International Journal of Social Science and Human Research

ISSN (print): 2644-0679, ISSN (online): 2644-0695

Volume 09 Issue 10 October 2026

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v9-i10-63, Impact factor- 8.361

Page No: 9113- 9118

Reading Profiles and Vocabulary Learning Needs of Grade 7 Students in Pio Duran as a Basis for Supplementary Material Development

Mark Jordan G. Obniala

Graduate Studies and Research, University of Saint Anthony, Iriga City, Philippines

ABSTRACT: Vocabulary support in early secondary education needs to reflect differences in learners' reading readiness and opportunities to use words meaningfully. This study examined reported reading profiles and vocabulary ratings from six public secondary schools in Pio Duran, Albay, Philippines, to inform the development of supplementary vocabulary material. A descriptive analysis was conducted using school assessment summaries, teacher informed vocabulary ratings, and curricular appraisal frequencies documented in the thesis. Reading categories were treated as indicators of reading performance rather than direct measures of vocabulary mastery. School summaries generally showed fewer learners in the frustration category at posttest and more learners in instructional or independent categories. Vocabulary ratings increased across the six schools, from baseline values of 1.67–3.12 to posttest values of 2.06–3.90. However, identical scores across generalization, application, breadth, and precision prevented separate interpretation of these dimensions. Recomputed appraisal means were 4.93 for content quality, 4.94 for format, and 4.92 for presentation and organization on the reported five point scale. Accuracy ratings also identified minor errors requiring editorial attention. The supplementary material was organized around progressively demanding vocabulary tasks, contextual use, and differentiated support. Findings provide a local basis for refining instructional resources, but they do not establish intervention effectiveness. Inconsistent participant totals, incomplete documentation of assessment procedures, and discrepancies in validation records limit interpretation. Verification of the original records and a subsequent classroom evaluation are needed before stronger claims can be made. The study supports alignment between learner evidence, material design, and the scope of conclusions drawn from school assessments.

KEYWORDS: Grade 7; vocabulary learning; reading assessment; Phil-IRI; supplementary materials; curricular appraisal

I. INTRODUCTION

Entering secondary school brings new demands on students' reading and language use. Learners encounter unfamiliar terms in subject texts, interpret longer explanations, and express ideas with greater precision. A student may recognize a word in a familiar passage yet struggle to explain it or use it in another setting. For teachers, the practical question is how to provide vocabulary support that responds to these differences without reducing instruction to memorizing definitions.

Vocabulary learning requires attention to both the words learners know and the ways they can use them. Nation (2013) describes a systematic approach to vocabulary teaching that connects knowledge of words with purposeful learning activities. Schmitt (2008) likewise argues for combining deliberate vocabulary instruction with opportunities to encounter words through language use. These perspectives support materials that offer clear explanations, repeated encounters, and meaningful practice rather than isolated word lists.

Reading assessments can help teachers locate learners who need additional support, but their results must be interpreted within the purpose of the instrument. The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) assesses oral reading, silent reading, and listening comprehension. Its manual positions the inventory as an approximate measure that can inform instruction alongside other assessments (Department of Education [DepEd], 2018b). A reading classification therefore provides useful context for vocabulary teaching; it does not, on its own, establish a learner's vocabulary size or precision of word use.

The original study addressed Grade 7 learners in six public secondary schools in Pio Duran, Albay. Its practical concern was the uneven reading readiness observed across schools and the need for supplementary vocabulary activities suited to different levels of support. The local contribution lies in connecting available school evidence with the design and appraisal of a teaching resource. It does not depend on claiming that a single material can explain changes in reading performance.

This article examines three questions: What reading patterns were reported across the participating schools? What do the reported vocabulary ratings indicate, within the limits of their documentation? How can these findings and the curricular appraisal

inform supplementary vocabulary material? The article condenses the thesis into a descriptive account of assessment patterns and material development. It distinguishes reported outcomes from instructional recommendations and identifies the evidence needed for a subsequent effectiveness study.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Design and Setting

The article uses a descriptive analysis of the school summaries and curricular appraisal records presented in the thesis. The original methodology labels the study descriptive-correlational, but the reported results do not include correlation coefficients, regression models, or other tests of association. Accordingly, this article reports descriptive findings only. The six schools were Alabangpuro High School, La Medalla High School, Malapay High School, Malidong High School, Marigondon National High School, and Pio Duran National High School. School names follow the results tables; the thesis uses some variations in their formal names.

