Applied Science and Innovative Research
ISSN 2474-4972 (Print) ISSN 2474-4980 (Online)
Vol. 4, No. 4, 2020
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/asir

Original Paper

The Effect of Video Presentation and Printed Reading Materials on Pupils' Comprehension Skills

Janene E. Gonzales[1*]

[1] Sriwittayapaknam School, Samut Prakan, Thailand

[*] Janene E. Gonzales, E-mail: janenegonzales@gmail.com

Received: October 15, 2020 Accepted: October 27, 2020 Online Published: November 6, 2020

doi:10.22158/asir.v4n4p19 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/asir.v4n4p19

Abstract

The study on the Effect of Video Presentation and Printed Reading Materials on the Pupils' Comprehension skills was conducted on the pupils of St. Scholastica's Academy in Bacolod City, Negros Occidental Philippines. This study was only limited to the Four Levels of Comprehension namely: Literal, Inferential, Evaluative, and Appreciative Comprehension. Based on the results of the tests, it showed that there was an increase in scores. The pretest scores of the Experimental Group is 4.53 the Controlled Group is 4.47. The posttest score of both groups is 5.08. Results presented that the Controlled Group has a higher mean difference. The Mean and T-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means were used to interpret the data gathered. Comparing the two values, the T-test shows that the difference of 0.056 between the values is not significant wherein the p-value is equivalent to 0.862.

It was recommended that the administrators must ensure that the educators must be prepared in implementing technology inside the classroom. The teachers must check the current standing of the pupils to determine the strength and weaknesses in comprehension. The parents should let their children explore technology and books; and further studies must focus on the upper level to determine if there are changes on the different grade levels as well determine the factors that affect the student's learning: motivation, learning style and strategies, learning environment, and classroom pedagogy.

Keywords

Comprehension, Printed Reading Materials, Videos Presentations

1. Introduction

Reading is a fundamental skill that defines the academic success or failure of students. Its ultimate goal is to understand – to gain insight and knowledge from the act of reading (Higgins, Boone, & Lovitt, 2002). Despite the changes in the 21st century, the ability to read remains an essential foundation of

educational success and is considered a leading factor in the attainment of work achievement (Binotti, Hamilton – Gunkel, & Sipple, 2001).

Comprehension is one of the pillars in the act of reading. It is the accurate construction of an author's intended meaning from the text. (Higgins, Boone, & Lovitt, 2002). According to Wang and Paul (2011), the challenges in reading comprehension are associated with many variables, namely the text (e.g., word identification, syntax), the reader (e.g., prior knowledge, metacognition), and the context (e.g., the purpose of reading). Kelly (2007) also added concern difficulties with lower and higher-level reading skills, such as poor vocabulary understanding, problems with syntax processing. Given these levels of reading comprehension namely: literal, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative, it is not surprising that most young learners have difficulties in reading. Learners lack fluency and are inefficient in decoding the text. They are not capable of making connections between what they read and what they already know. More so, children with limited vocabulary have comprehension difficulties for obvious reasons. They do not know the meaning of the words so they cannot think deeply about what they have read (Raeymaeckers, 2004).

Prensky (2007) observed that during the challenges, technologies did not stop to emerge. There is a push to integrate technology into the classroom to promote academic success among students.

Cooney (2013) observed that a common choice in developing reading comprehension is the use of printed materials such as books, magazines, and newspapers. This can improve the child's literacy building and opportunities for interaction. However, with the integration of technology in the classroom, there has been a steady emergence of different presentations made in reading such as audio, video, video subtitle, and so on (Chan, Lei, & Lena, 2014). Video presentations can not only arouse the students' enthusiasm, keep longer attention, but also widen their horizons, deepen the impression, inspire their imagination. The increasing expectation that multimedia will enhance the learning process of the students (Benbunan – Fich, 2002) as well as support interactive instruction, encouraging students to be more responsible for their learning (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).

The researcher being aware of this had an initial observation that if a video presentation is shown, some Grade Three pupils increase interest and enthusiasm towards the lesson. Moreover, some grade three pupils of St. Scholastica's Academy have difficulty in reading and understanding the given printed materials. This observation has motivated the researcher to determine the effect of video presentation on the pupils' comprehension skills.

1.1 Importance of Reading Comprehension

According to Shaywitz (2003), Reading is the most complex of human functions. The ability to read is considered an essential basic skill (Gorman, 2006). Lyon (2001) stated that a lack of skill in reading has a potent effect in other areas.

