

# THE DROP EVERYTHING AND READ (DEAR) PROGRAM AND THE READING PREFERENCES, VOCABULARY AND COMPREHENSION SKILLS

Anna Wilda C. Tado  
annawildatado@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*The Drop Everything and Read (DEAR) Program, the Reading Preferences, Vocabulary and Comprehension Skills of the Teacher Education Students were the focus of the study. Specifically, this study aimed to: (1) determine the level of implementation of the DEAR Program; (2) determine the reading preferences of the students; (3) find out the level of vocabulary skills of the students; (4) find out the level of comprehension skills of the students; (5) determine if there is a significant relationship between the following variables under study: the level of implementation and the reading preferences; level of implementation and vocabulary skills; level of implementation and comprehension skills; the reading preferences and comprehension skills; the reading preferences and vocabulary skills; and, the vocabulary skills and comprehension skills of Teacher Education Students. In addition, this study aimed to get information on how these TES think and feel about the implementation of the DEAR Program, the insights gained in terms of vocabulary skills, moral lessons obtained and reflections/reactions cited.*

*The study used the DEAR logs submitted by the TES for the level of implementation, moral lessons obtained and reflections/reactions cited. For the level of vocabulary and comprehension skills, the researcher conducted a test validated by a Language Expert of the school. For the reading preferences, it used a survey, and for the issues and concern and insights of the program, the researcher used group interviews to students.*

*For relationships there is no significant relationship between the level of implementation and the reading preferences, the level of implementation and vocabulary skills, level of implementation and comprehension skills, reading preferences and vocabulary skills, and between reading preferences and comprehension skills. On the other hand, there is a significant relationship between the vocabulary and comprehension skills of the students. Based on the findings of the study, first, the DEAR Program has not strengthened Teacher Education students' vocabulary and comprehension skills level for some levels are low and some are moderate. Second, the preferred reading materials by TES were non-fiction but this has no bearing with their vocabulary skills and comprehension skills for it does not show significant relationships.*

**Keywords:** reading comprehension, DEAR time, vocabulary, reading skills

## INTRODUCTION

### RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

In all aspects of academic endeavors and undertakings, it is a necessity for every individual to spend substantial amount of time reading. In whatever level of studying or profession one is into, every individual is compelled to read and ascertain that this reading task is coupled with comprehension.

The School of Education (SED) of San Isidro College (SIC) envisions its graduates to become skilled and efficient in all aspects of the teaching profession. The Pre-service teachers have to be trained to develop a love for reading. In this way, they will be able to advance their knowledge in any discipline across and beyond the curriculum. This is the vision of the School of Education of San Isidro College.

The School of Education (SED) of San Isidro College (SIC) has its DEAR program which was launched in July 1 of the Academic Year 2010-2011. DEAR stands for Drop Everything and Read. This is a program designed for the purpose of enhancing the reading skills amongst the teacher education students of SIC. Teacher education students are required to have a minimum time of 2 hours per week, for a total of 20 reading hours per semester. DEAR time was scheduled during non-class free time.

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study aims to determine the DEAR Program on the reading preferences, vocabulary knowledge and comprehension skills of the Teacher Education Students of San Isidro College. This sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of implementation of the DEAR Program in terms of:
  - 1.1. Number of vocabulary words learned
  - 1.2. Number of moral lessons obtained
  - 1.3. Number of reflections/reactions cited
2. What are the reading preferences of the Teacher Education Students?
3. What is the level of vocabulary skills of the Teacher Education Students?
4. What is the level of comprehension skills of the Teacher Education Students?
5. Is there a significant relationship between:
  - 5.1. Level of implementation of DEAR and Reading Preferences
  - 5.2. Level of Implementation of DEAR and Vocabulary Skills
  - 5.3. Level of Implementation of DEAR and Comprehension Skills

5.4. Reading Preferences and Comprehension Skills

5.5. Reading Preferences and Vocabulary Skills

5.6. Vocabulary Skills and Comprehension Skills

6. What are the issues and concerns on the implementation of DEAR Program?

7. What are the insights learned by the students in the DEAR Program in terms of:

7.1 vocabulary skills

7.2 moral lessons obtained

7.3. reflection/reactions cited

### HYPOTHESES

Ho1. There is no significant relationship between the level of implementation and the reading preferences of TES.

Ho2. There is no significant relationship between the level of implementation and the vocabulary skills of TES.

Ho3. There is no significant relationship between the level of implementation and the comprehension skills of TES.

Ho4. There is no significant relationship between the reading preferences and the comprehension skills of TES.

Ho5. There is no significant relationship between the reading preferences and the vocabulary skills of TES.

Ho6. There is no significant relationship between vocabulary skills and reading comprehension skills.

