

UV Journal of Research 2015

# Reading comprehension skills using SQ3R method

Jhon Kevin A. Mirafuentes

Nerissa S. Lopez

Felix Diano, Jr.

College of Education

University of the Visayas, Philippines

aljhonnas\_88@yahoo.com.ph

Date Submitted: May 5, 2015

Date Accepted: June 1, 2015

## ABSTRACT

The research assessed the four (4) reading comprehension levels among the third year Bachelor of Elementary Education students in terms of the literal, inferential, critical and evaluative skills using SQ3R method. The study utilized the pre-test-post-test design under pre-experimental research design to determine the levels of reading comprehension skills of BEd students before and after using SQ3R method. In addition, T-test was used to assess the significant difference of students' reading performance of the two assessments. Furthermore, the simple percentage was used to get the reading comprehension skill levels of the students and the K to 12 standard academic performance to interpret the results. Findings revealed that in the first assessment, the level of reading comprehension of the students was under the beginner level. After they were exposed to SQ3R method in the second assessment, their level move to Approaching Proficiency. The study concluded that using the SQ3R method in teaching reading results to honing reading comprehension skills and may lead readers to proficiency.

**Keywords:** *Comprehension Skills, Critical, Evaluative, Literal, Inferential, SQ3R Method*

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is said that there is a need to strive in mastering reading among students. Reading helps for survival and progress which indeed serves as a potent tool of humanity. Furthermore, it can be a tool for people to learn, it is also needed to acquire knowledge; therefore, it is not only a school subject but also a tool for learning. Reading is a child's great means to diverse the wonder of knowledge and enjoyment through the years of life. Thus, reading is a vital phase in the child's personal and educational development. Strang as cited by Villamin et al. (2001) once said that if reading contributes to personality, life changes. The study claims that students, regardless of teachers' competence, primarily excel when

reading materials meet their needs in the real-life situation.

In the study of Carlston (2012) on the Benefits of Student-Generated Note Packets: A Preliminary Investigation of SQ3R Implementation, minimal research to date has evaluated the impact of Survey-Question-Read-Recite-Review (SQ3R) implementation on content retention and student performance. Results from the current study indicate that when students use SQ3R strategies, they retain more information, as demonstrated by higher achievement on course exams. Donald (1967) as cited by Garty (1975) compared are two groups equated on the basis of M.A.I.Q., reading, geography, and history scores. The mean difference

results were found to be insignificant. During the year, SQ3R was taught to the experimental group; the controlled group received the traditional treatment including visual aids. At the end of the semester, the May testing showed differences of 6.69 in geography and 7.08 in history, a significant difference at the 0.01 level of confidence in favor of the treatment group.

In the Philippines, the result of the administered National Achievement Test by the Department of Education to public schools only showed 11.67 percent Mean Percentage Score (MPS) improvement in all subject areas from 2006 to 2009. This percentage reached only in the "near mastery level". In an interview, Dr. Yolanda Quijano, head of the DepEd's Bureau of Elementary Education, attributed "reading problems as the main culprit for the poor performance of some students in the NAT." Researchers believed that there is a need for teachers who can teach reading to increase the performance of the learners in terms of reading and to shy away from illiteracy (Ortlieb, 2013).

Knowing the poor reading performance in that achievement test, the researchers attempted to find out the levels of reading comprehension of the Bachelor of Elementary Education students using the SQ3R method and its effectiveness in teaching-learning process to the teachers' part, and especially in honing reading comprehension skills that may lead readers to reading proficiency.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Proposition Theory involves the reader constructing a main idea or macrostructure as they process the text. These main ideas are organized in a hierarchical fashion with the most important things given the highest priority to be memorized. The reader can process the skills to achieve the highest level of comprehension where readers can formulate the main idea of the text. Gunning (1996) also introduces and describes Organizational Strategy as the process of selecting important details and building relationships from them. This strategy includes: identifying the main idea and topic sentences, classifying information, deciding which information is relevant, sequencing and summarizing. Each of these is complex and a method for improving them needs to be taught

starting from the basic ideas and gradually, to the more difficult ones. Furthermore, this strategy helps readers to formulate the main idea from the detailed information based on reading. Thus, Proposition Theory and Organization Strategy are intertwined and interrelated to improve comprehension.