Reading comprehension is one of the pillars in the act of reading. When a person reads a text he engages in a complex array of cognitive processes. He is simultaneously using his awareness and understanding of phonemes (individual sound "pieces" in language), phonics (the connection between letters and

sounds and the relationship between sounds, letters, and words), and ability to comprehend or construct meaning from the text. Reading comprehension should not be confused with "reading ability". Reading ability, as it is commonly understood, means the ability to read the words on a page, but does not necessarily mean that what is read is understood. Being able to "decode" or to read words on a page is an essential part of reading. Reading comprehension is also defined as the level of understanding of a text message. This understanding comes from the interaction between the words that are written and how they trigger knowledge outside the text. Reading Comprehension does not just happen; it requires effort. Readers must intentionally and purposefully work to create meaning from what they read (Higgins, Boone, & Lovitt, 2002).

1.2 Four Levels of Comprehension

There are four levels/stages of comprehension namely: *Literal, Inferential, Evaluative*, and *Appreciative Comprehension*.

The first level is Literal. According to Heyman (2012), this refers to the ability to understand what is being read. This requires that the child understands the subject matter and the language used to convey it. As social creatures, we often engage in story-telling practices in our homes and so the ability to understand a story is usually a naturally developing skill. Furthermore, the reader can remember ideas and information that are directly stated in the textbook material. Literal Level produces knowledge of what the author said. The students decode words, determine what each word means in a given context, and recognize that there is some relationship among words that represent what the author has said. At this level, the learners are expected to identify the basic information and follow simple instructions; they form ideas or meanings directly stated in the selection. These ideas are elicited by questions beginning with what, when, where, who, and more (Tizon, 2011).

The second is the Inferential Comprehension. This forces the student to build his or her understanding of the subject matter by using the facts presented to read between the lines for the true meaning of what was meant (Heyman, 2012). Bureros (2014) also added that inferential comprehension is the reader's ability to extract ideas and information not directly stated in the textbook material, using prior or background knowledge to assist in such understanding.

In the Evaluative Level, the students give reaction, judgment, and evaluation of what is written. This involves how they can distinguish the literal meaning of words from suggestions or intentions expressed in the selection. It further calls for the reader's judgment on the wisdom, validity, or propriety of one's statement or literary output. It ultimately deals with the evaluation of what is read (Tizon, 2011). The child is required to apply what he has learned from reading to real-life events or situations. You can encourage this kind of interaction with texts by either asking your child what kind of connections they see (i.e., text to text, text to world, text to self, etc.) or by encouraging them to act based on the application they see (Heyman, 2012).

Lastly, the Appreciative Comprehension where it is based on the student's feelings towards the material or author. It is considered more abstract than any of the other levels because personality, likes,

and dislikes can affect this level. Creation need not necessarily be writing an original story but could include activities like creating a commercial, writing a play, writing a poem from the perspective of a character, etc. (Heyman, 2012). It is the reader's "emotional" response to the content of the textbook material read. This level of comprehension also includes creating new ideas from what was learned in school and life (Bureros, 2014)

1.3 Printed Reading Materials

Textbooks have long been used in classrooms from the first grade through the university level. It is considered one of the oldest sources of learning material. Paper books are still a popular choice among instructors and many students still prefer them (Robinson, 2011).

A study was commissioned by Reading Is Fundament al (RIF) and conducted by Learning Point Associates found that access to print materials can improve children's reading performance. The findings suggested that providing children with print materials help the learners read better. It is also considered as an instrument in helping children learn the basics of reading. Providing children with reading materials allows them to develop basic reading skills such as letter and word identification, phonemic awareness, and completion of sentences. Furthermore, it causes children to read more and for longer lengths of time. Giving children print materials leads to more shared reading between parents and children. Children receiving books also read more frequently and for longer periods. And finally, access to print materials produces improved attitudes toward reading and learning among children. Children with greater access to books and other print materials—through either borrowing books or receiving books to own—express more enjoyment of books, reading, and academics.

1.4 Use of Multimedia/Video Presentation

With the development of technology, the use of multimedia has been steadily growing. With the help of a computer, it can make better progress in reading. Multimedia is changing how people will go to learn, providing different presentation modes, such as the audio, the video, and the video subtitle, and so on (Chan, Lei, & Lena, 2014). Al-Seghayer (2001) also mentioned that the adoption of technology is regarded as the most exciting development stemming from the participation of advanced technology in education. Video presentations can not only arouse the students' enthusiasm, keep longer attention, but also widen their horizons, deepen the impression, inspire their imagination (Benbunan-Fich, 2002).

Students need to develop their reading, comprehension, and learning skills. They need to develop one set of skills to build their competence in reading and learning from paper. And these students also need to develop a completely different set of skills: digital literacy, and navigation skills. In an increasingly digital world, it would be irresponsible of schools to neglect the development of the child's digital literacy skills (Salter, 2013).