### METHODS

#### RESEARCH DESIGN

The study employed the mixed-method approach in which it is descriptive-correlational. This approach aimed to find out about the relationship between the DEAR Program and the Teacher Education Students' reading preferences, vocabulary skills and comprehension skills. It used purposive sampling technique as the 129 students enrolled this academic year 2016-2017 will all be taken as respondents.

#### RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

This research was conducted at San Isidro College located in Impalambong, Malaybalay City, Bukidnon Province during the Academic Year 2016-2017. It is the first and oldest Catholic Higher Education Institution in the Province of Bukidnon. This catholic institution is composed of the Integrated Basic Education (IBED), College, and the Institute of Technical and Health Related Programs (ITHRP). San Isidro College was founded by the late Fr. Joseph Reith, S.J. in July 1949. He named the school after the town's patron

Saint, San Isidro Labrador. The school bears the motto “Ora et Labora” which means prayer and work. This study focused on the college department, specifically the School of Education of San Isidro College.

## RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

This study used the DEAR logs accomplished by students to find out the level of implementation of the DEAR Program in terms of (1) Number of vocabulary words learned; (2) Number of moral lessons obtained; (3) number of reflections/reactions cited.

For the second research question, this study used a survey questionnaire on the reading preferences of the respondents which was embedded in the vocabulary test answer sheet.

For the third and the fourth research questions, the researcher constructed a vocabulary skills test and comprehension test to gauge the level of vocabulary skills and comprehension skills of the students after going through the DEAR Program for the last two, four or six semesters. However, these vocabulary and comprehension skills tests were subjected for content validation by one language expert of the school.

After validation, the two tests were subjected for pilot testing to check on the validity of the tests. In addition, the validity of the said tests rests heavily on the subjective opinions of this language experts and students.

Second revision was done, after which, the conduct of the test and checking of the papers followed.

## RESEARCH PROCEDURE

Significant data were gathered through the following steps; (1) The researcher sent a letter to the Vice President for Academic Affairs of San Isidro College and to the Dean of the School of Education to ask permission to conduct the study about the DEAR Program of the SED; (2) Tallying of the vocabulary words learned, moral lessons obtained and reflections/reactions cited were done. (3) Development and validation of the vocabulary skills test and reading comprehension skills test; (4) Upon approval and after validation, the conduct of pilot testing took place; (5) Final revision of the tests followed. (6) Conduct of the tests followed with the survey on reading preferences. (7) The tallying of the results of the survey on reading preferences and checking of the tests followed; (8) The conduct of group interviews; (9) The tallying of responses and reflections/reactions cited were done. (3) Development and validation of the vocabulary skills test and reading comprehension skills test; (4) Upon approval and after validation, the conduct of pilot testing took place; (5) Final revision of the tests

followed. (6) Conduct of the tests followed with the survey on reading preferences. (7) The tallying of the results of the survey on reading preferences and checking of the tests followed; (8) The conduct of group interviews; (9) The tallying of responses of students and categorizing them into similar ideas or themes; and, (10) The treatment of the data immediately took place.

## PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

**Table 1.1.1.** *BEEd Number of vocabulary words learned and Level of Implementation*

BEEd	1	2	3	4	Total	Wt. Mean	Interpretation
Second Yr	3	2	6	0	11	2.27	Low
Third Yr	5	1	7	4	17	2.59	High
Fourth Yr	9	4	0	1	14	1.50	Very Low
Total	17	7	13	5	42	2.14	Low

**Table 1.1.2.** *BSEd Number of vocabulary words learned and Level of Implementation*

BSEd	1	2	3	4	Total	Wt. Mean	Interpretation
Second Yr	4	11	8	1	24	2.25	Low
Third Yr	1	7	17	16	41	3.17	High
Fourth Yr	19	3	0	0	22	1.14	Very Low
Total	24	21	25	17	87	2.40	Low

**Table 1.1.3.** *Teacher Education Students' Number of Vocabulary Words Learned and Level of Implementation*

Overall	1	2	3	4	Total	Wt. Mean	Interpretation
Second Yr	7	13	14	1	35	2.26	Low
Third Yr	6	8	24	20	58	3.00	High
Fourth Yr	28	7	0	1	36	1.28	Very Low
Total	41	28	38	22	129	2.32	Low

**Table 1.1.4.** *Level of Implementation of the DEAR Program*

Hours (2 <sup>nd</sup> Yr)	Hours (3 <sup>rd</sup> Yr)	Hours (4 <sup>th</sup> Yr)	Rating	Descriptive Score
0-10	0-20	0-30	1	Poorly Implemented
11-20	21-40	31-60	2	Fairly Implemented
21-30	41-60	61-90	3	Well Implemented
31-40	61-80	91-120	4	Very Well Implemented

Tables above present the number of vocabulary learned and the level of implementation or the number of hours spent for reading by students who have undergone the DEAR Program of the SED per year level. The Second Year students have undergone the program for one academic year which is equivalent to two semesters. They are required to have accumulated 60 words for one academic year and expected to have spent 40 hours reading time for the DEAR. The Third Year should have accumulated 120 vocabulary learned with 80 hours reading time for the DEAR. The Fourth Year were expected to have 180 vocabulary words learned and 120 hours reading time.