SQ3R method as introduced by Robinson in 1946 in his book *Effective Study*, helps in improving the reading comprehension skills through surveying, questioning, reading, reciting and reviewing. Before reading, the teacher should survey first the material. In this study, students utilized the steps of this method to test learners' reading comprehension skills.

The steps of SQ3R Method are: survey, question, read, recite and review. First stage is the Survey Stage otherwise known as the preparation and the elicitation stage. Students must be motivated first before reading. This is also the stage where an initial or preliminary activity will help teacher and students organize the material as they read (Garty, 1975). Then follows the Question stage where the teacher can use an activity of asking questions. It focuses on the concentration on what students need to learn or get out of their reading. The teacher will post a question which is based on the text or selection, wherein students otherwise will answer it. Divergent answers are expected in this phase based on students' prior knowledge and experience (Pasa, 2011). Third is the Read stage, otherwise known as the "during reading" stage. At this stage, students will actively search for the answers to the posted question. If ever students cannot find the answer in a portion of paragraph, they may proceed reading the second or the third or the fourth paragraph until they catch the answer (Scott, 2009). Fourth is the Recite stage where students recite the answer to the question using their own words and examples. Thus, students have the understanding of the printed text and used material. Lastly is the Review step where students review the selection by summarizing the entire story, finding the theme or valuing, or relating or tapping the story based on their personal experience (Baier, 2011).

One cannot reach the comprehension level unless the nature and facets of reading are determined. All of these facets of reading are the

line of attack for a reader to possess the skills on reading comprehension: (a) Literal Level (reading the lines); (b) Inferential/Interpretive Level (reading between the lines); (c) Critical Level (reading beyond the lines; and (d) Creative/Evaluative Level. Therefore, the interaction between the reader and the reading text/material may occur at these levels. If one has mastered all these levels, he is said to possess reading comprehension skills (Santos, 2002).

In applying comprehension at the Literal Level, reading involves comprehension of ideas that is simply, directly and explicitly stated in the text (Villamin, 2001). Some specific skills at this level are following accurately specific written or printed instructions; following sequence and relationship of ideas; and understanding vocabulary. In school, the ability to follow accurately written or printed instructions is needed in completing written assignments, in taking written tests, in conducting science experiments, in solving mathematical problems, in completing an art project, etc. This illustrates the need to read carefully and closely following written instructions. Moreover, the sequence of ideas and understanding sequence is a prerequisite to making inferences, summarizing and outlining (Villanueva & delos Santos, 2008). Thus, comprehension skill requires not just for reading procedural steps, stages and development, or listing of chronological dates and events. Vocabulary is vitally imperative to reading comprehension. A word is a label for an internal reality which helps create a new perception. The richer one's vocabulary is the greater his or her reading power becomes (Freebody & Klausmier, 1981 as cited by Villamin, 2001). So if a learner knows the meaning of a word, then he easily reads a passage or paragraph without any intrusion by unfamiliar word(s).

For Inferential Level, the specific skills developed are finding meaning in context, interpreting figurative language, predicting outcomes and making inferences. Finding meaning in context can be both literal and inferential: literal in the sense that, when a reader reads, he may come upon words that he has seen, but not necessarily understand. In this study, the learner can figure out the meaning of a new or unknown word by looking for context clues in the words and

phrases that surround the word; and inferential because the reader tries to presume the meaning through how the word is used in the phrase or sentence. Interpreting figurative language has meaning beyond the actual meaning of the words. This creates images, or pictures, in the reader's mind. These are groups of words, phrases, or clauses that may differ in meaning from their literal interpretation; thus, the reader may also infer its meaning on how it is used in the sentence or context. Predicting outcomes and making inferences are the skills where readers can predict or infer the next events in a story for example. Additionally, Romero (1985) posited that a reader makes an intelligent guess of what he thinks may happen as a result of series of observations.

Critical level includes these specific skills; the ability to recognize facts and distinguish them from opinions. Facts are statements which can be or have been proven to be true, they are verifiable statements. On the other hand, opinions are statements which express a personal point of view, hence, can be biased and are not objectively verifiable (Krantz & Kimmelman, 1981 as cited by Villamin, 2001); the ability to compare and contrast, the ability to recognize the cause and effect. The ability to recognize facts is the first stage for a reader to distinguish if the statement is fact or opinion; thus, in this study, the learner compares and contrasts if the reading material is valid or not. This ability develops the reader's comprehension to judge and critique.