Videos are processed by the brain 60,000 times faster than text. According to Margalit (2015), these are meant to be consumed in short bursts, while literature, for example, is meant to be "sat with". Videos are sprints, while texts are walks. Because of this very different tone and purpose as a matter of design,

it's unfair to criticize videos as "less rigorous" than texts, just as it would be misleading to say that video is universally "more engaging" than text (Heick, 2014).

In addition, videos can provide students with more deeply engaging educational experiences that help them learn better and remember longer (Griffin, 2012; Hillner, 2012; National Teacher Training Institute, 2012). While teachers have long shown rented or purchased films produced specifically for the classroom, the internet (especially YouTube) provides easy and free access to a multitude of videos with varying degrees of educational content. Videos can present common experiences which all students can then discuss. They also provide the opportunity to take "field trips" to various - even impossible-places from inside the body to around the world across the galaxy.

Some studies of the effectiveness of video informal learning environments have yielded some confusing ideas as content acquired via video consumption doesn't easily transfer to the medium of text (Fisch 2002). This doesn't mean students aren't learning from the video (or the text for that matter), but it rather suggests that the design of each medium may impact how the brain processes and stores the lessons from the said medium, disrupting seamless transfer from one form to another.

1.5 Research Design

This study made use of a quasi-experimental design. According to Sevilla (2012), quasi-experimental consists of two groups and gives a pretest and posttest. This design is commonly used in groups with participants naturally assembled such as those in the classroom. An advantage of the design is that classes are chosen "as is", possible effects of reactive arrangements are minimized. A quasi-experimental design is an empirical study used to estimate the casual impact of an intervention on its target population and allows the researcher to control the assignment (Dinardo, 2008).

Since this study is aimed to determine the effect of video presentation on the pupils' comprehension skills, this design is used.

1.6 Subjects of the Study

The subjects in this study were the Grade Three pupils from St. Scholastica's Academy – Bacolod, School Year 2016-2017. The five classes among the six sections were heterogeneously grouped with a variety of academic abilities, socioeconomic status, and interests.

The table presented is a cross-tabulation of the two groups to determine if the respondents are matched by the number of pupils according to sex and as a whole.

Table 1. Distribution of Subjects

		Group			Total	
		Experimental	Control			
		Count	Count	%	Count	%
Sex	Male	11	11	30.6%	22	30.6%
	Female	25	25	69.4%	50	69.4%
Total		36	36	100.0%	72	100.0%

1.7 Sampling Technique

Simple random sampling is the sampling technique in determining the two groups of subjects. Each section is chosen entirely by chance (Easton & McColl, 2001). The fishbowl draw was used or also known as the lottery method (Egharevba, 2014).

1.8 Research Instrument

The study was designed to investigate the effect of the video presentation. The selections that were used were the following: Belling the Cat (Appendix D and E), The Lion and The Rabbit (Appendix F and G), and The Oak and The Reed (Appendix H and I). The selections were selected because it is at the instructional level of the pupils.

Each class received a different mode of instruction in the story. One class read the stories to themselves using printed materials. And the other class watched video presentations which were animated about the selections using television. Both of the materials used have the same content. The assessment contained two parts: pretest (Appendix B) and posttest (Appendix C). The pretest given to all classes was a series of multiple-choice questions designed to test comprehension and recall of the story. The set of questions was based on the four levels of comprehension: Literal, Inferential, Evaluative, and Appreciative.

Six lesson plans were developed by the researcher in this study to practice the comprehension skills among the Grade Three pupils after the pretests. The lesson plan format covered the following components: I. Objectives; II. Subject Matter (Topic, References, Materials); III. Procedure: A. Pre-reading (Motivation, Presentation of the Lesson, Unlocking Difficulties), B. During Reading (reading of the story), C. Post – Reading (Comprehension Questions that includes the four levels); IV. Evaluation (Multiple Choice); and, IV. Assignment (Essay).

The questions on both the pretest and posttest are worth one point. There were seven questions on each test, for a total of seven points. The total score of the pretest was the same for the posttest. The test was composed of four levels of comprehension. (1) Literal Comprehension, 3 points; (2) Inferential Comprehension, 2 points; (3) Evaluative Comprehension, 1 point; and (4) Appreciative Comprehension, 1 point.

The researcher made use of a standardized questionnaire for the pretest and posttest of the pupils from the Department of Education PHIL – IRI (Philippine Informal Reading Inventory) for Grade Three pupils on Reading Comprehension. The questions for the posttest were paraphrased, and the six lesson plans were corrected by professors who are experts in Reading and English.

2. Research Procedure

2.1 Preliminary Phase

The researcher asked the authorization from the school head of St. Scholastica's Academy – Bacolod to allow the researcher to conduct the study. From the five sections of the Grade Three pupils, the

researcher chose two groups/sections using Simple Random Sampling. Thus, these formed the control and experimental group.

