

## **A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning**



**Princess Aloha T. Arroyo<sup>1</sup>, Rohilmina Y. Nasilon<sup>2</sup>, Shermalyn G. Alamsahi<sup>3</sup>, Jayson V. Alviar<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>Senior High School Department, Tairan National High School, MBHTE-Basilan, BARMM, Philippines,7301.

**ABSTRACT:** This study aimed to determine the impact of the limited face-to-face class intervention on the achievements of students in English 7. A Post-Test Only Non-equivalence Groups Design was used. A total of twenty-four (24) respondents were conveniently chosen wherein twelve (12) of these respondents attended the English intervention using the modules and the other twelve (12) were exposed to modular print only. The Mann Whitney U test result ( $U = 114; p = .01581$ ), indicates that the Limited Intervention Group (LIG) performs significantly better with the higher average rank of 16 compared to the Modular Print Group (MPG) with an average rank of 9. Comparing the achievement level through the Mean Percentage Scores (MPS), it appears that the MPS of LIG is relatively higher than the MPG by 12.90%, indicating that limited intervention can improve students' English proficiency. Furthermore, the students in the LIG expressed a strong positive attitude towards the limited face-to-face class intervention.

**KEYWORDS:** Achievement, English Proficiency, Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention, Mean Percentage Score, Modular Distance Learning.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The COVID-19 outbreak drastically changed the education setting around the globe and posed immeasurable learning loss due to inadequate learning support (Save the Children, n.d.). There is a high demand in education to shift from the conventional instructions to distance learning and now, the reopening of classes. The Global Education Evidence Advisory Panel (GEEAP) reports showed that remote learning is less effective and that marginalized learners have been hardest hit by education inequality (UNICEF, 2022). Learning loss must be addressed to lessen its long-term impact on the lives of today's generation.

Estimates of learning loss if corrective actions are not urgently taken show that "a learner who has lost a year of schooling could lose up to three years' worth of learning" (UNICEF, 2022). Moreover, at least 60% of learning are loss for learners who are coming from less-educated homes (Engzell et al., 2021). In terms of learning loss in language, about "92% of children on average have lost at least one specific language ability from the previous year which include describing a picture or their experiences orally, reading familiar words, reading with comprehension and writing simple sentences based on a picture" (Azim Premji University, 2021).

In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented various learning modalities and Distance Learning is among the options (Chin, 2020). Most of the public schools implemented Modular Distance Learning which use the Self Learning Modules (SLM) to educate students due to poor internet connection and disparities in access to technology. The self-learning modules were provided by the Department of Education (DepEd) and are distributed weekly to the students. In modular distance learning, students are expected to independently learn and accomplish their modules. While learners are assumed to have access to other learning resources, parents are also expected to guide them. Unfortunately, students coming from less-educated homes are more likely to encounter problems in remote learning (Engzell et al. 2021). It is no surprise that plagiarism and cheating are prevalent and become the last resort among learners trying to completely accomplish their modules (Edd, 2021). Aside from Science and Mathematics, English language is one of the challenging subjects for ESL learners.

English language is the main language used in communication worldwide and the medium of instructions in different subjects at school in the Philippines particularly in English language, mathematics, science, except for Filipino, Araling Panlipunan, and Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao (ESP). English Language as a subject aim to develop the learner's four language skills including listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Coleman, 2010). Looking at the current education setting, students may find it difficult to master these four language skills on their own. Based on the study conducted at Islamic University of Riau, the

## **A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning**

factor of difficulties in reading comprehension of the students were lack of motivation to read or reading habit, having low reading skills, and the unfamiliar words to be unlocked (Satriani, 2018).

Since Modular Distance Learning (MDL) had been implemented last October 05, 2021, Former President Rodrigo Roa Duterte and the cabinet made a resolution to start the pilot testing of the limited face-to-face classes to the selected schools that are located in low-risk from COVID-19 (Sarao, 2021). The in-person classes will help students learn and develop the skills better since the teachers are now the facilitator of learning.

