

# Effectiveness Of Pull-Out Reading Approach Through the Use of Teacher-Made Contextualized Big & Small Books to The Literacy Performance of The Grade 4 Pupils

IVY MENDOZA

Teacher I

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major Elementary Education

[ivymendoza@deped.gov.ph](mailto:ivymendoza@deped.gov.ph)

**Abstract** — This study was conducted to determine the Effectiveness of Pull-out Reading Approach using teacher made-contextualized big books and small books to the performance of Grade 4 pupils in Albuera North Central School in the Schools Division of Leyte. The findings of the study were the basis for the proposed Intervention Plan. The study examined the effectiveness of the pull-out reading approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big books and small books utilized a quasi-experimental research design focusing on a single group of Grade 4 pupils. This design was particularly useful in educational research where random assignment is not feasible, allowing for the assessment of an intervention's impact on a specific group of students without the necessity of a control group. In this study, a cohort of Grade 4 pupils participated in the pull-out reading program, which involved removing them from their regular classroom setting for targeted reading instruction using contextualized materials. A pre-test was administered to measure the students' initial reading performance in areas such as fluency and comprehension. Following a specified intervention period where the students engage with the big books and small books tailored to their cultural and personal contexts, a post-test was conducted to evaluate any improvements in their reading skills. The results regarding the Pull-out Reading Approach—can be highly effective in raising literacy scores, particularly for students who are struggling. The control group's relatively lower performance, despite having a good post-test score, underscores the limitations of traditional teaching methods without specialized intervention. It suggests that relying solely on conventional instructional strategies may not provide the necessary support for students to reach their full potential. The significant difference in post-test scores highlights the importance of adopting and implementing evidence-based, tailored literacy interventions that address the specific needs of learners, especially those who may be at risk of underachievement.

**Keywords** — *Effectiveness*  
4

*Pull-out reading Approach*

*Smal/Big Books*

*Literacy Performance Grade*

## I. INTRODUCTION

For both academic performance and lifetime learning, it is imperative that children acquire effective reading abilities during their elementary school years. To better understand how to fulfill the varied needs of students, a study titled "Effectiveness of Pull-out Reading Approach Through the Use of Teacher-Made Contextualized Big Books and Small Books to the Performance of Grade 4 Pupils" was conducted. Targeted interventions are crucial since many kids struggle with reading comprehension and fluency. With the help of the pull-out reading technique, teachers may give struggling readers individualized attention in a supportive setting, which improves their learning results.

Kucirkova (2019) highlights that when reading materials are relatable to students' lives, their motivation and understanding improve. By utilizing teacher-made big books and small books that reflect the backgrounds and interests of Grade 4 pupils, educators can create a rich learning experience that promotes both engagement and deeper comprehension. This approach not only addresses the immediate reading needs of students but also fosters a love for reading by making the content relevant and enjoyable.

The pull-out reading model offers a structured opportunity for students to engage with these contextualized materials in a focused setting. As Allington (2013) emphasizes, effective reading interventions often include strategies that are adaptable to individual student needs, allowing them to progress at their own pace.

To suit different learning styles and preferences, this study integrates tiny volumes for personal practice and large books for group reading sessions. Big books' wider format promotes group learning, while compact books' crucial opportunity for individualized instruction supports an all-encompassing reading curriculum.

The ultimate goal of this study is to evaluate how these teaching techniques affect Grade 4 students' reading abilities. Through an assessment of the pull-out reading strategy's efficacy in conjunction with contextualized big and small books, the study hopes to provide insightful information on best practices in literacy instruction.

This study aims to explore how these customized materials can promote reading enjoyment and result in quantifiable gains in literacy abilities. The goal of this research is to offer important insights into efficient literacy techniques that can help Grade 4 students overcome their reading challenges by fusing the advantages of a structured pull-out program with the rich, relatable content of contextualized reading resources.

These are the motivations behind the researcher's efforts to continue his investigation into potential teaching methods to raise the reading proficiency of Grade 4 students, as indicated by the records he has accumulated.

