

## Oral Reading Intervention Activities: Its Influence on the Pronunciation Skill of Bangsamoro Grade 3 English Language Learners in Reading Aloud

Razul B. Omar\*,

Haron A. Mohamad, Datu Raffy Ralph S. Sinsuat, Marissa N. Parcon

*For affiliations and correspondence, see the last page.*

### Abstract

This study aimed to determine the Oral Reading Interventions Activities and their effects on the Pronunciation Skill of Bangsamoro Grade 3 English Language Learners in Reading Aloud in Usman Baunga Elemenatary School during the school Year 2021-2022. Specifically, sought answers the learners' pronunciation performance level before the oral reading intervention activities in the following parameters: words, phrases, and sentences. It also sought to found out the learners' pronunciation performance level after the oral reading intervention activities in the same parameters. Then afterwards, it also hunted to answer if there any significant difference between the learners' English pronunciation performance level before and after the reading activities are introduced and these were the basis for proposing instructional materials for English Language learners. The researcher utilized a descriptive statistic that includes mean, frequency, and percentage as statistical tools in answering the question 1 and 2 in the statement of the problem. The t-test for dependent samples was used in determining the significant difference in the pre-test and the post test scores of the learners' oral reading ability level. The test is set at 0.5 levels of significance. The study revealed that the pronunciation skills in reading words is average, in reading phrases is average and poor in reading sentences before the conduct of the reading intervention activities. While after the conduct of the reading intervention activities, the level of pronunciation in reading words is good, in reading phrases is good. Generally, the pronunciation skills of the students significantly improved after the conduct of oral intervention activities. Thus, it is concluded that the oral reading intervention activities is very effective in improving the students' pronunciation skills.

**Keywords:** Oral Reading Interventions Activities, Pronunciation Skill, English Language Learners

### Introduction

Pronunciation plays a significant part in the personal and social lives of people. The way of speaking reflects the person's identity and his association to particular communities (Seidlhofer, 2001). This justifies that the person's way of pronunciation is influenced by his or her culture and environment.

In Malaysia, English language instruction centers in the teaching and learning of four major skills namely; reading, writing, listening; and speaking. In the same way, the aspect of pronunciation is included in the English language textbook of Malaysian secondary education as mentioned by Rajadurai (2007). He also states that "pronunciation is often taught with a rigid adherence to prescribed norms" due to the following reasons: First, pronunciation is viewed as a most resilient to change component in the second language (L2) due to the influences of age and the first language (L1), thus leaving teachers to have very little control in teaching. Second, as many ESL classrooms have embraced the communicative paradigm that emphasizes fluency, meaning and authenticity, the teaching of discrete sound elements does not seem to fit comfortably in those classrooms. Third, teachers do

not find themselves well-equipped and comfortable to teach pronunciation, and it is also hard for them to incorporate pronunciation with other language skills. Fourth, the oral proficiency of native speakers is used as the yardstick for many oral proficiency assessments. Lastly, pronunciation is directly linked to social, cultural and individual identity issues.

Research on English as an international language found evidence that phonological problems often are reasons for unsuccessful communication not only in international contexts but also in intranational ones (Jenkins' 2000). English Language Teaching (ELT) professionals should stress that speaking is distinctive from pronunciation and they are not interchangeably used. This point is affirmed by Fraser (2000) who states that being able to speak English includes a number of sub-skills (vocabulary, grammar, and pragmatics) and pronunciation is the most important with good pronunciation. A speaker is intelligible despite other errors. Having poor pronunciation, speaker can be very difficult to understand despite accuracy in other areas. Thus, many ways are introduced by experts to help the learners overcome their difficulty in pronunciation.

Many studies have singled out the contributions of oral

reading intervention activities to learners' pronunciation skill, the researcher as an English wants to find out the influence of these activities to the pronunciation skill of the learners through experimental research. This is supported in the website below that that reading out loud allows an individual to improve his or her pronunciation of the language.

In the Philippine setting, the common problems of the Filipino learners in pronunciation are the stressing individual words incorrectly, stressing the wrong words in a sentence, pronouncing certain consonant sounds incorrectly, mixing up short and long vowel sounds, and forgetting to finish the words.

Similar problems in English pronunciation are noticed by the teachers at Usman Baunga Elementary when learners are reading aloud or speak English during oral recitation. Since erroneous pronunciation can affect the comprehensibility of communication, as English teacher, the researcher would like to determine the grade III learners' pronunciation skills through experimentation with the use of oral reading intervention activities so that appropriate intervention shall be done at the early grade level. This makes this study important.

### Research Questions

This study determined the influence of oral reading intervention activities to the pronunciation skill of the Grade III Bangsamoro English learners at Usman Baunga Elementary School, Tamontaka II, Cotabato City during the school year 2021-2022. Specifically, sought answers to the following sub-problems:

1. What is the learners' pronunciation performance level before the oral reading intervention activities in terms of:
  - 1.1 words;
  - 1.2 phrases; and
  - 1.3 sentences?
2. What is the learners' pronunciation performance level after the oral reading intervention activities in terms of:
  - 2.1 words;
  - 2.2 phrases; and
  - 2.3 sentences?
3. Is there any significant difference between the learners' English pronunciation performance level before and after the reading activities are introduced?

### Literature Review

#### English Language

For many years, English has been used globally by non-native speakers as an international language. As a result, the pedagogy of English teaching has also moved towards a higher emphasis on intelligibility rather than native likeness (Levis, 2005; Munro & Derwing, 2011; Pickering, 2006). Levis (2005) states that "...aiming for nativeness was an unrealistic burden for both teacher and learner" (p. 310). In her review of the status of intelligibility in English as a lingua franca, Pickering (2006) terms as a "revolutionary change" when non-native varieties are acknowledged as models instead of the native varieties of English (p. 1) and in a more recent article, Munro and Derwing (2011) observe that compared to native-like pronunciation, an aspect "most critical for successful communication in an L2" is intelligibility.