The said class intervention is very important in teaching various subject areas particularly in English subject. English language problems can be addressed and the students can learn the language skills better. The advantages of having face-to-face classes are the following: the teacher facilitate learnings for the student to understand the lessons clearly; any questions or clarification of the student can be answered right away; it can help to point out the important lectures that need to answer the quizzes and exams, assignments are personally handed; the assessments on the textbook can be answered during the intervention; students can compare ideas or learning to their classmates; students can get immediate feedback on the result of their assessment; and academic dishonesty specifically cheating can be avoided (Face-to-Face Learning, 2017). Former DepEd Secretary Leonor Magtolis Briones in her report to the Office of the President emphasized the necessity to reopen classes and explained that “face-to-face classes will be intermittent, staggered, or in shift” to ensure health protocols and social distancing measures will be followed (Briones, 2020).

Even pre-pandemic, students have difficulty in mastering English language competencies. Remediation and other intervention programs were done by educators to improve the achievement level of students in English. Literature revealed that remedial instructions are beneficial in improving students’ achievement in English (Luoche, 2014; Corona-Versibidad, 2014; Bansal & Deepika (n.d.)). Similarly, Maawa & Ortega-Dela Cruz (2019) evaluated the remedial and corrective feedback strategies in the teaching of English as a second language. Results show that students’ grades indicates positive effect of remedial and corrective feedback strategies in improving the English language proficiency of the students (Maawa & Ortega-Dela Cruz, 2019). Moreover, Cahyani (2019) determine the students’ perceptions on the English intervention. Interview results revealed that students who attended the remediation expected that the “teacher will be able to help them in order to get the most results” in the given assessment. This show that students are positive that with remediation their performance in English will eventually improve (Cahyani, 2019).

In Basilan Schools Division particularly at Tairan National High School, the teachers are conducting limited face-to-face class intervention to help the learners learn and master the learning competencies for English while in modular distance learning. This program is part of the Learning Continuity Plan of the school to mitigate learning loss. Students were encouraged to attend limited face-to-face class intervention after getting their Adaptive Learning Materials (ALM), self-learning modules. In this study, the researchers compared the academic performance of students who attended the intervention in English while completing their modules to those students who do not attend the intervention.

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of limited face-to-face class intervention on the achievement of students in English 7 and the perception of the students toward the class intervention. Specifically, it aims to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the English Assessment (EA) 7 results of the students exposed to the Limited face-to-face class Intervention Group (LIG) and those of the Modular Print Group (MPG)?
2. What is the level of achievement of the students in the LIG and MPG in English Assessment (EA) 7?
3. What are the perceptions of the Grade 7 students regarding the limited face-to-face intervention in English?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The design used in this study was Post-Test Only Non-equivalence Groups Design because it can be used to investigate causality without doing randomization (Cook & Campbell, 1979). In this design, two groups were compared. The Limited Intervention Group (LIG) attended the limited face-to-face class intervention to discuss the lessons in the ALM given to them while the Modular Print Group (MPG) got their modules and accomplished them on their own. Post-test, using English Assessment (EA) 7 will be given to both groups after 4 weeks to determine the impact of the limited face-to-face class intervention on the student’s achievement in English 7.

### **Participants**

The subjects of the study were twenty-four (24) Grade 7 B students of Tairan National High School enrolled in the school year 2021-2022. The respondents were conveniently chosen. There were 12 students who attended the limited face-to-face class intervention while the 12 students were exposed to purely modular distance learning.

# **A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning**

## **Data Gathering Procedure**

Before the conduct of the study, the list of the respondents was determined. The validity and reliability of the instruments were measured and pertinent documents were secured such as the informed consent for the respondents, permission to conduct the study from the School Head, and the endorsement letter from the school head.

During the intervention, the English teacher discussed the lessons presented in the Adaptive Learning Materials (ALM). The teacher and students were actively interacting with one another. The teacher used the Activity 4 and 5 in the ALM as an evaluation to test students' understanding of the materials presented. On the other hand, students in the MPG were independently working on their self-learning modules and learning on their own.