Cause and effect as well as drawing conclusions are sub-skills where a reader forms judgments that this effect happens due to its reason and gives his or her judgment based on the given facts, respectively. Finally, the Evaluative Level. If there is a given selection or paragraph, and he or she can summarize it through his own words, then he is a critical and creative reader (Marquez, Casela & Sadorra, 2009). He or she is able to relay the message of the text in his or her own idea. So, it is beyond the literal level. Ultimately, the skill to be gained is the ability to find the main idea. This sub-skill enables the reader to express his idea in his own words which he or she gives the focal point or the central thought of the context. Creative reading not only requires an inquisitive and imaginative mind, but also needs analysis,

synthesis and evaluation (Alcantara, Cabanilla, Espina & Villamin, 2003). This is the reader's ability to achieve a unique view of a situation, or event, and to integrate his own experiences with what the writer is saying and/or even drawing conclusions (Tejero & Catchillar, 2004).

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study utilized the pre-test-post-test design under pre-experimental research design to determine the levels of reading comprehension skills of BEED students before and after using SQ3R method. In addition, a t-test was used to assess the significant difference of students' reading performance of the two assessments.

Table 1

*The different class schedules and the number of respondents in each class.*

Class Schedules		Number of respondents	
Time	Days	No. of students enrolled	No. of students participated
3:30-5:00 P.M.	Monday/Wednesday	24	24
2:00-3:30 P.M.	Tuesday/Thursday	15	15
$\Sigma$		39	39

Table 1 shows that the class in the 3:30-5:00 P.M. had the higher number of participants than the class in 2:00-3:30 P. M. and they all had participated in answering the tests. The main instruments used are standardized questionnaires based on Strategies to Achieve Reading Success (STARS) developed and written by Deborah Adcock and Joan Krensky in 2006.

The first portion focused on the first level of comprehension skills, specially skills which is reading lines. The second portion was an inferential skills which means reading between the lines, and the third portion focused on critical skills which is reading beyond the lines, and the last portion focused on evaluative and creative skills, this is the application of what the reader understands. The researchers conducted the research by testing the students' levels of comprehension skills through series of tests catering the four levels: (a) Literal; (b) Inferential;

(c) Critical; and (d) Evaluative/Creative. On the first assessment results, intervention was administered. The researcher discussed the story employing SQ3R method after which, distributed the questionnaires based on the story. After the examination, the researchers tallied, tabulated and interpreted the data.

To better interpret the data gathered, the researchers used the standard academic performance of K to 12 designed and imposed by the Department of Education (Philippines) in the Enhanced Basic Education Curriculum (levels of performan.ce) through the Curriculum Guide in English. The Department of Education identified seven to eight (7-8) Domains of Literacy (Listening Comprehension, Oral Language and Fluency, Vocabulary Development, Reading Comprehension, Writing Composition, Grammar Awareness and Structure; Attitude and Study Strategies); one of which is Reading Comprehension for both elementary and secondary level. Thus, each of the content standards is assessed according to the DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2012:

- A (Advanced) 90 % and above
- P (Proficient) 85 % - 89 %
- AP (Approaching Proficiency) 80% - 84 %
- D (Developing) 75 % - 79 %
- B (Beginning) 74 % and below

Beginning (B) Level represents students' demoted by a grade of 74% below whose reading skills are struggling or have not been acquired. Developing (D) Level (75% to 79%) represents students' with minimum reading skills, thus, they need help and assistance. Approaching Proficiency (AP) (80% to 84%) represents students whose reading skills stills required same guidance from the teacher or some assistance from peers.

### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data obtained from the administered pretest and the post-test show the results before and after the implementation of SQ3R Method.

Presents here is the performance of the respondents in the four comprehension levels: the literal level (reading the lines), the inferential level (reading between the lines), the critical level

(reading beyond the lines) and the evaluative or creative level (application). This presents the total items of each test, the raw scores of each student with the corresponding percentages.

In the First Assessment, respondents are assessed according to Literal, Inferential, Critical and Evaluative levels of reading comprehension. Each level had eight (8) items to be answer.