Jenkins' (2000) research on English as an international language found evidence that phonological problems often are reasons for unsuccessful communications in not only international contexts but also in international ones. English Language Teaching (ELT) professionals should stress that speaking is distinctive from pronunciation and they are not interchangeably used. This point is affirmed by Fraser (2000) who stated that being able to speak English includes a number of sub-skills (vocabulary, grammar, and pragmatics) and pronunciation is "by far the most important with good pronunciation, a speaker is intelligible despite other errors; with poor pronunciation, a speaker can be very difficult to understand, despite accuracy in other areas".

In a 2013 study of 295 companies from 14 different sectors, it was found that English pronunciation skill was among the most assessed (56.9%) during the companies' recruitment processes (Sarudin, Mohd. Noor, Zubairi, Tunku Ahmad, & Nordin, 2013). Pronunciation skills also featured heavily in 48.9% of the typical tasks required of interviewees during the job interviews which were essay writing (35.5%), face-to-face interview (26.1%), prompts/tasks (14.1%), impromptu speeches (12.5%), and oral presentations (10.3%) (Sarudin et al., 2013).

English pronunciation skills are vital even in technical fields and lack of it impacts graduate employability. In its 2014 national survey, Aspiring Minds - an employability and evaluation consulting firm found that more than 51% of engineering graduates are not employable due to their spoken English scores and that the key problem is pronunciation, followed by fluency skills, grammar, and sentence construction. Thirty

thousand (30,000) engineering students across 500 colleges in India took part in the study. Similarly, graduates intending to find work in multinational companies inside or even outside Malaysia might consider taking a more serious look into their English pronunciation. A 2009 Australian study found that English language pronunciation appeared to be a hindrance for international students to obtain employment (Arkoudis, et al., 2009).

In addition, Gilakjani (2011) stated that among the reasons ESL students have difficulties learning pronunciation are that they are not interested, not regularly exposed to target language, and that teachers do not highlight the importance of pronunciation nor have the right tools to help their students learn proper pronunciation. In order to draw attention to the importance of pronunciation, it is important that English language instructors use the right methods and utilize the right tools to bring attention to pronunciation practices in the language classroom.

Pronunciation errors are a common phenomenon in many countries where English is a second language or foreign language. The learner identifies the fault and he/she can answer it by himself/herself. Gilakjani (2011) and Rivers (1981) have argued that language is an important way of communication. Learning grammatical rules, vocabularies, and phrases are not sufficient for students until they are not able to pronounce the language, which he wants to learn, in a way that the native speakers of that language can understand their expression correctly. Jenkins (2011), claimed that the non-native speakers are facing the impossibility to pronounce as the native speaker; rather non-native speakers can try to learn the pronunciation which is mutually agreed to native and non-native speakers. She emphasized some phonemes that a non-native speaker must learn and some phonemes are not as important as others.

Wahba (1998) examined the difficulties encountered by Egyptian students in learning English as a second language. He finds out that some specific phonological errors made by Egyptian students are related to stress and intonation. She also describes the reason for errors which are the different phonological features of English and Arabic. Ahmad (2011) found that Arab students scarcely can pronounce certain consonant sounds in the right way. For instance, the voiceless bilabial plosive /p/ sound has no equivalent in the Arabic language; hence Saudi students cannot easily understand the voiceless of /p/ sound. Instead, they replace the sound with a voiced /b/ sound. Begum and Hoque (2016) stated that in some specific situations,

some English sounds disappear in some words. The tertiary level students of Bangladesh encountered this problem. They do not pronounce a single sound while uttering a word.

Reading usually means dealing with language messages in written or printed form, it involves processing language messages, hence knowledge of language. Widdowson (1979) defines reading as “the process of getting linguistic information via print. Clearly, reading involves perceiving the written form of language.

### Meaning and Nature of Reading

Reading is a process of gaining what the writers mean in printed symbol. It is supported by Rumelhart (1986) as cited in Leu (1987) that reading is the process of understanding written language. In line with the idea, Hodgson, (1960) as cited in Tarigan (2009) states that reading is a process that is done and used by reader to get the message that will be delivered by the writer through words/text. Again, reading is recording and decoding process as emphasized by Anderson, (1972) (as cited in Tarigan 2009).

Furthermore, reading is bringing meaning to and getting meaning from printed or written material. Based on the former explanation, it can be concluded that reading is understanding the symbol of language from the written illustration (Finochiaro & Bonomo, 1973, as cited in Tarigan (2009).

Reading is an activity to see and understand the contents of that written expression or understand only through hearing (Bahri, 2008). Additionally, Allan and Arnold (2008), reading is defined as process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium of print. The main purpose of reading is to get information from its text. In order to read efficiently, the reader should be able to use the basic knowledge and skills which are owned.

In the process, the reader tries to recreate the meanings intended by the writer. From the reading definition above, it can be concluded that reading is an active process of interpreting printed or written language, so the reader understand meaning, message, and purpose by recording and decoding process from printed or written material that connect reader to writer's idea.