The researchers, with the guidance of the research adviser, administered the English Assessment (EA) 7 to measure students' learning after the intervention. Both the LIG and MPG took the assessment in school and in designated testing areas. The LIG answered the survey questionnaire to determine their perceptions on the limited face-to-face class intervention.

After the assessment and survey were administered, the data were summarized and analyzed using the appropriate statistical treatment.

## **Research Instrument**

The English Assessment (EA) 7 is a 40-item researcher-made assessment aligned with the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELC) prescribed by the Department of Education (DepEd) for English 7. The researchers used EA 7 to assess students' achievement in English. The researchers also developed a survey questionnaire to determine the perceptions of the students on the limited face-to-face class intervention.

The initial draft particularly the assessment and the checklist questionnaire were prepared. The questionnaire and assessment were carefully validated by the research adviser to accurately measure what it aims to measure. It was pilot-tested to 12 non-participant students. The data collected from the pilot test was analyzed using R, an open software, to test the internal consistency of the measured data and to ensure that the instrument is sufficiently reliable. The English Assessment 7 is acceptably reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .7 (Institute for Digital Research and Education Statistical Consulting, 2020). Also, the deletion of test items does not increase the reliability of the test. After the questionnaire revision, the final draft is ready to be used in the study.

## **Data Analysis**

The results of the English Assessment (EA)7 and the survey questionnaire were analyzed and interpreted using R Statistical Package. The researchers tested the normality and homogeneity of the English Assessment 7 scores since the sample for this study is relatively small. The Shapiro-Wilk test results showed no significant departure from normality were found;  $W(12) = 0.94103$ ,  $p = .5115$  for MPG. However, there was a significant departure from normality for the LIG;  $W(12) = 0.75803$ ,  $p = .003245$ . Hence, a non-parametric test, specifically, a Mann Whitney U test was used to find out if there is a significant difference between the English Assessment 7 results of the students exposed to the Limited face-to-face class intervention and those who are in Modular Print Group.

To determine the achievement or mastery levels, the Mean Percentage Scores (MPS) of the English Assessment 7 results of the two groups were computed (DepEd Memorandum no. 160 series of 2012). To convert the computed mean scores of the English Assessment 7 to Mean Percentage Score (MPS), the computed mean scores was divided by the total number of items multiplied by 100. The Mean Percentage Scores were interpreted using the descriptive ratings: Mastery (96-100), Closely Approximating Mastery (86-95), Moving Towards Mastery (66-85), Average Near Mastery (35-65), Low Mastery (15-34), Very Low Mastery (5-14), and Absolutely No Mastery (0-4).

To examine the perception of students about the limited face-to-face intervention, the mean was calculated.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### ***Comparison of the Assessment Results between the LIG and MPG***

The English Assessment (EA) 7 results of the Limited Intervention Group (LIG) and Modular Print Group (MPG) were compared and analyzed to determine if there is a significant difference between the achievement of the students exposed to the limited face-to-face class intervention and those in the modular distance learning. The learning competencies covered in the assessment were the Analogy, Genre of Viewing Materials, Using Active and Passive Voice of Verb, and Using Past and Past Perfect Tenses of Verb.

Table 1 shows the comparison of the summary statistics of the assessment results of the LIG and MPG.

## A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning

**Table 1. Summary Statistics of the Assessment Results in the LIG and MPG**

Groups	N	Min	Max	Mean Score	Std. Deviation	MPS (%)
LIG	12	11	34	16.33	6.36	<b>40.83</b>
MPG	12	5	16	11.17	3.41	<b>27.93</b>

The result shows that the mean score of the Limited Intervention Group (LIG) is 16 with a standard deviation of 6.36 while the mean score of Modular Print Group (MPG) is 11 with a standard deviation of 3.41. In the given 40-item assessment, the minimum and maximum scores for the LIG were 11 and 34 respectively, while the minimum and maximum score for the MPG were 5 and 16 respectively.

The mean score of LIG is greater than MPG. Comparing the mean scores, it appears that the students exposed to limited face-to-face class intervention got a higher score in the assessment than the students who were using modular print only. Consequently, the Mean Percentage Scores (MPS) of the LIG is relatively higher than MPG by 12.90%.