The methodology specifies a planned sample of 200 Grade 7 students selected through stratified random sampling by gender, section, and academic performance. The school tables, however, report enrollment totals of 677 at pretest and 664 at posttest. These are sums of the printed school totals, not verified counts of unique study participants. The relationship between the planned sample and the school assessment records is not documented. The unit of reporting in this article is therefore the school summary; no claim is made that the tabulated totals constitute the stated random sample or a matched longitudinal cohort.

B. Assessment Records and Vocabulary Ratings

The thesis presents pretest and posttest school distributions under four labels: struggling, frustration, instructional, and independent. These labels are retained when reporting the source data. DepEd (2018a) identifies independent, instructional, and frustration as Phil-IRI reading levels; the additional struggling category requires a locally documented definition. The thesis does not provide enough information to reconstruct its classification rule, the passages administered, or the comparability of the two assessment occasions. Because the cited policy concerns elementary learners, the basis for using or adapting the instrument with Grade 7 students also needs clarification.

Four vocabulary dimensions are discussed: generalization, application, breadth, and precision. In the thesis, generalization concerns transferring word knowledge across contexts; application concerns using words in communication; breadth concerns the range of known words; and precision concerns selecting words appropriate to a particular meaning. The results attribute these ratings to interviews with language teachers and observations of learner performance. A four-point scale is mentioned, but the number of teacher raters, scoring procedure, item structure, and interrater agreement are not sufficiently reported. The identical numerical entries in all four dimension tables are presented once and are not treated as four independent measurements.

C. Material Development and Curricular Appraisal

The thesis describes supplementary material organized to support learners with different reading needs. Foundational activities address basic vocabulary and contextual meaning; subsequent activities emphasize more varied contexts, practical word use, and enrichment. The reported design connects vocabulary support with classroom reading tasks and increasing learner independence. The available description establishes the intended instructional progression, but it does not document a reproducible lesson schedule, complete activity sequence, or implementation dosage.

The appended appraisal form covers content quality, format, presentation and organization, and accuracy and currency of information. It is labeled an LRMDS validation tool in the thesis and uses a five-point response format. The methodology lists eight intended experts, whereas most scored criteria contain ten responses. This article therefore describes the number of recorded ratings per criterion without asserting a verified panel size. The exact instrument version and any adaptations also require confirmation.

D. Analysis and Ethical Reporting

School frequencies are reproduced as reported; conflicting entries are identified rather than silently corrected. Differences between pretest and posttest vocabulary ratings were calculated by subtraction. Appraisal means were recomputed from the visible frequencies using the sum of rating multiplied by frequency divided by the number of recorded responses. Only rows containing ratings were included; unscored category headings were excluded. For content quality, this includes twelve separately scored values indicators. The resulting domain means describe the displayed responses and do not substitute for instrument-specific approval criteria.

No significance tests, effect sizes, confidence intervals, or participant-level transition rates were calculated because the required individual records and sampling information were unavailable. The thesis describes seeking school and parental permission, but it does not establish a completed ethics review, learner assent procedure, or approval identifier. This article uses aggregate records only. These reporting gaps must be resolved from the original documentation before submission; approval or consent cannot be inferred from a proposed procedure.

III. RESULTS

A. Reported Reading Profiles

The printed school summaries indicate differences in initial reading profiles and generally more favorable distributions at posttest (Table I). Alabangpuro's struggling count fell from 27 to 17, while its instructional count rose from 11 to 20. Malapay's frustration count fell from 77 to 31, with increases in both instructional and independent categories. These are changes in school totals, not verified movements of the same learners between categories.

TABLE I. REPORTED SCHOOL READING DISTRIBUTIONS

School	Occasion	Reported N	Struggling	Frustration	Instructional	Independent
Alabangpuro	Pre	49	27	11	11	0
	Post	47	17	8	20	2
La Medalla	Pre	50	5	12	8	25
	Post	50	0	3	3	44
Malapay	Pre	94	7	77	10	0
	Post	94	0	31	40	23
Malidong	Pre	152	13	53	64	22
	Post	153	1	49	65	38
Marigondon NHS	Pre	67	0	41	12	14
	Post	67	1	7	32	27
Pio Duran NHS	Pre	265	13	163	75	1
	Post	253	1	49	165	38

Note. Figures reproduce the total columns of the source tables and have not been reconciled against individual records. Pio Duran's pretest categories sum to 252 rather than the printed 265. Some sex subtotals conflict with category totals at La Medalla, Malidong, Marigondon, and Pio Duran. "Struggling" is a source-specific label whose operational definition is not supplied. NHS = National High School.