### Pronunciation

Pronunciation is a component of language and communication that conveys many different kinds of meaning and encompasses linguistic competence at

micro and macro levels for both production and perception of speech. It is comprising the segmental level of individual phonemes (consonants and vowels) and the suprasegmental or prosodic level of connected speech. These include linking and co-articulation, tone and intonation, stress and rhythm, and voice quality and articulatory setting. Terms and concepts are introduced, and examples illustrate the multiple functions conveyed in communication by pronunciation, including speaker's identity, and the potential for serious misunderstanding caused by pronunciation errors or differing conventions. It is seen how pronunciation goes far beyond correct articulation to incorporate multiple layers of language proficiency and types of communicative competence.

Teaching of pronunciation is one of the concerns of the English teachers. We often think of pronunciation teaching in terms of helping students achieve accurate pronunciation so that their production of sounds, stress, rhythm, and intonation begins to match an ideal pattern. But accuracy is only one part of good pronunciation. Fluency in producing sounds and other aspects of pronunciation is equally important. The two don't always go together. For example, many students learn to produce a new sound correctly when they're concentrating carefully and saying it alone or in a single word. When they need to use that same sound in conversation, however, it's much more difficult to keep producing it correctly. They cannot pronounce the sound fluently. After all, in real-world speaking, pronunciation is just one among many things that students have to think about. Vocabulary, grammar, the ideas they want to express, and the appropriate degree of politeness and formality also occupy their attention. It is difficult to use pronunciation accurately and fluently at the same time. Because of this, when students are practicing pronunciation. Educators should include some activities that emphasize pronunciation fluency, speaking smoothly and easily. Even if not all the sounds are perfect along with activities that emphasize accuracy in producing sounds correctly. Both accuracy and fluency are important in pronunciation, just as they are in speaking in general, and both deserve attention and practice.

**Suggested Activities to Enhance Learners' Pronunciation skills** Pronunciation can often be complex, especially the phonetic script, but they don't have to be an expert to teach pronunciation well as stated by Speck (2019). Here are the following activities to enhance learner's pronunciation skills:

First, find out what the students cannot do. The students will have different problems with

pronunciation depending on their first language. Chinese learners often have problems with vowel sounds and r in words like very. Arabic speakers can often get p and b mixed up, Spanish and Farsi speakers sometimes add an extra e in front of words that begin with an s like speak and Spain, so they become espeak and espain. To find out the problems of the students have, listen to them talking to each other or get them to read a text aloud for the class. Note down the problems they have with their pronunciation. Teachers check on Google to find out common problems for specific languages.

Secondly, introduce minimal pairs to students. Minimal pairs are words that sound almost the same but have a subtle pronunciation difference. Studying them will help them become aware of different vowel sounds and how to pronounce them. Here are some examples of minimal pairs but still can be searched in Google for an exhaustive list. These are some of the words: Sheep/ship, low/ throw, food / good, tin/ten, bet/bat, bat/bad, cat/cut, and many others. Activities with minimal pairs are also recommended for pronunciation.

Drilling gets students to pronounce the words chorally in class copying the pronunciation or one from a listening text. Write minimal pairs on the back of playing cards and ask students to play Pelmanism with the pairs that match. Teachers can also check out this great minimal pair's bingo game. Teachers can also look at the legendary pronunciation text book, but remember English is a stress-timed language.

Unlike some languages, English places the stress on important words in a sentence and not on other. This is why native speakers can sometimes leave out little words in informal speech, this is called ellipsis e.g. Where you been?

It's important for students to get the stress right if they are going to sound natural. For example: Where do you live? The stress is on Where and live, do isn't stressed at all.

There are also suggested activities to improve students' pronunciation. The teachers can dictate sentences and ask students to mark the words that are stressed and ask to underline the stressed words in a dialogue. They will be asked to say the sentences aloud and then drill the sentences in class chorally. Students record the sentences on their smart phones and check their stress.

Fourth focus on stress patterns in words. Like sentences, words often have different stress patterns.



The easiest way to identify these is by underlining the stressed part of the word. Encourage the students to break words down into syllables, for example beau-ti-ful, ask them to identify where the stressed part of the word is by reading it in different ways: beautiful / beautiful / beautiful. Ask students which one is correct. The correct answer is beautiful. When students record new words make sure they also record where the stress sits in the word by underlining the right syllable.

Another recommended activity is activities with stress patterns. The teacher asks students to find the stress. Give students a list of words and ask them to use an online dictionary to find the stress. Students can check with a partner before they elicit the right answers. The next one is the “stress pattern snap”. In this activity, the students are asked to write target words on the back of playing cards in permanent marker. They are further instructed to split the deck and get students in pairs to play snap by matching words that have the same stress pattern.

Another suggested meaningful activity is listened and read. It is a great way for students to improve their pronunciation is to listen to a text and notice the way the words are pronounced rather than just listening for meaning. There are lots of stories with audio on Youtube. Ask the students to watch and read some of the stories several times and to comment on the words they learned to pronounce.

Moreover, listen to repeating speeches is another identified activity.

It is very difficult for the students to listen to their own voices when they speak. If the teachers have a quiet space for students to use. Teacher could ask them to use the audio recorder on their smartphones for this activity.

Students can share their recording with a partner or just read it to their partner if they don't want to record it. Ask students the things they say wrong. Ask them to say the words better.

Try the same task but with audio that students choose, this could be a famous speech from a film or history. They can read or play recordings to the rest of the class as well as sharing them on your social media page. Use of tongue twisters is also recommended. Finally, tongue twisters can be great fun to check out how well students can pronounce words and sounds.

### **Influence of Oral Reading Intervention in the Pronunciation Skills**

“Reading is critical because a great deal of formal education depends upon being able to read with understanding. Reading difficulties will inevitably create educational difficulties, which in turn, are a major source of economic and social disadvantages” (Hulme & Snowling, 2011, p. 139). Chapter 1 shared information of results of students not being proficient readers. The review of literature focuses on information collected by three separate studies that individually researched early intervention and class size and their impact on reading proficiency.