After having the result, the researchers conducted an item analysis on the assessment results of LIG and MPG to determine which item students were struggling to answer. In the 40-item EA 7, there were: 10 items for supplying other words of expression that complete an analogy; 10 items for identifying genre, purpose, intended audience and features, newflash, internet-based program, documentary and video; 10 items for using active and passive voice meaningfully in varied contexts; and another 10 items for using the past and past perfect tenses correctly in varied contexts.

Student in the Limited Intervention Group (LIG) found item 10 easy but struggled in item 7. In item 10 which asked "What word, concept or idea with opposite meaning?" majority of the respondents answered option B (antonyms). The students were able to determine the difference between the antonyms and synonyms. Item 7 asked students to determine examples of different type of analogy. Students found it difficult to determine which group of word belongs to a type of analogy.

The Modular Print Group (MPG) found item 14 easy but found difficulties on items 5, 7, 18, and 36. It was found that Romeo and Juliet were very common to the majority of the respondents that they could easily determine which genre it belongs. In terms of difficult items in the assessment, item 5 and 7 were both under determining examples of types of analogy, only few of the respondents answered it correctly. Item 18 asked the genre of the given viewing materials; the respondents were not able to determine the different types of viewing materials. Also, students struggled on how to determine sentences that were in past and past perfect tenses of verb. In item 36 which asked "which sentence is an example of past perfect tense?", majority of the students got the wrong answer.

These results show that the students in Limited face-to-face class Intervention Group fared better compared to the Modular Print Group. Out of four (4) competencies, the MPG found 3 competencies difficult while the LIG demonstrated low mastery in one (1) learning competency only.

To determine if there is a significant difference in the assessment results of students who were exposed to the Limited Intervention Group (LIG) and those of the Modular Print Group (MPG), a Mann-Whitney U Test was used. Both groups were given the same assessment and Table 2 presents the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test statistics between the LIG and MPG groups.

**Table 2. Comparison of English Assessment 7 (EA 7) of the Limited Intervention Group (LIG) and Modular Print Group (MPG) by Mann-Whitney U Test**

Group	n	Rank Average	Rank Total	U	p	Interpretation
LIG	12	16	192	114	.01581	<b>Significant</b>
MPG	12	9	108			

Table 2 indicate that the LIG has a higher rank average, so it means that they were more successful than the MPG. The result is statistically significant ( $U = 114$ ;  $p = .01581$ ). This shows that there was a significant difference in the EA 7 results. A one-tailed Mann Whitney U test results show that students who attended the intervention in English 7 performed better in the English Assessment 7 (EA7) than the students who were using modular printed materials only;  $U = 114$ ,  $p = .007903$ . These findings corroborate with Luoche (2014), Corona-Versibidad (2014), Bansal & Deepika (n.d.), and Maawa & Ortega-Dela Cruz (2019) that remedial instructions are beneficial in improving students' achievement in English.

### **Comparison of the MPS of the English Assessment Results between LIG and MPG**

The researcher also calculated the MPS of the EA 7 of the two groups. Table 3 shows the achievement index per competency of the English Assessment 7 results of the LIG and MPG.

## A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning

**Table 3. Achievement Index per Competency of the English Assessment Results of the LIG and MPG**

Learning Competencies	LIG	MPG
	MPS (%)	MPS (%)
1. Supply other word or expression that complete an analogy.	46.7 (AVR)	24.17 (L)
2. Identify the genre, purpose, intended audience and features of various viewed text such as movie clip, trailer, newsflash, internet-based program, documentary, video	46.7 (AVR)	29.17 (L)
3. Use the active and passive voice meaningfully in varied contexts	35 (AVR)	29.17 (L)
4. Use the past and past perfect tenses correctly in varied contexts	35.8 (AVR)	29.17 (L)
<b>Overall Mean Percentage Score (MPS)</b>	<b>40.83 (AVR)</b>	<b>27.93 (L)</b>

Note. AVR – Average Near Mastery, L- Low

In all four (4) competencies on the given English Assessment 7, students demonstrated Average Near Mastery (AVR). The overall Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of the LIG is 40.83%. On the other hand, the students in the MPG demonstrated Low mastery in all learning competencies with the overall mean percentage score (MPS) of 27.93%. The level of achievement of the students in LIG was higher than those in MPG, indicating that students in the LIG have better mastery of the learning competencies.