It can be gleaned in the table that the first year students' level as to the number of vocabulary

words learned and level of implementation is low; the third year students' level is high; and the fourth year students' level is very low. The overall level of the SED students' level is low.

This means that the second and fourth year students do not meet the required number of new vocabulary to learn from the articles read during the two academic years of implementation of the DEAR Program. Furthermore, as noticed per tallying processes done by the researcher, from the ten DEAR Logs submitted every end of the semester, only the first two or three DEAR Logs have complete details. The rest of the logs lacked the needed details for this item in the log.

On the other hand, the Third Year students are religiously doing their tasks on reading and thereby accomplishing the DEAR logs required of them. It can be noticed that in the DEAR logs of the third year most of the items in the logs were completely filled out. Blank items in the logs were very minimal.

**Table 1.2.** *Moral Lessons Obtained by Teacher Education Students*

Moral Lessons	N	Mean	Max	SD	Descriptive Score
Second Yr	36	0	82	(16.12)	Poorly Implemented
Third Yr	55	0	115	(32.48)	Fairly Implemented

Table 1.2 presents the moral lessons obtained by Teacher Education Students for every article read. For this table, the fourth year level do not have the data because they used the old DEAR Log which has no details on moral lessons obtained. This is due to the revision of the DEAR Logs by the Dean of the School of Education during the Academic Year 2014-2015. However, during the Academic Year 2015-2016, the Fourth year students still used the old DEAR log.

For the Second year students, it has a mean of 18.69 and descriptive rating of poorly implemented. This means that the DEAR Program in terms of moral lessons obtained by students from the article read was poorly implemented. It is apparent in the DEAR Logs that the students were not following instructions as to the minimum number of the moral lessons to write for every article read. Some DEAR logs are having one moral lesson, other logs are blank.

For the Third year level, it has a mean of 43.50 and descriptive rating of fairly implemented. It means that the DEAR Program on moral lessons obtained from the article read is fairly implemented. It is indicative of average amount of moral lessons obtained by the third year students.

**Table 1.3.** *Reflections/Reactions Cited by Teacher Education Students*

Reflections/Reactions	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Descriptive Score
Second Yr	36	5	87	51.77	(23.46)	Very Well Implemented
Third Yr	58	0	212	67.65	(36.72)	Well Implemented
Fourth Yr	35	12	140	59.60	(29.99)	Poorly Implemented

Table 1.3 presents the reflections/reactions cited by students from the articles read. As mentioned, students are required to cite at least two reflections/reflections for each article read.

For the Second year students, it has a mean 51.77 and descriptive rating of very well implemented. This means that the second year students went beyond the required number of reflections or reactions to cite in every article read. Some DEAR Logs have four reflections, others have five.

For the Third year, it has a mean 67.65 and descriptive rating of well implemented. This means that the DEAR Program in terms of reflections/reactions cited is well implemented. This indicates greater number of reflections or reactions cited by students in every article read. For the fourth year, it has a mean 59.60 with the descriptive rating of poorly implemented. This means that the DEAR Program in terms of reflections or reactions cited for the year level is poorly implemented. Thus, a small number of reflections/reaction were cited by the students.

**Table 2.1.** *Reading Preferences by Teacher Education Students*

Preference	Course		Total
	BEEd	BSEd	
Fiction	15 (36%)	33 (38%)	48 (37%)
Non-Fiction	27 (64%)	54 (62%)	81 (63%)
Total	42 (33%)	87 (67%)	129

**Table 2.2.** *Reading Preferences by Year Level Cross Tabulation*

Preference	Course			Total
	2 <sup>nd</sup> Yr	3 <sup>rd</sup> Yr	4 <sup>th</sup> Yr	
Fiction	13 (37%)	24 (31%)	11 (31%)	48 (37%)
Non-Fiction	22 (63%)	34 (59%)	25 (69%)	81 (63%)
Total	35 (37%)	58 (45%)	36 (28%)	129

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 above present the Reading Preferences of the Teacher Education Students by major and by year level respectively. They are only to choose between fiction and non-fiction. As can be gleaned in the table above, 81 students or 63% out of the total respondents prefer non-fiction as their reading material usually chosen to read during the DEAR Time. It was emphasized during the survey that the preferred reading material would be in the context of the DEAR Program.