The Reading Recovery program was developed by Marie Clay in 1984. Reading Recovery is designed for first-grade students struggling with reading and writing as a short-term intervention. The program calls for teachers who are specially trained to work one-on-one with students for 30-minutes daily for 12 to 20 weeks. The Reading Recovery website stated about 75% of the lowest performing students attained grade-level proficiency after receiving the complete series of lessons (readingrecovery.org). The one-to-one intervention model became a popular literacy model due to the Reading Recovery program (Homan et al., 2001). The ALL program provides a balanced literacy reading and writing curriculum to strengthen instructional practice and leadership. ALL uses a content-based coaching model. ALL provides K-12 reading and writing units. It also provides teacher training to assist teachers in fully understanding the program and how to implement it to meet student needs.

Although school districts are satisfied with the outcome of a one-to-one program, funding the cost of the program and personnel needed to meet student needs is not feasible. Schools with the highest socioeconomic status populations are of the greatest need and only having a couple of trained reading interventions would not meet the needs of all of their students. This funding challenge has required district- and school-level decision makers to look into the expenses versus the paybacks of a one-to-one program (Homan et al., 2001). Homan et al. (2001) referred to a study by noting achievement with groups of three in the mid-1990s. The teachers in Hiebert's study, reported by Homan et al., looked at group size as a variable. The teachers worked with student groups of six or seven prior to training for the intervention program. When those teachers implemented the new program with large student groups, they determined it was not efficacious. Consequently, the teachers dropped the size of the groups to three students, and they experienced greater success. The large group size made it too difficult for the teachers to provide specific

feedback in a timely manner and lessened student involvement.

An appropriate arrangement for early intervention in literacy appears to be a smaller group of three students (Homan et al., 2001). The change in early literacy group sizes from one to three students called for adjustments in the ALL program. Teachers used various data to place students in groups. However, the low-performing first graders reading achievement remained unique to the individual student, even when students were at the same reading level. The most challenging facet of the small group work was the differentiations in reader skill sets (Homan et al., 2001). Recommendations provided by Clay for the Reading Recovery Program served as the configuration for ALL lessons. Homan et al. (2001) followed the descriptions of the ALL lesson parts as it was originally implemented in the one-to-one model, with variations that resulted from their small group innovations.

### Oral Reading Performance

In response to the “No Child Left Behind” federal legislation, some school districts have implemented Direct Instruction (DI) for teaching reading, even though inconsistent findings of the effects of DI on students’ reading comprehension have been reported in the literature (Abt Associates, 1977; Benbow, 1974; Bruton & Owen, 1988; Contreras, 1980; House, Glass, McLean, and Walker, 1978; Kennedy, 1978; Kuder, 1990; McCabe, 1974; McGlotten, 1982; Meyer, 1984; Mosley, 1997; O’Connor, Jenkins, Cole, & Mills, 1993; Slavin, Karweit, and Madden, 1989; Stallings, 1975; Stebbins, St. Pierre, Proper, Anderson, & Cerva, 1977). Results from the initial Project Follow Through study, the largest reported study of the longitudinal effects of DI on beginning reading instruction via a systematic-code approach (i.e., synthetic phonics) from kindergarten through third grade, indicated that the reading performance of students who received DI was at the 41st percentile, nine percentile points below the median (Stebbins, St. Pierre, Proper, Anderson, & Cerva, 1977), even though the students taught by DI had higher beginning reading achievement scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) than those in the control group (Abt Associates, 1977; Stallings, 1975).

There were inconsistent findings reported, however, across school settings (House, Glass, McLean, and Walker, 1978; Kennedy, 1978). A re-analysis of the Project Follow Through data compared the average DI schools’ effect size on the MAT subscale scores with

the control schools’ average effect size and reported that the average effect size difference across MAT basic skills was 1.8, with an average effect size for MAT total reading scores of DI schools being 1.6 and an average effect size for total reading scores of the control schools being .75 (Bereiter & Kurland, 1981-82). The findings from some studies have not favored DI in the areas of phonics (Benbow, Direct Reading Instruction, 4 1974; O’Connor, Jenkins, Cole, & Mills, 1993), reading comprehension (Bruton & Owen, 1988; Contreras, 1980; Kuder, 1990; McGlotten, 1982; Mosley, 1997), basic concepts and vocabulary (McCabe, 1974; McGlotten, 1982), and reading achievement (McGlotten, 1982). Other studies of the effects of DI have reported mixed results. McCabe (1974) compared the effects of DISTAR and traditional early reading programs and reported that pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students in traditional programs did significantly better than DISTAR students on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, but scores of first-grade students taught by DISTAR were higher than students in basal instruction; on the Wide Range Achievement Test the scores of first grade students who received basal reading instruction were significantly higher than scores of DISTAR students, while scores of kindergartners taught by DISTAR were significantly higher than those of kindergartners taught by reading readiness materials.

Scarcelli (1999) found that DRI instruction for first-grade students who were in the average-to-below-average range of reading ability produced significantly higher scores on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test than scores of students receiving whole language instruction, but no significant differences on the measure were found for students in the middle-third and upper-third ranges of reading ability. Carnine, Carnine, and Gersten (1984) reported that first-grade students taught by DISTAR did not perform well when decoding un-taught words, but that third-grade students taught by DISTAR demonstrated integration of phonic and contextual strategies during oral reading. A meta-analysis of 15 studies (Adams & Engelmann, 1996), including only those studies that used complete DI programs developed by Engelmann and associates, indicated an effect size of .69 for reading (based on 43 comparisons across the 15 studies). This finding, however, should be considered in light of the study’s limitations: only four of the 15 studies specifically examined reading comprehension (the remainder examined vocabulary/language development and word recognition); only three studies contained procedures that attempted to ensure fidelity of Direct Reading Instruction, 5 implementation of DI; only two studies

included more than 60 students; 12 studies included only special education students; and five of the studies examined DI that was in place less than a year. In addition, Adams and Engelmann ignored the weak reading comprehension effect (.07) reported by Slavin, Karweit, and Madden (1989).

