activity seeks to foster a reading culture among pupils. It aims to determine the most outstanding individual and team readers among elementary pupils in public schools; b. Drop Everything and Read (DEAR). This is a fifteen to twenty (15-20) minute daily activity devoted to reading books or any materials available in the school; c. Big Brother/ Big Sister / Kaklase Ko, Sagot Ko / Shared Reading. In this activity, older students or independent readers mentor pupils who are at the frustration reading level or non-reading level; d. Pull-Out Remedial Class / Reading Assistance Program/ Remediation Classes / Intensified Remedial Reading. Remedial lessons are given to children in the frustration reading level by teachers or class advisers;

e. Five Words A Week (FWAW)/A Paragraph A Day (APAD)/Library Hour A Week. In this activity, the pupils are encouraged to learn and master one word a day, five days a week, and to read aloud one or two paragraphs a day before classes starts to develop oral communication; and f. Reading Camp. This activity aims to highlight the pupils’ talents in communication arts through competitions. DepED officials (regional, division and school levels) are directed to lead a nationwide synchronized reading program conducted every first Monday of November from 9: 00 to 10: 00 in the morning. 2. For SY 2011-2012, the National Reading Month shall culminate in the Nationwide Araw ng Pagbasa (National Reading Day) on November 25, 2011.

This will coincide with the week of the celebration of the birth anniversary of the late Senator Benigno “ Ninoy” S. Aquino on November 27, 2011 and commemoration of the 20th year of the Signing of R. A. 7165 by Former President Corazon C. Aquino, creating the Literary Coordinating Council on November 25, 1991. This activity was initiated in 2008 by the Office of Representative Jorge “ Bolet” Banal, 3rd District of Quezon City, Metro Manila. To encourage elementary pupils and secondary students from both public and private schools to participate in Araw ng Pagbasa, teachers may organize activities such as: a. storytelling sessions;

b. reading list preparation;
c. readers’ training and a readership development program; and d. ilove2read declamation contest using Ninoy’s famous speeches (www. ilove2read. org). School officials are urged to conduct reading and literacy activities in honor of former Senator Benigno “ Ninoy” S. Aquino and other Filipino heroes. 4. Schools are recommended to partner with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector to foster cooperation within the community and optimize the success of these activities. 5. Immediate dissemination of this Memorandum is desired.
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