Research instruments were corrected, constructed, and paraphrased by three validators from Philippine Normal University – Visayas.

2.2 Experiment Proper

The researcher conducted a pretest among the control and experimental groups on the same day. It took 30-35 minutes for the pupils to take the test. After checking the pretest and determining the results, the researcher identified the level of comprehension of the pupils.

After conducting the pretest, the pupils were given two days before the intervention started. The experimental and control groups had the same teacher and classroom. The study was conducted in the morning. Three lessons were prepared to present in each section of Grade Three pupils of St. Scholastica's Academy – Bacolod, School Year 2016-2017. The subjects had one lesson each day. Thus, the intervention lasted for three days.

In the control group, the teacher-researcher applied the lesson plans using printed materials. In the experimental group, the teacher-researcher applied the lesson using television and laptop.

After the intervention, the researcher conducted a posttest among experimental and control groups. Pupils were given 30-35 minutes to take the test.

2.3 Post Experiment

Score results were recorded in Microsoft Excel. These scores were interpreted by the statistical tools used in this research.

2.4 Data Analysis

To analyze and interpret the data on the problem formulated measures of central tendency were utilized. The mean was used because it is the most reliable measure of central tendency. It is determined by just adding all the scores and dividing the sum by the number of scores added (Rico, 2011). Thus, it will determine the mean gain.

Table 2. Mean Rating Scale

Mean Score	Verbal Interpretation	Description
6.50 – 7.00	Outstanding	Exhibit excellent skills
5.50 – 6.49	Good	Show a high quality of the skills being measured
4.50 – 5.49	Above Average	Exhibits the proper use of the skills
3.50 – 4.49	Average	Show or have the qualities for what is expected of the group
2.50 – 3.49	Below Average	Is already behind of the skill-based from their level
1.50 – 2.49	Poor	Show low quality of the skills
1.00 – 1.49	Extremely poor	The skills are not strongly evident

The mean rating scale was adapted from Rico (2011), a sample of a behavior rating scale to assess students in oral report, which was used for the mean interpretation to the levels of reading comprehension in the pretests and posttests using video presentation and printed reading materials.

When the mean score falls between 6.50-7.00 this means that the pupils' level of comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentations is outstanding. If the mean falls in between 5.50-6.49 the pupils' level of comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentation is good. If the mean falls in between 4.50-5.49, the pupils' level of comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentation is above average. If the mean falls in between 3.50-4.49, the pupils' level of comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentation is average. If the mean falls in between 2.50-3.49, the pupils' level comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentation is below average. If the mean falls in between 1.50-2.49, the pupils' level comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentation is poor. Lastly, if the mean falls in between 1.00-1.49, the pupils' level comprehension in using printed reading materials and video presentation is extremely poor.

In measuring the significant difference between the mean gains of the experimental and control group, t-test for paired mean is used. The data were analyzed using a computer statistical software called Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). SPSS is a computer software used by the researcher to analyze and verify the findings of the study. If the value is less than or equal to 0.5, then the result yields a significant relationship. If the value is greater than 0.5, then the result is not significant.

3. Results

3.1 Level of Reading Comprehension in the Pretests

Table 3 shows the pupils' total level of comprehension in the pretest. The average score of the experimental group is 4.53 points and the controlled group is 4.47 points out of 7. It implies that both groups have different levels of comprehension skills. However, the difference is minimal. According to Shaywitz (2003), reading is the most complex of human functions. The ability to read is considered an essential basic skill. A lack of skill in reading has a potent effect in other areas (Lyon, 2001).

Table 3. Level of Comprehension of Both Groups in the Pretest Scores

Group	Mean	Description
Control	4.47	Above Average
Experimental	4.53	Average

3.2 Pretest Results Based on the Four Levels of Comprehension

The tables that are presented below are the current standing of the pupils in terms of the results of the pretest. It is based on the four levels of comprehension that the researcher conducted between the two

groups. The T-test results show no significant difference in the mean scores between the experimental and controlled groups.

3.3 Literal Comprehension

The table shows the participants of both Experimental and Controlled Groups result in Literal Comprehension. Both groups gained 2.50 points out of 3 points. This shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the literal comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = .000, df = 70, and p-value = 1.000. This implies that the two groups are comparable at the beginning of the study. Literal Comprehension is the reader's ability to remember ideas and information that are directly stated in the textbook material (Heyman, 2012). According to the study conducted by Tizon (2011) in determining the levels of reading comprehension ability through its four levels. The results showed that the majority have done well on the Literal level.

Table 4. Literal Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	2.55	11	2.64
Female	25	2.48	25	2.44
Total	36	2.50	36	2.50

3.4 Inferential Comprehension

In Table 5, it shows that the Experimental Group gained 1.14 points, while the Controlled group has 1.06 points as their mean, out of 2 points.