Promoters of DI programs for teaching reading believe that “. . . virtually all the reading failure in the early grades could be avoided if teachers . . . were given well-constructed codeemphasis instructional materials” to teach reading during the beginning stages of reading (Carnine, Silbert, & Kameenui, 1997, p. 56). This belief by advocates of DI has encouraged the production of large numbers of commercial materials designed to develop phonological decoding processes, some of which are designed to supplement a school’s adopted reading program. Also, there are commercially-produced developmental reading programs that include a strong phonological decoding component, such as Reading Mastery, Rainbow Edition, developed by Engelmann and Hammer (1995). Reading Mastery (RM) is one of several DISTAR programs (DISTAR is an acronym for Direct Instruction System for Teaching Arithmetic and Reading, which eventually became Direct Instruction System for Teaching and Remediation) developed by Engelmann and his colleagues (Engelmann and Hammer, 1995). RM lessons exemplify DI principles: (a) teacher-directed, scripted lessons; (b) presentation of phonological decoding skills (synthetic phonics) follow a hierarchical sequence; (c) student mastery is required at each step; (d) students respond orally as individuals, as a choral group, or by completing workbook assignments; and (e) systematic practice and review with a range of examples provide opportunities to correct student errors immediately.

Most of the published studies of the effects of DI, using the RM program or some other commercial program, have included fewer than 100 students and only a few studies have included Direct Reading Instruction, 6 samples of students who received more than a year of DI. Also, the inconsistent findings reported in the research literature related to the effects of DI, the lack of research examining the impact of DI on reading comprehension, and the lack of longitudinal studies of the effects of DI indicated the need for further study. This study presents the findings from a five-year longitudinal study that was designed to explore how sequential, systematic direct instruction impacts students’ reading comprehension as they progress through the elementary grades. The major research question addressed by the study was: How does sequential, systematic direct instruction in

reading via the Reading Mastery (RM) program impact students’ reading comprehension over time, when considering grade level at which RM began and length of time that students received

## Methodology

### Research Design

This study used quasi-experimental research design to determine the learners’ pronunciation performance levels before and after the use of oral reading Intervention activities. Since the study requires an actual conduct of experimentation to one group of the identified subjects to find out the influence of the oral reading intervention activities to the pronunciation performance level of the learners in a given period of time the quasi-experimental design is appropriately used.

### Locale of the study

The study was conducted at Usman Baunga Elementary School, Tamontaka II, Cotabato City. This school was established in 1994. It is located near detachment of military at diversion road, Cotabato City. Every high tide, this school experiences floods. This campus stood in an area of approximately one hectare. The land of this school was donated by late Datu Usman A. Baunga. This school has five buildings. It is located more or less 2 kilometers from the National high way of Cotabato City.

The school is presently under the administration of Dr. Leonila A. Palma, Elementary School Principal I. Under her administration, the school has improved a lot and it became one of the top performing schools in Cotabato City.

### Respondents of the Study

Twenty (20) grade 3 learners from Usman Baunga Elementary School were identified to be the respondents of this study. They were chosen randomly by means of draw lots. There are grade 3 learners in the school but only these learners were chosen to undergo the pre-test and post-test. They are also the respondents/ subjects of the oral reading intervention activities.

### Research Instrument

The researcher used oral reading test which was constructed by the researcher with the assistance of his

research adviser. There were 50 items oral reading activities prepared to improve the pronunciation of the pupils. The oral reading test was validated by the panel members during the thesis proposal. The student's oral examination was rated and identified by one experienced English teacher.

### Data Gathering Procedures

The researcher wrote a letter to the school principal of Usman Baunga Elementary School, Tamontaka II, Cotabato City asking permission to conduct the study. His letter was duly noted by his research adviser. When the adviser accessed the list of the grade 3 students. He personally inquired for the most convenient time of the students to conduct the study. The oral examination test was scheduled for the most convenient time of the subjects. However, before the students took the oral test, they were also informed of the general purpose of the study and they were informed that their performance on the oral examination test will not affect their grades. After the administration of the test, the results were rated by English teacher. The data obtained from the test were tallied, analyzed, and interpreted, and the manuscript was readied for the final presentation.

## Results and Discussion

This section contains the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered in the tabular form. The data includes the frequency, percentage and description distribution of the learners' performance level before and after oral reading intervention activities. Additionally, this chapter also covers data on comparison between the learners' English pronunciation performance before and after the reading activities.

### The Learners' Pronunciation Performance in Reading Words before the Reading Intervention

The pronunciation performance level of the learners in reading words before the oral reading intervention activity presented in table 1.

Table 1. *Frequency, Percentage, and Description Distribution of the Learners' Pronunciation Performance Levels Before the Oral Reading Intervention Activity in Terms of Words*

Range of Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
41 – 50	0	0	Very Good
31 – 40	3	15.0	Good
21 – 30	8	40.0	Average
11 – 20	6	30.0	Poor
1 – 10	3	15.0	Very Poor
Total	20	100.0	
Mean =	21.0		Average

The data in Table 1 revealed that out of 20 learners who were exposed to read 50 English words, none of them got the score within the range of 41-50 described as very good. This single out that none of the 20 learners has shown commendable performance in reading English words before the oral reading intervention. This implies that the learners' pronunciation skill in reading English words needs further pronunciation intervention activities. Widdowson (1979), said "the process of acquiring language knowledge through print." Obviously, reading necessitates linguistic comprehension.