**Table 3.1.** *Vocabulary Skills of Teacher Education*

Vocabulary Test	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating
Second Year	36	14	66	46.83	(23.46)	Low
Third Year	58	30	83	51.22	(36.72)	Moderate
Fourth Year	35	20	65	43.83	(29.99)	Low

**Table 3.2.** *Vocabulary Skills of Teacher Education Students Cross Tabulation*

Vocabulary Skills Scores	Course BEEd	BSEd	Total
0-25	0	3	3
26-50	28	47	75
51-75	14	35	49
76-100	0	2	2
Total	42	87	129

**Table 3.3.** *Vocabulary Skills of Teacher Education Students by Year Level Cross Tabulation*

Vocabulary Scores	2 <sup>nd</sup> Yr	3 <sup>rd</sup> Yr	4 <sup>th</sup> Yr	Total
0-25	1	0	2	3
26-50	20	30	25	75
51-75	14	26	9	49
76-100	0	2	0	2
Total	35	58	36	129

Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 show the level of Vocabulary Skills of the Teacher Education Students. These data were gathered from the results of the 100-item vocabulary test conducted to the respondents. Moreover, as mentioned, the words used in the test were lifted from the words which have the most number of occurrence in the students' DEAR Logs. For the second year, it has a mean score of 46.83 and descriptive rating of Low. This means that the performance of students is low and is indicative of less mastery on vocabulary skills.

For the third year, it has a mean score of 51.22 and descriptive rating of moderate. This means that the performance of the third year students on vocabulary skills test is average and is indicative of a mastery of vocabulary skills on the average level.

For the fourth year, it has a mean score of 43.82 and a descriptive rating of Low. It means that the performance of the fourth year students in vocabulary skills test is low and is indicative of less mastery of the lesson.

**Table 4.1.** *Level of Comprehension Skills of Teacher Education Students*

Reading Comprehension	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating
Second Year	36	20	97	50.66	(15.08)	Moderate
Third Year	58	26	95	61.63	(16.57)	Moderate
Fourth Year	35	35	96	63.91	(17.31)	Moderate

**Table 4.2.** *Level of Comprehension Skills of Teacher Education Students Cross Tabulation*

Comprehension Skills Scores	Course BEEd	BSEd	Total
0-25	0	3	3
26-50	28	47	75
51-75	14	35	49
76-100	0	2	2
Total	42	87	129

**Table 3.3.** *Level of Comprehension Skills of Teacher Education Students Year Level Tabulation*

Comprehension Skills Scores	2 <sup>nd</sup> Yr	3 <sup>rd</sup> Yr	4 <sup>th</sup> Yr	Total
0-25	1	0	0	1
26-50	18	16	9	43
51-75	14	31	19	64
76-100	2	11	8	21
Total	35	58	36	129

Tables above show the mean scores and the cross tabulations of the Teacher Education Students on Comprehension skills test scores. This is 100-item comprehension test which covers the skills noting details, finding the main idea, ability to comprehend a written text or passage, making inferences and drawing conclusions.

For the Second year, it has a mean score of 50.66; for the third year has a mean score 61.63; the fourth year, the mean score was 63.91. Across the three year levels of students, the descriptive rating is moderate. It means that the performance of the students in the test is average. This is indicative of a mastery of the lesson on the average level.

In summary, the three year levels of students have the same level of comprehension skills regardless of the differences in the number of semesters spent for the DEAR Program. Moreover, the third and the fourth year levels are expected to have a higher level of comprehension skills compared to the second year due to the number of years being with the DEAR Program.

**Table 5.1.1.** *BEEd Level of Implementation and their Reading Preferences*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	1.637	0.441	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	1.872	0.599	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	0.525	0.769	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	3.801	0.284	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant



**Table 5.1.2.** *BSEd Level of Implementation and their Reading Preferences*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	1.406	0.704	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	0.749	0.862	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	1.945	0.163	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	2.388	0.436	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.1.3.** *Teacher Education Students' Level of Implementation and their Reading Preferences*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	2.029	0.566	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	0.422	0.936	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	0.991	0.609	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	2.819	0.420	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Tables 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 show the results of comparing two variables one is continuous which is the implementation and the other is categorical which is the reading preferences. For Table 5.1.1, it compares the level of implementation of the DEAR program and the Bachelor of Elementary Education students' reading preferences; while Tables 5.1.2 compares the level of implementation of the DEAR program and the Bachelor of Secondary students' reading preferences. Table 5.1.3 compares the level of implementation of the DEAR program and the Teacher Education students across all levels.