The table shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the inferential comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = .628, df = 70, and p-value = .532. This implies that the two groups are comparable at the beginning of the study. Inferential Comprehension is where the reader's ability to extract ideas and information not directly stated in the textbook material, using prior or background knowledge to assist such understanding (Heyman, 2012). Based on the study of Villarosa (2014), this level of comprehension that the pupils have performed the best and had the highest number of correct points in the iSTAR Teaching Approach.

Table 5. Inferential Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	1.09	11	.82
Female	25	1.16	25	1.16
Total	36	1.14	36	1.06

3.5 Evaluative Comprehension

In Table 6, it shows that the Experimental Group gained .69 points, while the Controlled group has .72 points as their mean, out of 1 point. It shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the evaluative comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = .628, df = 70, and p-value = .532. It implies that the two groups are comparable at the beginning of the study. The level of comprehension when the reader's ability is to respond with personal judgments and ideas about the content of the textbook material, using his or her past knowledge and thoughts on the subject is called Evaluative Comprehension (Heyman, 2012). This is the level that the pupils have the lowest ability. Thus, it was recommended that teachers should use methodologies, strategies, and activities that will develop the pupils' levels (Sorrells, 2009).

Table 6. Evaluative Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	.73	11	.73
Female	25	.68	25	.72
Total	36	.69	36	.72

3.6 Appreciative Comprehension

Table 7 shows the participants of both Experimental and Controlled Groups result in Appreciative Comprehension. Both groups gained .19 points out of 1. This shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the appreciative comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = .000, df = 70, and p-value = 1.000. It implies that the two groups are comparable at the beginning of the study. Appreciative Comprehension is the reader's "emotional" response to the content of the textbook material read (Heyman, 2012). The purpose of this comprehension level is to gain an emotional or other kinds of valued response from the passage (Khoshsima, 2014).

Table 7. Appreciative Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	.27	11	.45
Female	25	.16	25	.08
Total	36	.19	36	.19

3.7 Level of Reading Comprehension in the Posttests

In Table 8, it shows the pupils' total level of comprehension in the posttest. The average score of the experimental group is 5.08 points and the controlled group is also 5.08 points out of 7. The mean scores of the two groups belong to the range of 4.50-5.49 on the rating scale. Thus, it shows that the comprehension skills of pupils in both groups is above average. Comprehension is the level of understanding of the text. Biancarosa (2005), found the use of technology which can improve the literacy skills and reading comprehension abilities of the students. It helps students construct personal knowledge and makes meaningful learning. However, technology in isolation or lack of student control rarely adds meaning to the lesson. Students need to have personal meaning and make connections for learning (Alessi, 2001).

Table 8. Posttest - Total Test

Sex	Mean	
	Experimental	Controlled
Male	5.64	4.64
Female	4.84	5.28
Total	5.08	5.08

3.8 Posttest Results Based on the Four Levels of Comprehension

The tables show the levels of comprehension of the pupils in the posttest, segregated by level. The T-test results show no significant difference in the mean scores between the experimental and controlled groups.

3.9 Literal Comprehension

The Table 9 shows the participants of both Experimental and Controlled Groups result in Literal Comprehension. The Experimental Group gained 2.69 points, while the Controlled Group has 2.44 points as their mean, out of 3 points.

The table shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the literal comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = 1.606, df = 66.263, and p-value = .113. Literal Comprehension refers to the ability to understand what is being read; subject matter and the language used to convey it (Heyman, 2012). A study of Villarosa (2014) found that among the comprehension levels, pupils have the highest difficulty in the literal level in using the iSTAR Method.

Table 9. Literal Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	3.00	11	2.18
Female	25	2.56	25	2.56
Total	36	2.69	36	2.44

3.10 Inferential Comprehension

In Table 10, it shows that the Experimental Group gained 1.53 points, while the Controlled group has 1.58 points as their mean, out of 2 points. It presents that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the inferential comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = .405, df = 70, and p-value = .0687. Inferential comprehension is finding information that is not explicitly stated in the passage. Readers should use their experiences and intuition (Khoshima, 2014). A study conducted by Boloori (2010) sought to evaluate the predictive power of critical thinking of EFL learners on their performance on the inferential reading comprehension test. She explored that there was a significant relationship between critical thinking and inferential reading comprehension.

Table 10. Inferential Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	1.55	11	1.36
Female	25	1.52	25	1.68
Total	36	1.53	36	1.58

3.11 Evaluative Comprehension

In Table 11, it shows that the Experimental Group gained .69 points, while the Controlled group has .81 points as their mean, out of 1 point. This shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the evaluative comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = 1.082, df = 68.447, and p-value = .283. This comprehension level requires the student to apply what he or she has learned from reading to real-life events or situations (Heyman, 2012). Myers and Dyer (2006) studied the effect of students' learning styles and critical thinking skills. 135 students at Florida University were chosen. The George Style Delineator was administered to assess the preferred learning style of each student. To determine the critical thinking skills of each student, the cornel critical thinking test was administered. Students with deep learning style preferences had higher critical thinking scores.