The data suggest that reading enforcement activities shall be given to further improve the pronunciation skill of the learners in reading English words. According to Harmer (2001), teachers' failure to pay enough attention to English pronunciation is due to a lack of high-quality, appropriate teaching and learning materials, as well as a lack of time to practice pronunciation.

On the other hand, 6 or 30 percent of the learners have the gotten the score within the range of 11-20 described as poor before the oral reading intervention. This means that more than one-fourth of the learners have difficulty in reading English words with the correct pronunciation. This suggests for rigorous reading intervention. In this same way, 3 or 15 percent of the learners are very poor in reading English words. They need reading intervention English words from the teachers and they also need practices to improve their pronunciation skills.

Additionally, 3 or 15 percent of the learners got the score within the score range of 31-40 categorized as good. The figure explains that only few of the learners have the ability to read the English words correctly before the oral reading intervention. This calls for close attention to the English teachers to address the needs of the learners.



In the score range of 21-30 labelled as average, there were 8 or 40 percent of the learners scored within the score range. The data shows that nearly one half of the learners possess the minimum competency to read the English words with correct pronunciation before the oral reading intervention. This means that their pronunciation skill in English still need enforcement.

Generally, the Table reflects a mean of 21.0 labelled as average. The data revealed that in totality, the pronunciation performance of the learners in reading English words before the oral reading intervention is only average. This means that their pronunciation performance in reading English words can still be improved in varied ways. One of the ways can be through teachers' assistance. Thus, teachers have great roles on helping the students in pronunciation development. This is justified in the contention of expert that teachers should teach their students that slow speech with accurate pronunciation is preferable to quick speech with incorrect pronunciation. Learners must realize that understandability is more important than speed of speaking (Rasekhi, Kolokdaragh 2010).

### **The Learners' Pronunciation performance levels before the reading intervention activity in reading phrases.**

The frequency, percentage and description distribution of the performance of the learners in reading English phrases are shown in the table 2.

Table 2. *Frequency, Percentage, and Description Distribution of the learners' Pronunciation Performance levels before the Oral Reading Intervention Activity in Reading Phrases*

Range of Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
41 – 50	0	0	Very Good
31 – 40	3	15.0	Good
21 – 30	6	30.0	Average
11 – 20	11	55.0	Poor
1 – 10	0	0	Very Poor
Total	20	100.0	
Mean = 21.5			Average

In reading phrases, 11 or 55 percent of the learners have scored within the range of 11- 20 described as poor. This indicates that more than one half of the

learners were struggling in reading English Phrases with correct pronunciation. This suggests reading intervention to address the learners' pronunciation or reading difficulty. Teachers should include pronunciation in their lessons. Pronunciation lessons assist learners in adapting to the sound systems of a new language in other language tasks and overcome their affective issues associated to English language acquisition (Kolokdaragh, 2010).

Furthermore, the data showed that 6 or 30 percent of the learners have obtained the score within the score range of 21-30 described as average. This means that more than one fourth of the learners have the minimum competency in pronouncing English words when exposed to reading phrases. The data disclose that they still need additional practices and intervention to further improve their pronunciation skill as supported by Harmer (2001) who claimed that there is a dearth of high-quality, appropriate teaching and learning resources, as well as a lack of time to prepare them. Teachers' failure to pay enough attention to English pronunciation is primarily due to a lack of practice.

In the level of above average or good, only 3 or 15 percent of the learners fall in this category. This data disclosed that only few have possessed the ability to read English phrases with correct pronunciation

Considering the scores of all learners in reading English phrases, the obtained mean is 21.5 described as average. This implies that the oral reading English phrases performance of the learners still have a room for improvement as affirmed by McIntyre et al. (2010) who stress the importance of teacher mediation for early readers to build reading skills, because "the first-grade children who gained the most were either provided guided reading practice or independent reading with feedback" (p. 66).

### **The Learners' Pronunciation Performance Level before the Oral Intervention Activity in Reading Sentences**

The frequency, percentage, oral description distribution of the performance of the learners in reading English phrases are shown in table 3.

Table 3. *Frequency, Percentage, and Description Distribution of the Learners' Pronunciation Performance Levels Before the Oral Reading Intervention Activity in Terms of Sentences*

Range of Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
41 – 50	0	0	Very Good
31 – 40	3	15.0	Good
21 – 30	1	5.0	Average
11 – 20	16	80.0	Poor
1 – 10	0	0	Very Poor
Total	20	100.0	
Mean = 19.0			Poor

In table 3, 16 or 80 percent of the learners have shown poor performance in English when exposed to reading English sentences. The proof is revealed with scores within the range of 11-20 describe as poor which was gotten by 16 or 80 percent of the learners. The data further revealed that majority of the students are needing assistance in English pronunciation and reading. The data imply that the learners' difficulty in English pronunciation when exposed to reading English sentences need immediate remediation or intervention so that the difficulty shall be lessened and eventually overcome as affirmed Kamps et al. (2008) stating that students receiving interventions were placed in intervention groups based on teacher recommendation due to their performance.

In the average level, only 1 or 5 percent out 20 learners got the score within the range of 21-30 described as average. The learner has possessed the minimum competency in pronouncing English words through reading English sentences even before the oral reading intervention.