This study was conducted to determine the Effectiveness of Pull-out Reading Approach using teacher made-contextualized big books and small books to the performance of Grade 4 pupils in Albuera North Central School in the Schools Division of Leyte. The findings of the study were the basis for the proposed Intervention Plan.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the literacy performance of the Grade 4 pupils before the integration of Pull-out Reading Approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big books and small books BASED ON THE FOLLOWING GROUPS:
  - 1.1 CONTROL;
  - 1.2 EXPERIMENTAL; ?
2. What is the literacy performance of the Grade 4 pupils after the integration of Pull-out Reading Approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big books and small books?
3. Is there a significant difference between the literacy performance of the Grade 4 pupils before and after the integration of Pull-out Reading Approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big books and small books?
4. What enhancement plan can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Statement of Hypothesis:

Ho: There is no significant difference between the literacy performance of the Grade 4 pupils before and after the integration of Pull-out Reading Approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big books and small books.

---

## II. METHODOLOGY

**Design.** The study examined the effectiveness of the pull-out reading approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big books and small books utilized a quasi-experimental research design focusing on a single group of Grade 4 pupils. This design was particularly useful in educational research where random assignment is not feasible, allowing for the assessment of an intervention's impact on a specific group of students without the necessity of a control group. In this study, a cohort of Grade 4 pupils participated in the pull-out reading program, which involved removing them from their regular classroom setting for targeted reading instruction using contextualized materials. A pre-test was administered to measure the students' initial reading performance in areas such as fluency and comprehension. Following a specified intervention period where the students engage with the big books and small books tailored to their cultural and personal contexts, a post-test was conducted to evaluate any improvements in their reading skills. Data collected from the pre-test and post-test was analyzed to identify significant changes in reading performance resulting from the intervention. Additionally, qualitative feedback may be gathered through interviews or surveys from both students and teachers to gain insight into their experiences with the pull-out program and the contextualized materials. The main local of the study is in Albuera North Central School, Albuera North District in the schools Division of Leyte. To gather the necessary data needed in the study, the researcher utilized the Phil-IRI tool and Reading Materials (Big books and Small Books) to get the pretest and posttest literacy performance of the learners. The proposed intervention Plan was taken based on the findings of the study.

**Sampling.** The respondents of the study were Grade 4 learners of Albuera North Central School, Albuera North District in the Schools Division of Leyte. There are forty-two (42) males and forty-seven (47) females with a total of eighty-nine (89) respondents that were involved in this study were being identified and the primary means of reach is during the actual conduct of the study as well as during the gathering of data in the school where the study was conducted.

**Research Procedure.** The researcher prepared the research design which is the quasi-experimental research method to gauge the Effectiveness of contextualized Audio-Video Materials to the test scores of the Grade 2 pupils in Mathematics. The researcher formulated the following steps or procedures to be guided during the gathering of data. The steps are the following:

To gather the necessary data in 1 month (30 days), the researcher asked for permission from the office of the Schools Division Office, headed by the School Division Superintendent, through a Transmittal Letter. The same letter content was given to the Public-School District Supervisor, School Principal, and to the teachers under whose care the respondents were.

The researcher then conducted the pretest performance before integrating the Pull-out Reading Approach through the use of teacher-made contextualized big and small books. After administering the pretest, the researcher integrated the Pull-out Reading Approach using teacher-made contextualized big books and small books for a period of 1 month. After the given period of time, a posttest examination was conducted to assess the learners' learning. The data was collated and submitted for appropriate statistical treatment

**Ethical Issues.** The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the principal, approval of the Superintendent of the Division. Orientation of the respondents both School Principal, teachers and parent were done.

**Treatment of Data.** The following statistical formulas were used in this study:

The quantitative responses was tallied and tabulated. The data will be treated statistically using the following statistical tool.

Weighted Mean. This was utilized to assess the performance of the Grade 4 learners in literacy performance.

T-Test for Mean Difference. This tool was used to calculate the literacy performance of the Grade 4 learners.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1**  
**Pre-Test Performance of Grade 4 Learners in Literacy**

Score Range	Description	PRETEST CONTROL		PRETEST EXPERIMENTAL	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
25-30	Excellent	0	0	0	0
19-24	Very Good	5	28	1	6
13-18	Good	6	33	11	61
7-12	Fair	6	33	6	33
1-6	Poor	1	6	0	0
Total		18	100	18	100
Weighted Mean		14.50	Good	14.55	Good

Table 1 presents the pre-test performance of Grade 4 learners in literacy, comparing the results of the control group and the experimental group. The table categorizes the learners' performance according to score ranges, with corresponding descriptions of their proficiency levels. The table shows that both groups had similar distributions in terms of frequency and percentage across different performance categories, ranging from "Excellent" to "Poor." The weighted mean scores for both groups are also quite similar, with the control group scoring 14.50 (Good) and the experimental group scoring 14.55 (Good), indicating comparable overall literacy levels before the intervention.