Table 11. Evaluative Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	.82	11	.73
Female	25	.64	25	.84
Total	36	.69	36	.81

3.12 Appreciative Comprehension

The table below shows the participants of both Experimental and Controlled Groups result in Appreciative Comprehension. The Experimental Group gained .17 points, while the Controlled group has .25 points as their mean, out of 1 point. The above table shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the appreciative comprehension of the pupils between the experimental and controlled groups. Wherein t = .863, df = 70, and p-value = .391. Appreciative Comprehension is based on the student's feelings towards the material or author. It is considered as the most abstract of any of the other levels because personality, likes, and dislikes can affect this level (Heyman, 2012).

Table 12. Appreciative Comprehension

Sex	Experimental		Controlled	
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean
Male	11	.27	11	.36
Female	25	.12	25	.20
Total	36	.17	36	.25

3.13 Significant Difference in the Scores of Pupils in the Pretests

Despite the difference between the mean scores of the pupils in Table 3, it shows that the mean difference = 0.056 and the p-value = 0.822. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the experimental and controlled groups. The difference is significant only if the p-value is less than 0.05. A study conducted by the Joan Ganz Cooney Center (2013), found that literacy building in children is effective with a printed book because of the centralized focus on the story. However, a study of Beach (2015) indicated that there is a relationship between technology and reading rate in terms of reading comprehension scores.

3.14 Significant Difference in the Scores of Pupils in the Posttests

Based on the result, it shows that the mean difference = 0.000 and p-value = 1.000. It indicates that there is no significant difference between the experimental and controlled groups. The difference is significant only if the p-value is less than 0.05. The use of digital video technology can be used that

enables students to learn (Chuang & Rosenbuch, 2005). On contrary, Mantranga (2007), stated that media do not influence learning, only the content of the materials that cause learning.

3.15 Difference of Posttest and Pretest Scores

In identifying the differences in the pretest and posttest mean scores for individual pupils, the averages of these differences for both experimental and control groups were then compared.

In Table 13, results show that there was a mean increase in scores of 0.56 for the experimental group and 0.61 for the control group. However, comparing these two values, the t-test shows that although the control group has a higher mean difference, the difference 0f 0.056 between the two values is not significant wherein the p-value is equivalent to 0.862.

Based on the results conducted, it simply shows that there is no significant difference between using video presentations and printed reading materials as instructions inside the classroom. In the Impact study of Cox and Watson (2000) with 2,300 students from 87 classrooms in primary and secondary schools, the results showed that there were small differences in using instructional technology in the students' academic achievement.

Moreover, in the study conducted by Sorrels (2009), he stated that there are multiple variables in determining the achievement of students in learning. Some of the factors are teaching philosophy, teacher knowledge and skills, the curriculum, and the student social factors that can be expanded to better understand the effects of media upon students' learning. Johnston (2004) pointed out that students are excited and pumped up if there is integration. Whereas, Woodward, et.al. (1986) stated that combining computer-based technologies with principles of literary instruction can help students develop their skills and confidence to be successful readers.

Table 13. The difference between Posttest and Pretest Scores

Sex	Mean	
	Experimental	Controlled
Male	1.00	.00
Female	.36	.88
Total	.56	.61

4. Discussion

The study's main objective was to determine the effect of video presentation and printed reading materials on pupils' comprehension skills, especially on the 4 levels: literal, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative comprehension. The study was conducted through a matched group experimental design and was implemented using two different sections that were heterogeneously grouped of Grade Three pupils of St. Scholastica's Academy – Bacolod School Year 2016-2017.

The implementation lasted for three consecutive days, where the teacher used video presentations to one section and using Printed Reading Materials with the other. The test results of the pupils were recorded and observed by the researchers and were subjected to the appropriate statistical tool and presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered were presented in this chapter.

Based on the summary of data found in Chapter 4, findings were gathered.

The level of reading comprehension in the pretest of the experimental Group gained 4.53 points and the controlled group is 4.47 points out of 7. The comprehension of the pupils belong to the experimental is Above Average and controlled is Average. Despite the difference between the mean scores of the pupils, the mean difference is equal to 0.056 and the p-value = 0.822, it indicates that there is no significant difference between the two groups. The difference is significant only if the p-value is less than 0.05.

The pupils' level of reading comprehension in the posttest of both groups based on the given results present that there is no significant difference. Despite having a different medium of instruction, both groups gained 5.08 points out of 7.