Table 2  
*Literal Level Pretest Results*

Level Literal (Items)	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
8	36	92	Advanced
5	35	90	Advanced
1	33	85	Proficient
2	33	85	Proficient
3	32	82	Approaching Proficiency
<b>4</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>Beginning</b>
<b>Σ</b>		<b>76</b>	<b>Developing</b>

Item number 8 gained the highest number of students who got the correct answer which is 92 % (Advanced). This means that majority of the BEEed students found this item very easy. Item number 5 gained the second highest which is 90 % (Advanced). This means that majority of the BEEed students found this item easy. For items number 1 and 2 each gained an average of 85% (Proficient). This simply means that these items were quite easy, since 33 students got the correct answer. Item number 3 gained an average of 82% (Approaching Proficiency) which means that 32 of the BEEed students found this item quite easy. Item number 4 gained an average of 72% of the 39 respondents (Beginning) which means that the item was quite difficult. Item number 7 scored a mean of 67% among the 39 respondents (Beginning). This means the item was also difficult. Lastly, item number 6 gained an average of 38% (Beginning) which means that this item was very difficult for the respondents. This implies that majority of the respondents have acquired the literal level in reading comprehension skill since they passed five out of eight items; consequently, the skill on literal level in general signifies that majority of the respondents were able to reach the

required mean average percentage, 76% which indicates a reading level which is still developing. Thus, the literal level should be given emphasis in teaching reading. Guzman et al. (1976) mentioned a reader fails to understand a passage because he or she allows what he or she thinks or knows about the subject to interfere with what the writer is actually saying. Villamin (2001) said that most readers tend to gloss over details which, to them, may not seem important. It is when there is a need to recall specific information about the passage that the reader realizes due attention was not given to seemingly small but significant details. Medes (SEAMEO, 2012), the assistant chief of staff development division of Bureau of Elementary Education, added that the majority of the students at this level possess the minimum knowledge and skills and core understanding. Thus, they still need help throughout the performance of authentic tasks.

Table 3  
*Inferential Level Pretest Results*

Level Inferential (Items)	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
<b>3</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>Approaching Proficiency</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>Developing</b>
1	26	67	Beginning
4	26	67	Beginning
5	26	67	Beginning
7	24	62	Beginning
8	19	49	Beginning
<b>Σ</b>		<b>70</b>	<b>Beginning</b>

For the inferential level, only items 2 and 3 were correctly answered 82% and 92% of the respondent respectively. The item with the third highest average was only 77% of the respondents, which levels it as quite difficult. Moreover, this level only reached 70% in the mean percentage, with students failure five out of eight items. It implies that the majority of the respondents are weak at the inferential comprehension level and their level in general is the beginning. The respondents' inferential skills in reading comprehension should therefore be given focus in teaching reading especially on predicting



outcomes, making inferences, finding the meaning of the words in context and figures of speech. May (1986) as cited by Villamin (2001), mentioned that without appropriate and adequate experience and knowledge, the reader cannot make the necessary inferences, and without inferences there is no real reading.

The Inferential level involves the reader's ability to determine facts and relationships, the depth and breadth of his prior knowledge and experience, and his ability to understand the language signals of the writer. Villamin (2001) added that any inadequacy in these factors may lead the reader to make incorrect and illogical inferences. Medes (SEAMEO, 2012), assistant chief of staff development division of Bureau of Elementary Education, said that the student at this level struggles with his/her understanding; prerequisite and fundamental knowledge and/or skills have not been acquired or developed adequately to aid understanding.

Table 4

*Critical Level Pretest Results*

Level Critical (Items)	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
6	28	72	Beginning
2	26	67	Beginning
3	26	67	Beginning
5	26	67	Beginning
8	26	67	Beginning
7	23	59	Beginning
1	22	56	Beginning
4	22	56	Beginning
$\Sigma$		64	Beginning

For item number 6, 72% (Beginning) of the 39 respondents scored under the Beginning level of Academic Performance which means that this item is quite difficult. For items number 2, 3, 5 and 8 majority of the 39 respondents gained 67% (Beginning) who got the correct answer. This means that the items are difficult. For item number 7, 59% (Beginning) of the 39 respondents gained about this item which is very difficult for them. Items number 1 and 4 gained the same percentage (56%) of the 39 respondents who got the correct answer, (Beginning). This means that these items are very difficult. All items in this level were not correctly answered by the respondents. In this

level, respondents need improvement. No one passed in this level because only 64% attained this level. Therefore, respondents found this level difficult since the level of performance displaced is Beginning. In consequence, they need to master the ability to compare and contrast, ability to recognize fact from opinion, and the ability to recognize cause and effect. Medes (SEAMEO, 2012) said that the student at this level struggles with his or her understanding; prerequisite and fundamental knowledge and/or skills have not been acquired or developed adequately to aid understanding.