Looking at the pre-test results, the control group had a slightly higher number of learners in the "Good" category, with 33% (6 out of 18 learners) scoring within the range of 13-18, compared to the experimental group, which had 61% of its learners in the "Good" category. Meanwhile, the number of learners in the "Very Good" category was higher in the control group, with 28% (5 out of 18 learners), compared to only 6% (1 out of 18 learners) in the experimental group. In contrast, the "Fair" category saw the same percentage of learners (33%) in both groups, showing similar levels of performance.

Despite some differences in the specific category distributions, both groups showed a lack of learners performing at the "Excellent" level, which suggests that the literacy proficiency of both groups might have room for improvement. The "Poor" category was represented minimally in both groups, with only 1 learner (6%) in the control group scoring in this range, while the experimental group had no learners performing at this level. This could suggest that while both groups had learners with varying levels of proficiency, no group had extreme gaps in learning.

The results implied that, while there are slight differences in the performance distribution between the control and experimental groups, both groups are generally performing at a "Good" level. The absence of any learners in the "Excellent" category suggests that the literacy program might need to be adjusted or enhanced to push students beyond the "Good" category. The fact that the experimental group showed a higher proportion of learners in the "Good" category (61%) compared to the control group (33%) may imply that the experimental treatment could have a more positive effect on learner outcomes. Further intervention or more focused strategies may be necessary to help those who scored in the "Fair" or "Poor" categories.



**Table 2**  
**Post-Test Performance of Grade 4 Learners in Literacy**

Score Range	Description	POST-TEST CONTROL		POST-TEST EXPERIMENTAL	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
25-30	Excellent	0	0	18	100
19-24	Very Good	8	44	0	0
13-18	Good	10	56	0	0
7-12	Fair	0	10	0	0
1-6	Poor	0	0	0	0
Total		18	100	30	100
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>18.33</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>27.72</b>	<b>Excellent</b>

Table 2 presents the post-test performance of Grade 4 learners in literacy, comparing the results of the control group and the experimental group. The table categorizes the learners' performance according to score ranges, from "Excellent" to "Poor," and shows the frequency and percentage of learners in each category. A notable difference between the two groups is evident in the performance distribution: the experimental group demonstrated a much stronger outcome, with all its learners (100%) scoring in the "Excellent" category. In contrast, the control group had a more varied distribution, with learners falling into the "Very Good," "Good," and "Fair" categories. The weighted mean scores further highlight this difference, with the experimental group achieving a significantly higher mean of 27.72 (Excellent), compared to the control group's mean of 18.33 (Good).

The post-test results clearly show a stark contrast between the two groups. The experimental group exhibited remarkable improvement, with 100% of the learners scoring in the "Excellent" category (25-30), indicating significant progress in their literacy skills after the intervention. On the other hand, the control group's results remained more spread out across various categories, with 44% of the learners scoring "Very Good" (19-24) and 56% scoring "Good" (13-18). There were no learners in the control group who reached the "Excellent" level, and the group also had a small percentage (10%) in the "Fair" category (7-12). The control group's performance shows an overall improvement, but it falls short compared to the experimental group. The weighted mean of the control group was 18.33, which indicates a "Good" performance, while the experimental group achieved a mean of 27.72, which falls in the "Excellent" category, signaling a substantial leap in performance.

The results implied that the intervention used with this group—likely the Pull-out Reading Approach with teacher-made contextualized big books and small books—had a significant positive impact on learners' literacy. This outcome supports the idea that specific, targeted literacy interventions can yield high levels of improvement, especially for students who may initially show lower levels of proficiency. In contrast, the control group, despite improvement, showed a more gradual progression, indicating that traditional methods or lack of tailored interventions might not be as effective in fostering rapid literacy gains. These results emphasize the importance of using contextually relevant, interactive, and engaging reading materials in improving literacy outcomes. The difference between the two groups underscores the need for schools to consider more personalized and intensive interventions for struggling learners to achieve optimal results.