### *Summary of Perception of the Students in the Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention*

The perception of the student toward the limited face-to-face intervention was evaluated using a 4-points Likert Scale with 10 statements. It was divided into two categories, the first category with statements 1-5 regarding on student's attitude toward Modular Distance Learning (MDL) and the second category with statements 6-10, regarding on student's perception about the limited face-to-face class intervention. The responses range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). Mean scores were computed and interpreted using the following description.

**Table 4. Summary of the Perception of Students' Attitude towards MDL**

Statements	Mean	Remarks
1. I am an independent learner.	2.75	Agree
2. I can handle all the assessment on the SLMs.	2.5	Agree
3. I can understand the lesson on the SLM.	2.83	Agree
4. I don't encounter difficulties in answering my self-learning module.	1.75	Disagree
5. I can finish my module within the given period of time.	3.083	Strongly Agree
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 4 shows that students agreed of being an independent learner with a mean of 2.75. This reveals that learner could handle the assessments and understand the lessons on their Adaptive Learning Materials (ALM) with the mean score between 2.4 and 2.9, respectively. Students disagreed in not encountering difficulties in answering the ALMs; with the lowest mean score of 1.75 in the survey analysis. Yet students still strongly agreed that they can manage to finish their ALMs within the given period of time with the mean score of 3.083.

**Table 5. Summary of the Perception of Students on Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention**

Statements	Mean	Remarks
6. I understand the lesson more when I attended the intervention.	3.417	Strongly Agree
7. It is easier for me to answer the assessments in the SLMs with having a limited intervention.	3.67	Strongly Agree
8. Having an intervention decreased my struggles in	3.25	Strongly Agree

## A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning

completing my self-learning module.		
9. I get higher score on my assessments with the help of having an intervention.	3.25	Strongly Agree
10. I become more motivated on my learnings with the help of having a limited intervention.	3.58	Strongly Agree
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

On the other hand, students claimed that they find it easier to understand the lesson, they can handle the assessment, and decreased their struggles on completing the self-learning modules through having the intervention with the remarks of strongly agree and mean score above 3.00. In addition, it was found that the students got higher scores in their assessment and become more motivated in their learnings, as a result of having the intervention. The student's overall perception toward the limited intervention were overwhelming positive with the average mean score of 3.43. In general, the students expressed that the intervention serves great benefit in understanding lessons, answering module, getting higher scores and being motivated in their learnings

### CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The limited face-to-face class intervention can help students learn the learning competencies for English 7 while using the ALM.
2. Since the achievement level in the LIG is higher than the MPG, the students attending the limited face-to-face intervention for English 7 have better mastery compared to those who were not attending the intervention.
3. Students have a positive attitude towards the limited face-to-face class intervention.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