Additionally, 3 or 15 percent of the learners have shown good performance in reading English sentences with correct pronunciation. Probably, they possessed good training in English sentences with correct pronunciation. According to Kenworthy (1987), some pupils' understanding of appropriate pronunciation is influenced by a number of circumstances without having to rely on their teachers' Phonetic abilities, integrative motivation, and achievement are the three factors motivation.

In Table 3, none got the scores within the range of 41-50 which is very go and 1-10 which is very poor.

Finally, table 3 exhibits a mean of 19.0 described as poor. It clearly discloses that before the oral reading intervention the learners' pronunciation performance level in reading English sentences is poor. Meaning, they are struggling in reading English sentences and

the need assistance or remediation. According to Jesson and Limbrick (2014), pupils who get Reading Recovery Teachers must continue to monitor intervention to ensure that their skills are not jeopardized and maintain their level of performance in comparison to their peers.

### The Learners' Pronunciation Performance in Reading Words after the Oral Reading Intervention

After the oral reading intervention activities, the learners' performance level in English pronunciation in reading words is revealed in Table 4.

Table 4. *Frequency, Percentage, and Description Distribution of the Learners' Pronunciation Performance Levels After the Oral Reading Intervention Activity in Terms of Words*

Range of Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
41 – 50	5	25.0	Very Good
31 – 40	15	75.0	Good
21 – 30	0	0	Average
11 – 20	0	0	Poor
1 – 10	0	0	Very Poor
Total	20	100.0	
Mean = 38.0			Good

It can be gleaned in table 4 that after exposing students to oral reading activities 15 or 75 percent have obtained the score within the score range of 31-40 described as good. The data shows that majority of the learners can pronounce English words correctly after exposing them to oral reading intervention activities. It implies that the oral reading intervention activities have improved the learners' ability in pronouncing English words. The data further suggest that the oral reading activities are helpful in developing the learners' performance in pronouncing English word correctly as supported by Rajadurai (2001) who claimed that oral reading intervention are very helpful to help the students to pronounce words correctly.

Another 5 or 25 percent of the learners have gotten the score within the range of 41-50 categorized as very good. It means that only few of the learners have excellent performance in pronouncing the English words correctly after exposing them to oral reading intervention activities. It implies that oral reading intervention activities are helpful in improving the learners' pronunciation skill.

In totality, Table 4 reflects a mean of 38.0 described as good. This explicates that considering the scores of the learners in English pronunciation their performance in pronouncing English words is commendable. This explains that they possess the ability to pronounce English words correctly after the oral reading intervention activities. The data imply that exposures of learners to different oral reading intervention help them improve their pronunciation skill this is supported by Yildirim, Ritz, Akyol, and Rasinski (2015) that learners' who exposed in various reading intervention improve their reading and pronunciation skills.

No general, no students got score range 11-20 categorized as poor. Meanwhile zero frequency or no students got the score 21-30 which categorized as average. On the other hand during oral reading activities only 5 or 25 percent have obtained the score within the range of 41-50 describe as very good.

### **The Learners' Pronunciation Performance Level After the Oral Intervention Activity in reading English Phrases after the Oral Reading Intervention Activities**

The level of performance of the learners in pronunciation in reading English phrases after their exposures to oral reading intervention activities is shown in in Table 5.

Table 5. *Frequency, Percentage, and Description Distribution of the Learners' Pronunciation Performance Levels After the Oral Reading Intervention Activities in Reading Phrases*

Range of Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
41 – 50	4	20.0	Very Good
31 – 40	16	80.0	Good
21 – 30	0	0	Average
11 – 20	0	0	Poor
1 – 10	0	0	Very Poor
Total	20	100.0	
Mean = 37.5			Good

The pronunciation level of the learners when reading phrases has shown that 80 percent of the students have good pronunciation performance level. This result is manifested in the data that 16 or 80 percent can read English phrases correctly for they have gotten scores within the range of 31-40. This means that after exposing the learners to oral reading intervention

activities, majority of the students have learned to pronounce the English phrases accurately. It is an indication that oral reading intervention activities help level-up ones' performance in pronouncing English phrases with accuracy.

Another justification that students' have performed better in pronunciation English phrases after exposing them to oral reading intervention activities is the results of the post-test. It shows that there are 4 or 20 percent of the students have scored within the range of the 41-50 described as very good. The result manifest that 20 percent have passed the standard of English pronunciation of the English phrases. Probably, their performance in pronunciation is enhance by the oral reading interventions. This is testified by McCutchen, et al. ( 2009) by stating that when the students are exposed in oral reading interventions their pronunciation and reading skills are improved.

Table 5 also shows that none of the learners got score in the range of 21-30 described as average, 11-20, poor and 1-10 very poor. This means that the learners have performed better in English pronunciation after exposing them to oral reading intervention activities.

Generally, Table 5 has obtained a mean of 37.5 described as good which means that the over-all performance of the learners in pronouncing English phrases after their exposures to oral reading intervention activities is quite commendable. They can pronounce English phrases accurately. Thus, oral reading intervention activities are helpful in improving ones' pronunciation. As students repeatedly read and chart their progress, this can help to improve their sight word vocabulary as many high frequency words appear from text to text (Roberts et al., 2008).

In general, no students got score range 11-20 categorized as poor. Meanwhile zero frequency or no students got the score 21-30 which categorized as average. On the other hand during oral reading activities only 5 or 25 percent have obtained with the score range of 41-50 describe as very good.