La Medalla's reported independent count rose from 25 to 44. Malidong showed a smaller reduction in frustration counts, from 53 to 49, and a reported increase in independent readers from 22 to 38. Marigondon's frustration count fell from 41 to 7, although the struggling category increased from zero to one. Pio Duran's table reports a decrease in frustration counts from 163 to 49 and an increase in instructional counts from 75 to 165. The numerical discrepancies noted below Table I prevent a reliable pooled estimate of the magnitude of change.

The defensible finding is that the school summaries describe uneven starting points and continuing support needs. They do not establish that a particular intervention caused improvement. The assessment dates, learner matching, changes in enrollment, and exposure to instruction would need to be documented before interpreting these distributions as individual learning gains.

B. Reported Vocabulary Ratings

TABLE II. VOCABULARY RATINGS REPEATED ACROSS THE FOUR DIMENSIONS

School	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Alabangpuro High School	1.67	2.06	0.39
La Medalla High School	3.12	3.90	0.78
Malapay High School	2.03	2.91	0.88
Malidong High School	2.63	2.92	0.29

School	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Marigondon NHS	2.60	3.27	0.67
Pio Duran NHS	2.22	2.95	0.73

Note. Each row appears identically in the thesis tables for generalization, application, breadth, and precision. Differences are arithmetic posttest minus pretest values. The table preserves the reported ratings without endorsing separate dimension scores or validated mastery thresholds.

All six schools have higher reported posttest ratings. The largest arithmetic difference is 0.88 at Malapay and the smallest is 0.29 at Malidong. Alabangpuro has the lowest reported values on both occasions, while La Medalla has the highest. These patterns may guide a review of instructional needs, but the repeated dimension scores and incomplete scoring documentation prevent conclusions about which vocabulary component was strongest, weakest, or most responsive to instruction.

C. Curricular Appraisal

The appraisal frequencies were concentrated in the upper two response categories. Table III summarizes the three quality domains whose scored rows each contain ten responses. The highest recomputed mean was for format, followed closely by content quality and presentation and organization. Under the thesis's stated 4.20–5.00 interval, these means fall within its "very valid" category. That label is retained only as the interpretation specified by the study; it does not establish psychometric validity or classroom effectiveness.

TABLE III. RECOMPUTED CURRICULAR APPRAISAL OF QUALITY DOMAINS

Domain	Scored criteria	Recorded ratings	Mean
Content quality	18	180	4.93
Format	18	180	4.94
Presentation and organization	5	50	4.92

Note. Means use the visible five-point frequencies. Recorded ratings are item responses, not numbers of unique experts. Content quality includes twelve values subitems. No overall approval score is calculated because domain weighting and the instrument's approval rules are not established.

The content criterion concerning safety and cautionary notes received four ratings of 5 and six of 4, yielding 4.40, the lowest mean among the scored content criteria. In the format domain, illustration appeal, cultural relevance, illustration-to-text balance, and the combination of design elements each received eight ratings of 5 and two of 4. In presentation and organization, adaptation of vocabulary to the target reader received the same distribution. These findings identify features worth checking during revision, even though their numerical ratings remain favorable.

Accuracy uses error-presence descriptions rather than the same substantive quality labels. Conceptual errors were rated absent by seven responses and very minor by three; factual errors were rated absent by eight and very minor by two; grammatical or typographical errors were rated absent by six and very minor by four. The "other errors" row contains seven absent and two very minor responses, totaling nine. The incomplete row was not imputed. These results support proofreading and content checking; they do not justify describing the material as entirely error-free.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Implications for Vocabulary Support

The school profiles suggest that one uniform set of vocabulary exercises would be unlikely to address every learner's needs. The presence of struggling and frustration classifications alongside independent classifications calls for tasks with different levels of support. However, school averages should not become permanent labels for individual learners. Teachers need short, direct checks of word understanding and use before assigning vocabulary activities.