Table 5

*Evaluative Level Pretest Results*

Level Evaluative (Items)	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
3	30	77	Developing
1	29	74	Beginning
8	24	62	Beginning
4	22	56	Beginning
2	13	33	Beginning
7	3	8	Beginning
5	1	3	Beginning
6	1	3	Beginning
$\Sigma$		39.5	Beginning

Item number 3 gained the highest percentage (77%, Developing) of the 39 respondents who got the correct answer in this item. Hence, the item is quite easy. Item number 1 which asked the main idea of the first paragraph gained 74% of the 39 respondents who got the correct answer. This means that these respondents' level of academic performance is Beginning. Further more, this item is quite difficult to answer. The rest of the item where answered by two few of the students are displayed in the table above. This means that the items were very difficult to answer. Nevertheless, for items 5, 6 and 7 in the evaluative level, 3 of the 39 respondents and only 1 of the 39 respondents respectively got the correct answers. The same with, items 5, 6 and 7 talk about getting the main idea and summarizing. This implies that majority of the respondents need to master the skills in getting the main idea and summarizing of the texts. As a result, respondents found at this level to be difficult and the level of performance

is Beginning in general because 39.5% of the 39 respondents got the correct answers in the 1 to 8 item Evaluative Skill test. The data implied that as students are exposed to the highest level of comprehension, a deeper of understanding is really needed. Samples (1976) as cited by Villamin (2001), stated that metaphorical mind is required in creative reading, the highest level of reading, but the most neglected reading ability. Thus, the reader must go beyond facts and literal details. To summarize the four tables, the literal level (Table 2), the inferential level (Table 3), the critical level (Table 4) and evaluative level (Table 5), only the literal level was successfully achieved by the respondents. This is the level where readers understand only the surface level or what is in the printed text or reading material. The rest of the levels need to be mastered and enhanced.

The succeeding discussion revolved around the students result in the posttest after the SQ3R interventions was administered.

Table 6  
*Literal Level Posttest Result*

Level Literal (Items)	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
3	39	100	Advanced
5	34	87	Proficient
1	30	77	Developing
<b>Σ</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>Proficient</b>

For item number 3 respondents gained a perfect score of 100%. This means that the item was very easy for them to answer. Item number 5 gained 87% (Proficient). This means that the item was also easy. Lastly, for item number 1 gained 77% (Developing) of the 39 respondents. This means that the item is quite easy to answer. This shows that there was indeed a development in the academic performance of the respondents' reading comprehension skills, meaning that majority of the respondents showed Proficiency in the Literal Level. Thus, Medes (SEAMEO, 2012) reported that the student at this level has developed the fundamental knowledge and skills

and core understandings and can transfer them independently through authentic performance tasks. Villamin (2011) added that reading in the literal level requires the reader to hold in his mind or remember significant details which contribute to an eventual understanding of what is read.

Table 7  
*Inferential Level Posttest Results*

Level Inferential (Items)	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
6	38	97	Advanced
7	33	85	Proficient
9	21	54	Beginning
<b>Σ</b>		<b>79</b>	<b>Developing</b>

For item number 6 gained 97% (Advanced). This means that the item is very easy. This proves that answering a figure of speech is an inferential skill of reading comprehension. For item number 7 gained 85% (Proficient) of the 39 respondents who were able to answer it correctly. This means that the item was easy. Lastly, Item number 9 gained 54% (Beginning). This implies that majority of the respondents are only able to develop their inferential skill when they are exposed to SQ3R method.

Medes (2012), said that the student at this level possesses the minimum knowledge and skills and core understandings, but needs help throughout the performance of authentic tasks. Yen-Chi Fan (2010), Center for General Education, I-Shou University in Taiwan, discussed the effect of comprehension strategy instruction on EFL Learner's Reading Comprehension. From Palincsar and Brown's (1984) point of view, predicting is also a comprehension monitoring activity which facilitates making and testing inferences. Pressley (2006) additionally contends that "prior knowledge plays an important role, permitting the generation of inferences required to understand the text". Similarly, Nuttall (1996) stressed that implicit inferential comprehension can be enhanced by the activation of prior knowledge.