### **The Learners' Pronunciation Performance level After the Oral Intervention Activity in reading English Sentences**

The learners were exposed to oral reading intervention activities. After their exposures to their activities, their level of performance in pronouncing English Sentences is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. *Frequency, Percentage, and Description Distribution of the Learners' Pronunciation Performance Levels After the Oral Reading Intervention Activity in Terms of Sentences*

Range of Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
41 – 50	1	5.0	Very Good
31 – 40	19	95.0	Good
21 – 30	0	0	Average
11 – 20	0	0	Poor
1 – 10	0	0	Very Poor
Total	20	100.0	
Mean = 36.0			Good

The data in Table 6 revealed that after the exposures of the learners to oral reading intervention activities, 19 or 95 percent of the learners have shown good performance in pronouncing English sentences. This is justified by their scores in the pronunciation test that fall within the score range of 31-40 described as good. The scores of the learners in the pronunciation test manifest that after their exposures to oral reading intervention activities, almost all of them have acquired competency in pronouncing English sentences correctly. The data reveal that their exposures to oral reading intervention activities help them improve in English pronunciation as supported by Brown, et al. (2010) the more students exposed in oral reading interventions the more they improve reading and pronounce the word correctly.

The data further justify that learners' exposure to oral reading intervention activities help them acquire competence in English pronunciation when given sentences to read. The scores within the range of 40-50 testifies that 1 or 5 percent of the learners has obtained this score. The data in Table 6 further convey that after the oral reading intervention activities the scores of the learners fall in the categories of very good and good. The descriptions of their level of performance tells that oral reading intervention activity is effective way of improving learners' pronunciation skill in English.

The over-all mean of 36.0 described as good is another manifestation of the improvement in English pronunciation by the oral reading intervention activity.

### **The Comparison of Learners' English Pronunciation Performance in Reading English Words, Phrases, and Sentences Before and After Reading Activities**

Table 7. *Comparison Between the Learners' English Pronunciation Performance Before and After the Reading Activities are Introduced*

Indicators	Comparison of Paired Samples	Mean	Computed t-value	Tabular t-value	Description
1. Words					
	Pre-test	21.80	10.418	2.093	Significant
	Post-test	36.55			
2. Phrases					
	Pre-test	23.40	12.809	2.093	Significant
	Post-test	34.95			
3. Sentences					
	Pre-test	20.75	11.825	2.093	Significant
	Post-test	34.30			
4. In General					
	Pre-test	21.98	13.719	2.093	Significant
	Post-test	35.26			

It is shown in Table 7 the results of the comparison of the paired samples before and after the oral reading intervention activities. In the category of pronouncing English words, the computed t-value is 10.418 which is higher than the tabular t-values of 2.093 described as the significant. This is the value is generated from the mean of pre-test which is 21.80 and the mean of the post-test which is 36.55. This means that oral reading intervention activities have improved the pronunciation skills of the learners in reading English words. The data further revealed that oral reading intervention activities are very effective in improving pronunciation skill of the learning in reading English words. The result rejects the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the pronunciation skill level of the learners in reading English words before and after the oral reading intervention activities.

Furthermore, in English phrases, it has a re-test mean score of 23.40 and a post-test mean score of 34.95 with a computed t-value of 12.809 which is also higher than the tabular value of 2.093 categorized as significant. The data reveal that there is a significant improvement in the pronunciation skill level of the learners after their exposures to oral reading intervention activities. This rejects the null hypothesis claiming that there is no significant difference between the pronunciation skill level of the learners before and after the oral intervention activities.



Lastly, the pre-test mean score of the learners in reading English sentences is 21.98 and the post-test mean score is 35.26 with a t-computed value of 13.719 which is far higher than the tabular t-value of 2.093 described as significant. This tells that after the oral reading interventions, the pronunciation skill level of the learners in reading sentences has exhibited a very significant improvement. The data revealed the effectiveness of oral reading intervention activities in the English pronunciation of the learners. Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is a significant difference in the pronunciation skill level of the learners in reading English sentences before and after oral reading intervention activities is rejected. The study of Atli and Bergil (2012) claims that oral reading interventions is more effective in improving the oral reading of the learners.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concluded that the pronunciation skill of the learners in reading English words, phrases, and sentences is greatly improved by the oral reading intervention activities. Therefore; the oral reading intervention activities is very effective in improving the pronunciation skill of the learners.

Moreover, based on the findings and conclusion, the following are recommended: (1) The learners may continue exposing themselves in reading English words, phrases, and sentences to improve their English pronunciation skill. (2) The teachers may utilize the output of the study to provide the learners opportunities for oral reading. (3) The Elementary English teachers may consider providing oral reading

intervention activities to the learners to further hone their pronunciation and reading skills. (4) The learners need to be actively engaged in the oral reading intervention activities to further improve their pronunciation and reading skill. (5) Other researchers may consider conducting similar study to the subjects and setting to further validate the result of the study.

## References

- Leslie Giesen (2001) Activities for Integrating Reading and Writing in the Language Classroom
- Willow F. Pangket (2019) "Oral English Proficiency: Factors Affecting the Learners' Development
- Zulqarnain Abu Bakar\* and Muhammad Ridhuan Tony Lim Abdullah (2015) "Importance of Correct Pronunciation in Spoken English: Dimension of Second Language Learners' Perspective Journal.

## Affiliations and Corresponding Information

### Razul Omar, MAELT

Usman Baunga Elementary School  
Cotabato City Division, MBHTE  
Philippines

### Haron Mohamad, MAELT

MBHTE-BARMM Talitay National High School  
Maguindanao-1 Division  
Philippines

### Datu Raffy Ralph Sinsuat, MScIT

BARMM -Bangsamoro Information and  
Communications Technology Office  
Philippines

### Dr. Marissa Parcon

Mindanao State University  
Maguindanao, Philippines