Based on the results of the pretest and posttest of experimental and controlled groups, results show that there was an increase in scores. The pretest of the experimental group is 4.53 points and the posttest is 5.08 points out 0f 7. The pretest of the controlled group is 4.47 points and the posttest is 5.08 points out of 7. Thus, there was an increase in the mean scores of both groups. The experimental group has an increase of 0.56 and 0.61 for the controlled group. Based on the data, the controlled group has a higher mean difference compared to the experimental. However, comparing the two values, the T-test shows that the difference of 0.056 between the two values is not significant wherein the p-value is equivalent to 0.862.

After conducting the tests, the result shows that there was no significant difference between the two participating sections. The reason for this outcome might be the fact that some of the pupils' have limited attention span which leads to not giving focus on the task. Thus, hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Moreover, after the implementation of the intervention, it was observed that the results of the posttest of the controlled and experimental group show that there is no significant difference. Thus, hypothesis 2 is accepted. It is believed that participants have different types of learning strategies to develop their comprehension skills.

Based on the mean scores of the experimental and controlled group, it shows that there is no significant difference between the two pretests and posttests that the researcher conducted. Thus, hypothesis 3 is accepted. The controlled group has a higher mean difference compared to the experimental group. However, comparing the two values did not yield a significant difference.

5. Conclusion

Reading is an important factor for students, this generation is exposed to various technologies and devices that make learning fun and easier. There are a lot of ways that incorporate technology because

a lot believe that with this, students can adapt, learn, and develop even the most difficult and complex skills. Thus, it is the reason why the researcher came up with this study to determine the effect of video presentation and printed reading materials on pupils' comprehension skills. The researcher implemented the use of video presentations in a group of pupils and printed reading materials in another group. It is to determine if there is any difference in using these instructions in class. Based on the data gathered, there are small gains in each group. However, this does not yield a significant difference. This does not mean pupils are not learning from the materials that were used, but it rather explained that the design of each medium may impact depends how the brain processes and stores the lesson (Fisch, 2002).

There are multiple factors involved in determining the pupils' comprehension levels. Factors such as teaching Philosophy, teacher knowledge and skills, the curriculum, and student's social factor are variables that can be expanded to better understand the effects of technology upon comprehension skills (Sorrells, 2009).

References

A1-Seghayer, K. (2001). *The effect of multimedia annotation modes on L2 vocabulary acquisition: A comparative study*. Language Learning and Technology.

Adreasen, H. (2009). *Combining Comprehension Reading Instruction with Video Anchors with Middle – Level Learners*. Dissertation. Utah State University.

Afflerbach, P. (2004). Assessing adolescent reading. In T. L. Jetton, & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 369-391). New York: Guilford.

Alessi, S. M., & Trollip, S. P. (2001). *Multimedia for Learning*. Massachusetts: Pearson Education Company.

Beach, K. (2008). *The Effect of Media, Text Length, and Reading Rates on College Student Reading Comprehension Levels*. Dissertation, University of Phoenix.

Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The "digital natives" debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(5), 775-786. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x

Biancarosa, G. (2005). After third grade. *Educational Leadership*, *63*(2).

Calderon, J., & Gonzales, E. (2014). *Research Methods*. Mandaluyong City. MG Reprographics Supply & Services Inc.

Canning – Wilson, C. (2000). *Research in Visuals*. TESOL Quarterly.

Chan, Lei, Luna. (2014). A Study of Video Effects on English Listening Comprehension. *International Journal of Information and Educational Technology*, *2*(4).

David, S. (2002). *Students' Performance in Reading Utilizing Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) and Traditional Method* (Master Thesis). The University of St. La Salle – Bacolod.

Deles, C. (2013). *The Effectiveness of Technology on Children's Creativity* (Master Thesis). The University of St. La Salle – Bacolod.

Egharevba, K. (2004). *Sampling Method in Social Research*.

Flojo. O. (n.d.). The *Phil-IRI assessing the reading levels of pupils in the public school*. Handout.

Fraenkel, J., & Wallen, N. (2007). *How to Design and Evaluate Research. Sixth Edition*. New York, America. The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Gaudelli, W. (2006). The convergence of technology and diversity: Experiences of two beginning teachers in web-based distance learning for global/multicultural education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

Goffe, W. L., & Sosin, K. (2005). Teaching with technology: May you live in interesting times. *Journal of Economic Education*, *36*(3). https://doi.org/10.3200/JECE.36.3.278-291

Gorman, M. (2006, June 25). *ALA president's program: Reading: The essential skill*.

Gutierrez, D. S. (2007). *Learning English The Easy Way 3*. Valenzuela City. TRU – COPY Publishing House Inc.