Table 8.  
*Critical Level Posttest Results*

LEVELS	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
Critical (Items)			
8	36	92	Advanced
10	33	85	Proficient
4	32	82	Approaching Proficiency
<b>Σ</b>		<b>86</b>	<b>Proficient</b>

This table shows that item number 8 gained an average of 92% (Advanced). This means that the item was a very easy to answer. Item number 10 also gained 85% (Proficient), Which means that the item was also easy to answer. Lastly, item number 4 gained 82 % (Approaching Proficiency). This means that the item was easy as well. The items in the Critical level were answered correctly by majority of the respondents; thus, their skill in the critical level is Proficient which garnered 86% on average who got the correct answer. Medes (SEAMEO, 2012) reported that the student at this level has developed the fundamental knowledge and skills and core understandings and can transfer them independently through authentic performance tasks. This level requires concentration and practice, but its rewards are eminently worthwhile (Guzman et al., 1976).

Table 9  
*Evaluative Level Posttest Results*

LEVELS	<i>f</i>	%	Level of Academic Performance
Evaluative (Items)			
11	35	90	Advanced
2	27	69	Beginning
12	20	51	Beginning
<b>Σ</b>		<b>70</b>	<b>Beginning</b>

This shows that item number 11 gained the 90 % respondents (Advanced) who got the correct answer. This item is very easy to answer. Item number 2 gained an average of 69% (Beginning). This means that the item is very difficult to answer. In the evaluative level pretest results, it shows that majority of the respondents found items very

difficult to answer. It implies that the teacher must religiously utilize the method and likewise the students must read the selection comprehensively. Lastly, item number 12 which asked for the lesson taught by the myth was correctly answered by 51% (Beginning) respondents. This means that the item is very difficult to answer. Out of three items, only one item (item number 11) was answered correctly, the respondents' evaluative skill needs to be honed and mastered, especially in ability in getting the main idea, summarizing and evaluating the text to get the conclusion of the text read. Medes (SEAMEO, 2012) reported that the student at this level struggles with his or her understanding; prerequisite and fundamental knowledge and/or skills have not been acquired or developed adequately to aid understanding. Therefore, the reader needs to extend his thinking beyond what is implied or expected, and allow his imagination to soar (Villamin, 2001).

Table 10  
*Significant Difference Between Pretest and Posttest*

Levels	First Assessment	Level of Performance	Second Assessment	Level of Performance
Literal	76%	Developing	88%	Proficient
Inferential	70%	Beginning	79%	Developing
Critical	64%	Beginning	86%	Proficient
Evaluative/Creative	39.5%	Beginning	70%	Beginning
<b>Σ</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>Approaching Proficiency</b>

Table 10 confirms, in the Pretest, the respondents scored 70% in the Literal level; thus, the level of performance is Beginning; whereas, the level of reading comprehension skill of the respondents exposed to SQ3R method in the posttest of the same level is Proficient since they scored 88%. Precisely, there was an increase of 12% difference. In the Pretest, respondents scored 70% in the Inferential level which means the level of performance is Beginning. However, as the respondents were exposed to SQ3R method, is 79% respondents reached the Developing level of performance. Amazingly, there was an increase of 9% difference. In the Pretest, respondents scored 64% in the Critical level which means their skills are at beginners level. On the other hand, 86% of the respondents exposed to SQ3R method in the



Posttest, rose to a Proficient level. Surprisingly, there was a noticeable increase of 22%. Lastly, in the Pretest only 39.5% of the respondents were able to score in the Evaluative level which means the level of performance is still at the beginners level. Likewise, in the post test administered after, they were exposed to SQ3R method, respondents still scored within the beginners level. In other words, these respondents need to give focus on the mastery of the Evaluative/Creative level. However, there was an increase in this level by 30.5% difference. In a nutshell, the mean gain between the Pretest and Posttest is 18%, thus, escalating from 63% for those not exposed to SQ3R method and is Beginning level (see table 9) to 81% for those exposed to SQ3R method and is Approaching Proficiency level (see table 10).