This study revealed the impact of Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention on the Achievements of students in English 7. Hence, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. Limited face-to-face class intervention should be done regularly to help address learning loss;
2. Teachers must focus on the least learning competencies of the students;
3. Cover more learning competencies in conducting English interventions; and
4. Increase the number of students who should attend the intervention for English 7.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to thank the following people behind the success of this research endeavor: Munnang J. Talib, Teacher In-Charge of Tairan National High School, for giving us a permit to conduct this study; Jayson V. Alviar, the SHS Coordinator and Research Adviser, for his invaluable time, efforts, and for guiding the researchers; the Basilan Schools Division Superintendent Tim J. Undain-Sanchez, EdD, FRIEdr, for the support given to the Project PRIME; the Assistant Schools Division Superintendent, Noel B. Notario and the Education Program Supervisors, Dr. Janet F. Sotto, Dr. Hamsira M. Harad, Hja. Delia A. Sandatan, Hja. Sapura M. Sali, for their invaluable reviews and suggestions; Carlito H. Layos, Jr., John Roderick S. Tolentino, Cynthia S. Daymiel, and Anwar I. Kolong, for their objective evaluation of the thesis paper; the Tairan National High School teaching staff for the technical support; to the Grade 7B students who participated in this study; and to our dearest parents for the untiring support given to the researchers. Above all, the researchers are immensely grateful for the wisdom, patience, and strength showered by the Almighty God in doing this worthwhile endeavor.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Azim Premji University . (2021). *Loss of Learning during the Pandemic*. Azim Premji University . Field Studies in Education.
- 2) Bansal, P., & Deepika. (n.d.). THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ENGLISH REMEDIAL PROGRAM: A CASE STUDY. *Government College of Education, Chandigarh*. Retrieved February 27, 2022
- 3) Briones, L. M. (2020). *SHARED RESPONSIBILITY: Recommendation on Limited Face-to-Face*. Department of Education. Retrieved February 27, 2022, from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/20201214-Recommendation-on-Face-to-Face-Classes-Final-1.pdf>
- 4) Cahyani, A. W. (2019, August 2). Students' Perception on Remedial Semester in Department of English Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

## A Comparative Study on the English Achievement of Students in Limited Face-to-Face Class Intervention versus Modular Distance Learning

- 5) Chin, M. (2020, October 11). *Unique Philippines*. Retrieved April 27, 2021, from Unique Philippines: <http://www.uniquephilippine.com/students-new-normal-modular-distance-learning/>
- 6) Coleman, H. (2010). The English Language in Development. *British Council*.
- 7) Conjointly. (n.d.). Retrieved 12 15, 2021, from <https://conjointly.com/kb/descriptive-statistics/>
- 8) Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues in field settings. *Houghton Mifflin*.
- 9) Corona-Verbosidad, A. B. (2019, December). THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION. *Luz Y Saber*, 13(4), 92-117.
- 10) Edd, G. (2021). *DePed to tap social media platforms, use "honesty" pledges vs "online kopyahan"*. Retrieved October 2021, from <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2021/09/22/2128946/deped-tap-social-media-platforms-use-honesty-pledges-vs-online-kopyahan>
- 11) Engzell, P., Frey, A., & Verhagen, M. D. (2021, April 27). Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)*, 118(17). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022376118>
- 12) Face-to-Face Learning. (2017). Retrieved October 24, 2021, from <https://www.colleges.co.za/face-to-face-learning>
- 13) *Institute for Digital Research and Education Statistical Consulting*. (2020, Dec 17). Retrieved from <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/spss/faq/what-does-cronbachs-alpha-mean/#:~:text=The%20alpha%20coefficient%20for%20the,mot%20social%20science%20research%20situations.>
- 14) Louche, T. O. (2014, October 7). The Impact of Remedial English on the Improvement of English Proficiency: The Case of the United States International University-Africa. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 1178-1188. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.296>
- 15) Maawa, P. K., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. (2019). REMEDIAL AND CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY. *International Journal of Language Education*, 3(1), 1-11. doi: 10.26858/ijole.v1i1.7794
- 16) Sarao, Z. (2021). *DepEd releases memo on pilot run of face-to-face classes*. Inquirer.Net. Retrieved February 27, 2022, from <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1503553/deped-releases-memo-on-pilot-run-of-face-to-face-classes>
- 17) Satriani, E. (2018, AUGUST). READING COMPREHENSION DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY ENGLISH STUDENTS OF ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF RIAU. *J-SHMIC Journal of English for Academic* 5(2), vol5(2).1885, 15. doi:10.25299/jshmic.2018
- 18) Save the Children. (n.d.). *Save the Children*. Retrieved February 27, 2022, from Save the Children Organization: <https://www.savethechildren.org/us/charity-stories/learning-loss>
- 19) UNICEF. (2022). *Learning loss must be recovered to avoid long-term damage to children's wellbeing and productivity, new report says*. Retrieved February 27, 2022, from <https://www.unicef.org/philippines/press-releases/learning-loss-must-be-recovered-avoid-long-term-damage-childrens-wellbeing-and>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (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.