Helping Struggling Reader. (2014). Retrieved June 25, 2014, from http://www.readingrockets.org/helping/target/comprehension

Ho, D. (2005). *Journeys 3*. Manila. Publication and Training, Inc.

http://rif.org/us/about/literacy-issues/giving-children-access-to-print-materials-improves-reading-performance.htm

http://www.allkindsofminds.org/mastering-the-challenges-of-reading-reading-comprehension-the-attention-components

http://www.spreeder.com/blog/ebooks-vs-printed-books-which-is-preferred-now/

http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id/613018/Reading-Comprehension-Has-Different-Levels.html?nav=509

http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/why-digital-natives-prefer-reading-in-print-yes-you-read-that-right/2015/02/22/8596ca86-b871-11e4-9423-f3d0a1ec335c_story.html

https://explorable.com/matched-subjects-design

Jabr, F. (2013). The Reading Brain in the Digital Age: The Science of Paper versus Screens. *Scientific American*.

McVee, M. B., Dunsmore, K., & Gavelek, J. R. (2005). Schema theory revisited. *Review of Educational Research*, *75*(4), 531-566. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075004531

Melocoton, M. (2003). *Teachers' Perception of the Reading Difficulties of Grade III – A basis for Remedial Reading Program*. The University of St. La Salle – Bacolod.

Nation, K., Clarke, P., Marshall, C. M., & Durand, M. (2004). Hidden language impairments in children: Parallels between poor reading comprehension and specific language impairment? *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *47*, 199-211. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2004/017)

National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). *Rates of computer and Internet use by children in nursery schools and students in kindergarten through twelfth grade: 2003*.

National Postsecondary Education Cooperative. (2004). *How does technology affect access in postsecondary education? What do we really know?* U.S. Department of Education.

Nelson, A. (2010). *An Inquiry into the use of video media by Secondary in the Digital Generation using Peer Coaching* (Dissertation). Capella University.

Nelson, A. H. (2010). *The Effects of Reading Comprehension and Fluency Abilities on the N400 Event-Related Potential*. Dissertation, University of South Florida.

OECD and Statistics Canada. (2005). *Learning a living: First results of the adult literacy and life skills survey*. Ottawa and Paris: OECD Publishing.

Pano, J. S. (2013). *Soaring to New Heights in Reading 3*. Quezon City. Abiva Publishing House, Inc.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5). 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816

RAND Corporation. (2004). *RAND study says 50-state assessment of student reading shows students in grades 4-12 lag behind federal goals*.

Rapp, D. N., van den Broek, P., McMaster, K. L., Kendeou, P., & Espin, C. A. (2007). Higher-order comprehension processes in struggling readers: A perspective for research and intervention. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *11*(4), 289-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888430701530417

Rico, A. (2011). *Assessment of Students' Learning*. Anvil Publishing, Inc.

Salter, P. (2013). Helping or hindering? Technology's impact on secondary students' self-regulated learning. In J. Herrington et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia and Telecommunications 2013* (pp. 2271-2280). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Scholastic. (2006). *Research foundation paper: School libraries work*! Scholastic Library Publishing.

Shaywitz, B. et al. (2004). Development of left occipitotemporal systems for skilled reading in children after phonologically based intervention. *Biological Psychiatry*, *55*, 926-933. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2003.12.019

Sorrells, R. (2009*). Relationships between Student Achievement and Use of Power Videos, Digital Educational Videos*. Dissertation, Seton Hall University.

The Access Center. (2007). *Literacy-Rich Environments*. Retrieved February 1, 2008, from http://www.k8accesscenter.org/training_resources/literacy-richenvironments.asp

Tizon, M. (2011). *Reading Comprehension Ability of Grade VI Pupils of Kinangay Sur Elementary School*. College of Arts and Sciences.

Villarosa, J. A. (2014). *The Effect of the Researcher-Made iSTAR in Improving Reading Comprehension Skills of Pupils*. University of St. La Salle – Bacolod.

Wang, S., Dong, X., Ren, Y., & Yang, Y. (2009). The development of semantic priming effect in childhood: An event-related potential study. *NeuroReport, 20*, 574-578. https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e328329f215

Werquin, P. (2006). Literacy: Words count. *OECD Observer*.

Westby, C. (2005, September 27). Language, culture, and literacy: A report from the ASHA schools conference. *ASHA Leader, 10*(13). https://doi.org/10.1044/leader.FTR5.10132005.16

Wolfe, P., & Nevills, P. (2004). *On the Nature of Reading*. Thousand Oaks. CA: Corwin Press.

Wolfe, S., & Flewitt, R. (2010). New technologies, new multimodal literacy practices and young children's metacognitive development. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 40*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2010.526589

Zhou, G. L., & Yang, S. D. (2004). The effects of visual aids on English majors listening comprehension. *Journal of PLA Foreign Language Institute*.