Reading support and vocabulary instruction should be connected while remaining distinguishable in assessment. A learner classified at frustration level may need help with decoding, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, or several of these areas. The Phil-IRI manual's recommendation to combine its results with other evidence is especially relevant here (DepEd, 2018b). A supplementary vocabulary resource can address word knowledge, but it should not be presented as a complete response to every reading difficulty.

The instructional progression described in the thesis offers a practical starting point: introduce accessible word meanings, guide learners in using them, and gradually increase the range of contexts. This direction is consistent with Schmitt's (2008) emphasis on deliberate learning alongside meaningful exposure. Nation's (2013) work also supports planning vocabulary instruction systematically. For this setting, the implication is to make the relationship between the target word, the task, and the intended learning outcome explicit.

B. Refining the Supplementary Material

Material revision should begin with a clear map of target vocabulary and expected learner performance. For example, a task intended to develop precision should require a reasoned choice between words with related meanings, rather than merely matching a word with a definition. A generalization task should introduce a new context so that success does not depend on remembering the original example. These are proposed refinements, not activities whose effects were measured in the reported study.

A manageable instructional sequence could move from a brief model to guided practice and then an independent response. Sweller's (1988) account of cognitive load provides a rationale for reducing unnecessary task demands while learners acquire new knowledge. In practice, this means avoiding pages crowded with unfamiliar words, competing directions, and decorative elements that do not support the lesson. Such design choices remain recommendations requiring classroom checks of usability.

Repeated encounters should serve a clear learning purpose. A learner might meet a word in a passage, explain its meaning orally, and later use it in a different sentence. Webb's (2007) study of repetition provides a relevant basis for revisiting vocabulary rather than assuming that one encounter is sufficient. The appropriate frequency and difficulty of these encounters for the participating learners were not established by the present data.

Expert appraisal can help improve content and presentation before classroom use. Here, the favorable ratings suggest that the resource was viewed positively on the listed criteria. Yet the concentration of responses at the top of the scale, uncertainty about the number of experts, and absence of detailed qualitative comments restrict what can be inferred. A further review should preserve specific recommendations, document revisions, and check the revised version with intended users.

C. Limitations and Further Evaluation

The main limitations concern the connection between the research plan and the reported evidence. The planned sample differs from the school totals; some frequencies are internally inconsistent; and the vocabulary dimensions contain identical scores without a documented derivation. Dates, intervention duration, assessment forms, and individual matching are insufficiently specified. Consequently, the article cannot estimate district-wide vocabulary mastery, compare schools as measures of teaching quality, or attribute observed changes to the developed material.

The appraisal records also contain a mismatch between the intended expert panel and the number of responses, with one incomplete accuracy criterion. No interrater reliability estimate or verified approval decision is available. These limitations do not erase the instructional needs described in the records, but they narrow the contribution to a provisional local needs analysis and appraisal of a proposed educational resource.

A subsequent evaluation should first reconcile the records and establish clear measures for the four vocabulary dimensions. It should document learner selection, assessment dates, implementation conditions, and ethical safeguards. A comparison design with suitable baseline assessment would provide stronger evidence of effectiveness; delayed assessment would help examine retention. Reading outcomes and direct vocabulary outcomes should be reported separately so that any improvement can be interpreted in relation to the skill actually measured.

V. CONCLUSION

The reported school records indicate varied reading readiness among Grade 7 learners in Pio Duran and provide a practical reason to differentiate vocabulary support. The supplementary material received favorable ratings for content, format, and presentation, while the accuracy appraisal identified minor concerns for review. These findings support refinement and further evaluation of the resource. They do not establish that it improved vocabulary mastery or caused the reported changes in reading categories. The strongest next step is to verify the original records, clarify assessment and validation procedures, and test the revised material under documented classroom conditions.

REFERENCES

1) Department of Education. (2018a). Policy guidelines on the administration of the revised Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (DepEd Order No. 14, s. 2018). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/DO_s2018_014.pdf
2) Department of Education. (2018b). The Philippine Informal Reading Inventory manual 2018. https://lrmds.deped.gov.ph/detail/13908
3) Nation, I. S. P. (2013). Learning vocabulary in another language (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858656

4) Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. Language Teaching Research, 12(3), 329–363. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921
5) Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4
6) Webb, S. (2007). The effects of repetition on vocabulary knowledge. Applied Linguistics, 28(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml048

There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 4.0 Intenational (CC BY-NC 4.0)
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.