Pearson Chi-Square results:  $X^2(13) = 2.029$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ;  $X^2(32) = 0.422$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ; and  $X^2(23) = 0.609$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ;  $X^2(68) = 2.819$ ,  $p > 0.05$  indicate that there is no significant relationship between level of implementation or the number of hours spent on reading and reading preferences of second year, third year and fourth year Teacher Education students. This evidence could imply that students' reading preferences cannot be associated to the increase the implementation or vice versa. Thus, hours spent for reading is not dependent on whether they are fiction or non-fiction readers.

**Table 5.2.1.** *BEEd Level of Implementation and their Vocabulary Skills*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	22.000	0.232	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	47.661	0.365	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	16.722	0.542	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	78.541	0.279	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.2.2.** *BSEd Level of Implementation and their Vocabulary Skills*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	43.691	0.527	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	101.757	0.133	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	22.000	0.185	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	128.870	0.487	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.2.3.** *Teacher Education Students' Level of Implementation and their Vocabulary Skills*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	65.224	0.399	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	91.068	0.703	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	43.393	0.412	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	144.226	0.341	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

The tables above present the results of associating the implementation of the DEAR program and the vocabulary skills of Teacher Education students. As discussed earlier, implementation refers to the number of hours spent by students for reading within the Drop Everything and Read program. On the other hand, vocabulary skills refers to the students' ability to find the meaning of the word using context clue, giving synonyms and antonyms of the given word and completing the sentence by filling the correct word. Chi squared ( $X^2 = 65.224$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ;  $X^2 = 91.068$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ; and  $X^2 = 43.393$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) revealed that there is no significant relationship between these two variables. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This result implies that time spent for reading was not enough to increase their vocabulary or it did not allow them to accumulate significant number of correct answers in the aforementioned test. This implies further that the hours to be rendered for reading must be increased the next time the program will be implemented. It has to require students across levels more time to read to enable them to learn more words or vocabulary.

**Table 5.3.1.** *BEEd Level of Implementation and their Comprehension Skills*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	22.00	0.341	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	36.489	0.585	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	20.222	0.684	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	91.0.26	0.624	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.3.2.** BSEd Level of Implementation and their Comprehension Skills

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	55.545	0.212	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	75.077	0.573	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	22.000	0.185	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	140.950	0.281	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.3.3.** Teacher Education Students' Level of Implementation and their Comprehension Skills

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	83.487	0.167	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	104.642	0.409	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	46.929	0.673	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	184.948	0.341	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Tables above contains the results of associating the number of hours spent by Teacher Education students for reading in the DEAR program and their comprehension skills. To clarify, comprehension skills are students' capabilities to note details, find main idea, comprehend written text or passages, make inferences and draw conclusions. With the results above ( $X^2 = 83.478$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ;  $X^2 = 104.642$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ; and  $X^2 = 46.929$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), the study revealed that there is no significant relation between these variables. Thus, comprehension skills cannot be associated with the number of hours spent for reading. Therefore, null hypotheses is accepted. The latter did not improve students' comprehension skills. Similarly, the time spent wasn't enough for students to develop the capabilities to note details, find main idea, make inferences and draw conclusion. This calls for modification and re-engineering the program.

**Table 5.4.1.** BEEd Reading preferences and their Comprehension Skills

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	11.000	0.358	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	14.248	0.357	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	14.000	0.301	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	32.563	0.439	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.4.2.** BSEd Reading Preferences and their Comprehension Skills

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	14.756	0.543	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	22.460	0.663	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	18.543	0.355	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	40.632	0.617	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.4.3.** All Teaching Students Reading preferences and their Comprehension Skills

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	24.292	0.445	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	29.692	0.679	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	27.517	0.383	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	49.431	0.752	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Tables 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 above exhibit the results of associating the comprehension skills of Teacher Education Students and their Reading Preferences. To find this out, a test was conducted among respondents to measure their comprehension skills. Using Chi-square, the study explores whether these two variables have significant relationship. The results,  $X^2 (24) = 24.292$ ,  $p > 0.05$  (second year);  $X^2 (33) = 37.387$ ,  $p > 0.05$  (third year); and  $X^2 (26) = 32.550$ ,  $p > 0.05$  (fourth year) indicate that there is no significant relationship between comprehension skills and reading preferences across year levels. These results imply that being fiction and non-fiction re

**Table 5.5.1.** BEEd Reading preferences and their Vocabulary Skill

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	11.000	0.276	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	14.936	0.456	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	9.100	0.428	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	26.393	0.334	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.5.2.** *BSEd Reading Preferences and their Vocabulary Skills*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	14.613	0.480	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	27.953	0.520	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	14.317	0.645	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	36.252	0.794	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