**Table 3**  
**Test of Difference Between in the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups**

Aspects	Test Scores		Computed T	Critical T	Decision	Interpretation
<b>Control</b>	Pre	14.50	0.688	0.733	Accept $H_0$	Not Significant
	Post	18.33				
<b>Experimental</b>	Pre	14.55	1.944	0.733	Reject $H_0$	Significant
	Post	27.72				

Table 3 presents the results of the test used to determine the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of both the control and experimental groups. The table includes the computed t-value and critical t-value for both groups, along with the decision to either accept or reject the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) and the interpretation of the results. The control group's comparison shows no significant difference, with a computed t-value of 0.688, which is lower than the critical t-value of 0.733, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. On the other hand, the experimental group displayed a significant difference, with a computed t-value of 1.944, which exceeds the critical t-value of 0.733, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The pre-test score of the experimental group was 14.55 (Good), while their post-test score surged to 27.72 (Excellent), reflecting substantial progress. The t-test result for the experimental group (1.944) was well above the critical value (0.733), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and indicating that the change in scores was statistically significant. In contrast, the control group had a much smaller increase, with the pre-test score at 14.50 (Good) and the post-test score at 18.33 (Good). The computed t-value for the control group (0.688) was less than the critical t-value (0.733), which means the null hypothesis was accepted, signifying that the difference in scores was not statistically significant. These results indicate that the intervention used with the experimental group—likely the Pull-out Reading Approach—had a significant positive effect on learners' literacy skills, while the control group's performance did not show any substantial change. The statistical evidence suggests that the teaching approach in the experimental group was more effective in improving literacy than the method employed with the control group.

The results from Table 3 imply that Pull-out Reading Approach with teacher-made contextualized books, can lead to substantial gains in literacy. In contrast, the control group's lack of significant progress suggests that traditional methods or a lack of focused intervention may not be sufficient for driving measurable improvements in literacy. Therefore, educators and policymakers should consider adopting more individualized, evidence-based strategies like those used in the experimental group to ensure better literacy outcomes for all learners. The results also suggest that, in order to maximize student achievement, interventions should be tailored to meet the specific needs of the learners, taking into account their prior performance and areas for growth.

**Table 4**  
**Test of Difference Between in the Post-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups**

Aspects	Test Scores		Computed T	Critical T	Decision	Interpretation
<b>Control</b>	Post	18.33	1.775	0.921	Reject $H_0$	Significant
<b>Experimental</b>	Post	27.72				

Table 4 presents the results of the test comparing the post-test scores of the control and experimental groups. It includes the computed t-value, critical t-value, decision to accept or reject the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ), and the interpretation of the results. For the control group, the post-test score was 18.33, with a computed t-value of 0.921, which is less than the critical t-value of 1.775. This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating that the difference between the post-test scores of the two groups was significant. On the other hand, the experimental group's post-test score was 27.72, which was significantly higher, though the corresponding t-value for the group was not explicitly listed in this table.

Upon analyzing the post-test scores, the table shows that the experimental group performed significantly better than the control group. The control group's post-test score was 18.33, which is categorized as "Good," while the experimental group achieved a much higher post-test score of 27.72, falling into the "Excellent" category. The computed t-value for the control group (0.921) was lower than the critical t-value (1.775), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and indicating that the differences between the control group's post-test scores and the experimental group's post-test scores were statistically significant. The table shows that the intervention applied to the experimental group produced substantial improvement in literacy, and this result clearly highlights the effectiveness of the intervention. In contrast, the control group did not show the same level of improvement, reinforcing the conclusion that the intervention applied to the experimental group played a crucial role in enhancing their literacy scores. The significant difference in

post-test results between the two groups is a clear indication of the positive impact of the experimental approach used with the experimental group.

The results of Table 4 implied that Pull-out Reading Approach—can be highly effective in raising literacy scores, particularly for students who are struggling. The control group's relatively lower performance, despite having a good post-test score, underscores the limitations of traditional teaching methods without specialized intervention. It suggests that relying solely on conventional instructional strategies may not provide the necessary support for students to reach their full potential. The significant difference in post-test scores highlights the importance of adopting and implementing evidence-based, tailored literacy interventions that address the specific needs of learners, especially those who may be at risk of underachievement. Therefore, educators should consider integrating more focused and individualized literacy programs to ensure better learning outcomes across diverse student populations.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study about the pull-out Reading Approach using teacher-made contextualized books has proven to be highly effective in improving literacy, particularly for struggling learners, as evidenced by the significant gains in the experimental group's post-test scores. In contrast, the lack of substantial progress in the control group highlights the limitations of traditional, one-size-fits-all teaching methods. These findings emphasize the need for more individualized, evidence-based interventions tailored to students' specific needs in order to maximize literacy outcomes. To ensure that all learners achieve their full potential, educators and policymakers should prioritize the adoption of focused, customized literacy programs that address both strengths and areas for growth.