Table 11  
*Difference between the Pretest and Posttest*

	t	df
<b>Equal variances Assumed</b>	-5.634*	76
<b>Equal variances not assumed</b>	-5.634*	75.844

\*α=0.05

Using a T-test to determine the difference between the first and second assessments, the data revealed a significant difference of the First and Second Assessments with 39 respondents. Table 11 shows the difference between the performance in first and second assessment. It is seen that there is significant difference between the pretest and posttest. It implies that the performance of the student respondents really improved after the implementation of the SQ3R method in the teaching-learning process. As observed in the assessments, students performed better in the posttest than in the pretest. The researchers come to a conclusion that the SQ3R method is effective in reading instruction. Thus, if teachers use SQ3R method thoroughly in the teaching-learning process, there is a greater increase of the reading comprehension skills of the students based on the performances of BEEEd students.

**V. CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings, the respondents reading comprehension skills increased when they were exposed to the method. The study concluded that using the SQ3R method in teaching reading improves the level of reading comprehension skills. Thus, there will be more effective reading instruction on the part of the teacher, and using the SQ3R method may lead reading to better proficiency.

Originality Index:	92 %
Similarity Index:	8 %
Paper ID:	658702123
Grammarly:	Checked

**REFERENCES**

Adcock, D., & Krensky, J. (2000). *Strategies to Achieve Reading Success (STARS)*. MA, USA: Curriculum Associates.

Alcantara, R., Cabanilla, J., Espina, F., & Villamin, A. (2003). *Teaching strategies I (3rd ed.)*. Makati City, PH: Katha Publishing Co., Inc.

Baier, K. (2011). *The effects of SQ3R on fifth grade students' comprehension levels* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Bowling Green State University, Ohio United States.

Brown, A. L., Palincsar, A. S., & Armbruster, B. B. (1984). Instructing comprehension-fostering activities in interactive learning situations. In H. Mandl, N. L. Stein, & T. Trabasso (Eds.) *Learning and comprehension of text* (pp 255-286). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Carlston, D. L. (2011). Benefits of Student-Generated Note Packets A Preliminary Investigation of SQ3R Implementation. *Teaching of Psychology*, 38(3), 142-146.

Fan, Y. C. (2010). The effect of comprehension strategy instruction on efl learners' reading comprehension. *Asian Social Science*, 6(8), 19.

Garty, R. H. (1975). The Effect of DRA and SQ3R on the Immediate and Delayed Recall of Seventh-Grade Social Studies Material.

- Reading Horizon*, 23(1), 246
- Gunning, T. (1996). Creating Reading Instruction for All Children. In T. Gunning (Ed.) *Creating reading instruction for all children* (pp.192-236). Des Moines, IA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Guzman, M., Calaguian, C., Flores, C., Parayno, S., & Peñaflores, A. (1976). *Developing Reading and Language Skills for College*. Manila, PH: Publishers Association of the Philippines, Inc.
- Marquez, S., Casela, N., & Sadorra, B. (2009). *Developmental Reading 2*. Quezon City, PH: Lorimar Publishing.
- Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Ortlieb, E. (2013). Using Anticipatory Reading Guides to Improve Elementary Students' Comprehension. *Online Submission*, 6(2), 145-162.
- Pasa, R. A. (2014). *The effect of teaching reading using SQ3R Method on the eighth grade students' reading comprehension achievement at SMPN 2 Panti Jember*. *English Education Program, Jember University*. Department of Education, Jember University, East Java, Indonesia
- Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching*. New York, USA: Guilford.
- Romero, A., & Romero, R. C. (1985). *Developmental Reading*. Manila, Philippines: Rex Book Store
- Santos, N. A. (2002). *Teaching Reading*. Quezon City, PH: JMC Press.
- Scott, S. E. (2009). *Knowledge for teaching reading comprehension: Mapping the terrain*. ProQuest.
- Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization. (2012). *K to 12 Toolkit*. Quezon City, PH.
- Tejero, E., & Catchillar, G. (2004). *Teaching Reading in the Elementary Grades*. Mandaluyong City, PH: National Book Store.
- Villamin, A. M., Diaz, L. S., Talens, B. A., & Santos, N. S. (2001). *Gateways and skyways to developmental reading*. Quezon City, PH: Katha Publishing Co., Inc.
- Villanueva, A. S., & Santos, R. L. (2008). *Developmental Reading 1*. Quezon City, Philippines: Lorimar Printing Co., Inc.