**Table 5.5.3.** *Teacher Education Students' Level of Implementation and their Vocabulary Skills*

Indicators	Chi-Squared	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Second Year	20.009	0.521	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Third Year	30.860	0.574	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fourth Year	14.400	0.852	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant
Total	36.210	0.849	Do not Reject Ho	Not Significant

Tables 5.5.1, 5.5.2 and 5.5.3 show the results of associating the vocabulary skills and reading preferences of Teacher Education students. The results,  $X^2(21) = 20.009$ ,  $p > 0.05$  (second year);  $X^2(33) = 30.860$ ,  $p > 0.05$  (third year); and  $X^2(21) = 14.400$ ,  $p > 0.05$  (fourth year) indicate that there is no significant relationship between these variables in all levels. Vocabulary skills of students does not have any bearing with their reading preferences.

**Table 5.6.** *Vocabulary Skills and Comprehension Skills of Teacher Education Students*

Variables	Pearson-r	Degree of Correlation	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Vocabulary Skills and Comprehension Skills	0.288	Low Correlation	0.001**	Reject Ho	Significant

Table 5.6 presents the association of vocabulary skills and comprehension skills of Teacher Education students who underwent the DEAR program. Both variables have been defined above very clearly. Results ( $r = .288$ ,  $p < 0.001^{**}$ ) revealed that there is a significant relationship between vocabulary skills and comprehension skills of second year and third year Teacher Education students. Yet these relationships are both low. For these results, the null hypothesis is rejected. At some extent it can be claimed that the increase of vocabulary skills can somehow increase comprehension skills.

To supplement the results gathered from the DEAR Logs and test scores on vocabulary and comprehension skills of TES, the qualitative approach was used. This qualitative research is concerned with

achieving a clear understanding of the problem under study. This methodology is used to get information about how these TES think and feel about the implementation of the DEAR Program. This section of the research was conducted through group interviews consisting of four groups in separate sessions. The information collected was presented in a narrative that includes the description and analysis of data.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the results and findings of the study.

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Below are the significant findings of the study based on the data gathered:

1. The level of implementation which refers to the number of hours spent for reading in terms of

1.1 Number of vocabulary word learned:

1.1.1. For the Second Year students it is low which means that the DEAR Program was fairly implemented.

1.1.2. For the Third Year students, it is high which means that the DEAR Program was very well implemented.

1.1.3. For the Fourth Year, it is very low, which means that the implementation of the DEAR was poorly implemented

1.2. Number of moral lessons obtained

1.2.1. The Second Year students' level of implementation in terms of moral lessons obtained was poorly implemented, while for the third year students it was fairly implemented.

1.3. Reflections/Reactions Cited

1.3.1 For the Second Year, the level of implementation in terms of reflections/reactions cited was very well implemented; third year was well-implemented; and, the fourth year was poor.

2. The reading preferences of Teacher Education Students were Non- Fiction. Non- Fiction reading materials include newspapers, reader's digest, National Geographic Magazines, and other professional magazines.

3. For the level of Vocabulary Skills of the Teacher



Education Students, the Second Year is Low; the Third Year is Moderate; and the Fourth Year is Low.

4. Across all levels, the Comprehension Skills level of Teacher Education Students was moderate.

5. On significant relationships:

- 5.1. There is no significant relationship between the level of implementation or the number of hours spent on reading and reading preferences of second year, third year and fourth year Teacher Education students.
- 5.2. There is no significant relationship between level of implementation or the number of hours spent for reading and vocabulary skills of the second year, the third year and the fourth year Teacher Education students.
- 5.3. There is no significant relationship between the level of implementation or the number of hours spent for reading and comprehension skills of the second year, the third year and the fourth year Teacher Education students.
- 5.4. There is no significant relationship between comprehension skills and reading preferences across year levels.
- 5.5. There is no significant relationship between the reading preferences and vocabulary skills in all levels
- 5.6. There is a significant relationship between vocabulary skills and comprehension skills of Teacher Education Students.

6. On Issues and Concerns on the Implementation of the DEAR Program:

- 6.1. For the second year, they believed that the DEAR Program has positive effects on them. For the Third year, they considered the DEAR Program to have positive effects on them and also on copying the DEAR logs of other students. However, the Fourth Year students considered the DEAR Program to be time consuming as it used up their time because instead of studying their lessons they worked on accomplishing the DEAR logs. According to them, this is due to the number of DEAR Logs to be submitted to the SED office at the end of the semester.

7. For the insights gained on the implementation of the DEAR in terms of:

- 7.1. For their vocabulary skills, all levels of the Teacher Education students believed that the DEAR Program helped them in enhancing, improving and widening their vocabulary skills.
- 7.2. For the moral lessons obtained from the DEAR Program, the Second Year and

Fourth Year Students considered that the DEAR impart lessons in life. On the other hand, the third year students claimed that the DEAR is very important to them for they gained knowledge through it.