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that the utilization of the intervention plan be extended across various educational settings to improve literacy outcomes.
2. Teachers should be encouraged to incorporate the Pull-out Reading Approach with teacher-made contextualized books into their instructional practices, tailoring the materials to suit the specific needs and backgrounds of their students.
3. School Heads should support this initiative by providing professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their skills in implementing these targeted reading strategies, ensuring a collaborative and sustained effort in improving student performance.
4. The Public School District Supervisor and Education Program Supervisor should advocate for the widespread adoption of evidence-based literacy interventions, helping to ensure that adequate resources are allocated for the development and dissemination of teacher-made, contextualized reading materials.
5. Parents and stakeholders should be engaged in the literacy improvement process by providing support and encouragement at home, while also staying informed about the reading strategies being used in the classroom. Collaboration between parents, teachers, and school heads can create a holistic approach to enhancing student literacy.
6. The Researcher is encouraged to continue investigating the long-term effects of the Pull-out Reading Approach, exploring how it can be further refined and scaled to different grade levels and diverse student populations.
7. Future researchers should consider examining the impact of such individualized approaches across various regions or demographics, exploring how contextualized reading interventions can be adapted to different cultural or socio-economic contexts for even greater effectiveness in literacy development.

---

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher offers her earnest gratitude to the following whom she deeply indebted who had enormously contributed to the success of the study:

Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Chairman, for his meticulous review and indefatigable effort in improving the study;

Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao, the writer's research adviser for her exceptional support, insightful guidance, valuable suggestions, and encouragement. Her patience was crucial to the successful completion of this study;

Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao and Dr. Jasmine B. Misa, as members of the Panel of Examiners, for giving their professional suggestions and recommendations for the realization of this study;

Mrs. Divina W. Dalanon Schools District Supervisor of Albuera North District and Mrs. Cristina C. Tayros School Principal of Albuera North Central School, for giving permission to the researcher to conduct the study in Albuera North Central School, Albuera North District.

The respondents of Albuera North Central School the Grade 4 pupils, who participated in completing the data needed, your invaluable contributions to the success of this study were greatly appreciated.

The researcher's loving family, whose unwavering care and encouragement throughout the journey inspired her to finish this book. Their love and belief in the researcher have been her constant source of strength; To all those who helped make this research paper done;

Above all, to God Almighty be the glory for the blessings, strength, wisdom, guidance, and opportunity given to pursue graduate studies; thus, gaining professional development is possible. His grace and enlightenment sustained the researcher through challenging times. May His work in this study be a testament to His glory, which made the researcher capable enough to continue living a life that matters.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Allington, R. L. (2018). Effective reading interventions for struggling readers: A comprehensive approach. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(5), 557-564. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1737>
- [2] DepEd Order 30 s. 2021. Interem guidelines for Assessment and Grading in light of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan.
- [3] Gonzalez, E. J. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching and literacy skills enhancement among diverse learners. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 52(1), 50-72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19887251>
- [4] Miller, D., & Beech, M. (2022). Teachers' perceptions of contextualized materials in reading instruction: A qualitative study. *Reading Psychology*, 43(3), 295-317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2022.2033090>
- [5] Rasinski, T. V., & Frederick, J. (2024). The long-term impact of targeted reading interventions on fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 59(1), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.494>



**AUTHOR'S PROFILE****IVY MENDOZA**

The author was born on May 25, 1983, in San Remigio, Cebu, Philippines. She graduated in May 2019 with the course Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education majoring General Education at Cebu Normal University and passed the September 2019 Licensure Examination for Teachers. She is now a Teacher I in the Department of Education and a Grade IV Teacher at Albuera North Central School at Real Street, Poblacion, Albuera, Leyte, Philippines. It's been her passion teaching young learners, and that helped her decide to take Elementary Education as her field of specialization for her master's degree. She is currently finishing her degree in Master of Arts in Education majoring Elementary Education at Western Leyte College of Ormoc City.

Teaching and guiding young children to become the kind of person that God wants them to be is her way of living a life that matters.