- 7.3. For the reflections/reactions cited, all levels of the Teacher Education Students considered the DEAR as it is beneficial to them as readers. They gained more knowledge and information with the DEAR program.

## CONCLUSION

The following conclusion were drawn based on the findings above:

1. The DEAR Program which has been implemented for seven years already was poorly implemented in terms of vocabulary learned and moral lessons obtained for the Second and Fourth Year Students. For the reflections/reactions cited they were well implemented for the Second and Third Year students. Moreover, these students were non-compliant with the required details needed in the program and the program itself did not meet its target which is to provide students more time to read and consequently develop students' reading skills
2. The DEAR Program has not strengthened Teacher Education students' vocabulary skills and comprehension skills level for some levels are low and some are moderate.
3. The preferred reading materials by TES were non-fiction but this has no bearing with their vocabulary skills and comprehension skills for it does not show significant relationship.
4. On the viewpoints of the students, they believed that the DEAR was beneficial to them as a reader and as being future educators. Only the Fourth Year considered it as a burden to them.
5. The students considered that the DEAR helped them in enhancing their vocabulary skills, learning lessons in life and benefitting them as a reader.
6. The results gathered from the DEAR Logs and the results of the vocabulary test and the responses contains some contradicting points from each other especially in terms of enhancing vocabulary skills.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Vocabulary and comprehension skills tests could be designed by the DEAN of the SED, to be assisted

by the Assistant Dean and English Language Faculty members. It could be given as a pre-test for the students who will enroll in the SED. In this way, it will gauge students' level of vocabulary skills and comprehension upon entering the said course. A post-test will be given after three years with the DEAR program, thus, this will gauge the impact of the DEAR program to Teacher Education Students.

2. The DEAR Program should be continued, however this calls for modification and re-designing the program as to the submission of the DEAR Logs, the number of logs to be submitted, the venue and the DEAR time.

3. There should be close monitoring of the submission of the DEAR Logs among the SED students on the details that students provided in the logs.

4. There will be additional reading materials for students which include the fiction and non-fiction reading materials.

5. An activity will be designed for the students in relation to vocabulary and comprehension skills of students to indicate whether they have the significant gains from the DEAR program undertaken each academic year.

6. An evaluation sheet will be designed to gauge the success area the program and the areas for improvements as these will be used as bases for the modification of the program.

## REFERENCES

Aiken, L.R. (1997). Questionnaires and inventories: Surveying opinions and assessing personality. Chichester: Wiley personality. New York: J. Wiley

Bridges, L. (2014). The joy and power of reading: A summary of research and expert opinion. New York: Scholastic

Bulsara, C. (n.d.). using a mixed methods approach to enhance and validate your research. pp 1-23. Retrieved from [https://www.nd.edu.au/downloads/research/ihr/using\\_mixed\\_methods\\_approach\\_to\\_enhance\\_and\\_validate\\_your\\_research.pdf](https://www.nd.edu.au/downloads/research/ihr/using_mixed_methods_approach_to_enhance_and_validate_your_research.pdf)  
Celebrate "Drop Everything and Read" with Beverly Cleary . (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.dropeverythingandread.com/NationalDEARday.html>

Cunningham, A. & Stanovich, K. (2011). What reading does to mind. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 137-149. Reprinted with the permission from The American Federation of Teachers. *American Educator*, Vol. 22, No. 1-2, pp. 8-15. Retrieved from [https://www.csun.edu/~krowlands/Content/Academic\\_Resources/Reading/Useful%20Articles/Cunningham-What%20Reading%20Does%20for%20the%20Mind.pdf](https://www.csun.edu/~krowlands/Content/Academic_Resources/Reading/Useful%20Articles/Cunningham-What%20Reading%20Does%20for%20the%20Mind.pdf)

[edu/~krowlands/Content/Academic\\_Resources/Reading/Useful%20Articles/Cunningham-What%20Reading%20Does%20for%20the%20Mind.pdf](https://www.csun.edu/~krowlands/Content/Academic_Resources/Reading/Useful%20Articles/Cunningham-What%20Reading%20Does%20for%20the%20Mind.pdf)

Classroom Vocabulary Assessment for Content Areas Katherine A. Dougherty Stahl, Marco A. Bravo. Retrieved February 12, 2017 From [www.readingrockets.org/article/classroom-vocabulary-assessment-content-areas](http://www.readingrockets.org/article/classroom-vocabulary-assessment-content-areas)

Flores, W.L. (2016, April 3). The Philippine Star, p. E4.

Gallego, M.T., Llach, D.P.A. (2009). Exploring the increase of receptive vocabulary knowledge in the foreign language. A longitudinal study. *International Journal of English Studies*. 9(1)

Gardner, T. (n. d. ). A daily DEAR program: Drop everything, and read!. Retrieved from <http://readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/daily-dear-program-drop-55.html>

Hussain, I. & Munshi, P. (2011). Identifying reading preferences of secondary school students. *Creative Education*. Vol. 2., No. 5., 429-434

Hebert, L.W. (n.d.) 10 benefits of reading: Why you should read everyday. Retrieved from [www.lifehack.org/articles/productivity/10-habits-highly-respected-people.html](http://www.lifehack.org/articles/productivity/10-habits-highly-respected-people.html)

Lai, Y.L., Tung, Y.J., & Luo, S.Y. ( n.d.) Theory of reading strategies and its application by EFL learners: Reflections on two case studies. Retrieved from <https://www.lhu.edu.tw/m/oa/synthetic/publish/publish/26/11.%E8%B3%B4%E9%9B%85%E4%BF%90-Theory%20of%20Reading%20Strategies%20and%20its%20Application%20by%20EFL%20Learners.pdf>

Llach, D.P.A. (2009). The effects of reading only, reading and comprehension, and sentence writing in lexical learning in a foreign language; Some preliminary results. The Reading Agency. Retrieved from pp 9-33. Literature review: The impact of reading for pleasure and empowerment. June 2015. Retrieved July 25, 2016 from <https://readingagency.org.uk/news/The%20Impact%20of%20Reading%20forPleasure%20and%20Empowerment.pdf>

Noor, Noorizah Mohd (2001). Reading habits and preferences of EFL post-graduates: A case study. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 1

Owusu-Acheaw, M. (2014). Reading habits among students and its effect on academic performance: A study of students of Kofuridua Polytechnic. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Paper 1130. Retrieved July 4, 2016 from <http://digitalscommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1130>

Pikulski, J.& Templeton, S. (2004). Teaching and developing vocabulary: Key to long-term reading success. Houghton Mifflin Company. Litho in USA. 15M1203 G-23748. Retrieved July 8, 2016 from [www.eduplace.com](http://www.eduplace.com)

Post, M., Dorfner, T., Artelt, C. (2013). Students' extracurricular reading behavior and the development of vocabulary and reading comprehension. Published in *Learning and Individual Differences*, 26(2013), 89-102: doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2013.04.008

Quian, D. (n.d.). Assessing the roles of depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension. Retrieved October 10, 2016 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.56.2.282>

Rahmani, M., Sadeghi, K., (2011). Effects of note-taking training on reading comprehension and recall. *The Reading Matrix*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp.116-128. Retrieved July 2, 2016 from [www.readingmatrix.com/articles/april\\_2011/rahmani\\_sadeghi.pdf](http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/april_2011/rahmani_sadeghi.pdf)

Rohmann, B. (2007). Verbal qualifiers for rating scales: Sociolinguistic considerations and psychometric data project report. University of Melbourne/Australia. Retrieved January 25, 2017 from <http://www.rohrmannresearch.net/pdfs/rohrmann-vgs-report.pdf>

Sanden, S. (2014). Out of the shadow of SSR: Real teachers' classroom independent reading practices. Retrieved July 2, 2016 from [www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/LA/0913-jan2014/LA0913Out.pdf](http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/LA/0913-jan2014/LA0913Out.pdf)

School Library Media Research. Research journal of the American Association of School Libraries. (2000). Vol. 3. Retrieved January 25, 2017 from [www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org/aasl/files/content/aaslpubsandjournals/slr/vol3/SLMR\\_IndependentReading\\_V3.pdf](http://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org/aasl/files/content/aaslpubsandjournals/slr/vol3/SLMR_IndependentReading_V3.pdf)

Slavin, R., Cheung, A., Groff, C., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective Reading Programs for Middle and High Schools: A Best-Evidence Synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(3), 290-322.

Sponer, N., Brunstein, J., Kieschke, U. (2008). Improving students' reading comprehension skills: Effects of strategy instruction and reciprocal teaching. Elsevier Ltd. Doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.5.003

Vogel, J.T. (2013). A case study on the impact of the read 180 intervention program on affective and cognitive reading skills for at-risk secondary level students. Unpublished dissertation. Whole School Reading Program (WSRP) Retrieved July 2, 2016 from [idd.edc.org/sites/idd.edc.org/files/EQUIP3%20EQUALLS2%20WSRP%204pgr.pdf](http://idd.edc.org/sites/idd.edc.org/files/EQUIP3%20EQUALLS2%20WSRP%204pgr.pdf)