

# Phonics Teaching Techniques: A Mixed Method Study with Lower Primary English Teachers in Malaysia

NurFatin Nadiera\*, Hamidah Yamat\*\*

Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.9.04.2019.p8875

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.9.04.2019.p8875>

**Abstract-** This paper presents and discusses a study on effective techniques employed by teachers in teaching early reading through phonics approach. The study aimed to describe the implementation of these techniques to determine teachers' perception on the techniques that impacted their students' reading comprehension. An explanatory sequential mixed method research design was employed and conducted in two phases. Quantitative data were collected in Phase I through a survey questionnaire responded by 289 Year 1 and Year 2 English teachers. The respondents were selected via chain-referral sampling. Qualitative data were then collected in Phase II through e-interviews and documents gathered from five purposively chosen participants from the respondents in Phase I. Findings revealed that majority of the respondents constantly employed a controlled technique during their teaching and learning process which may have negative effects on students' performance. However, findings from the e-interviews indicated that the participants combined three categories of effective techniques – controlled, semi-controlled and free techniques which may have contributed to students' reading comprehension. This indicated that the techniques employed by teachers in teaching early reading through phonics had an influence on students' reading performance. This suggests that teachers should not depend on one category of techniques when teaching early reading through phonics approach. Teachers should explore and try new techniques. A combination of controlled, semi-controlled and free techniques could be implemented by teachers during the teaching and learning process including other reading comprehension strategies.

**Index Terms-** early reading, mixed method, phonics, teaching techniques

## I. INTRODUCTION

Reading is a skill that is able to help someone to be successful throughout their life (Roe & Smith, 2012). However, learning to read is a daunting task as Sousa (2014) asserts that it is a long and complicated process. Phonics is a systematic way that allows students to decode a word. Students are taught the letter sounds first, followed by letter-sound correspondences, syllables, words, and sentences. Gough and Tunmer (1986) affirm that students would be able to decode any words and become good readers who could read isolated words quickly, accurately, and silently if they are

taught using phonics approach. Abundant studies on the effectiveness of phonics in teaching reading have been conducted in first language environment (Finnegan, 2012; Johnston, McGeown, & Watson, 2012;) and second language environment (Dixon, Schagen & Seedhouse, 2011; Khairul Azhar Jamaludin, Norlidah Alias, Roselina Johari Mohd Khira, Dorothy DeWitta & Husaina Banu Kenayathulaa, 2015; Su & Hawkins, 2013; Yeung, Siegel, & Chan, 2013). Based on these studies, it is proven that phonics is an approach that is able to make students read fluently.

Hence, in 2011, the Malaysian Ministry of Education (MOE) introduced phonics in the Primary School Standard-Based Curriculum as an approach to teach early reading. However, after several years of phonics implementation at schools, statistics showed that 29.8% Year 1 and 21.7% Year 2 students in Malaysia still could not attain basic reading skills (PADU, 2014). The results were disturbing as inability to read impacts access to education (Ardila & Rosselli, 2013) which consequently may affect their economic development and life outcomes in the future. More alarming, studies uncovered that teachers in Malaysia need training and coaching in using phonics approach (Nadiah Yan Abdullah, Napisah Kepol & Mariyatunnitha Shari, 2014; Prasad, Nooreiny Maarof & Hamidah Yamat, 2016; Nee & Nooreiny Maarof, 2017). Nadiah et al. (2014) highlighted that teachers need to explore and try new methods. Meanwhile, Nee and Nooreiny Maarof (2017) added that teachers need to be exposed to more creative ways in teaching phonics.

Therefore, this study was aimed to investigate the techniques employed by Year 1 and Year 2 English teachers in teaching early reading through phonics approach to disclose the effective techniques. The research questions underpinning this study were:

- What are the techniques used by teachers to teach early reading through phonics approach?
- How do teachers implement the effective techniques?
- How do teachers perceive the effective techniques that impacting on the students' reading comprehension?

The findings of the study could enlighten teachers on effective ways to teach phonics. Consequently, they could discover and try out the techniques to assist their students to become fluent readers.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### Teaching Techniques

Anthony (1963) defines technique as various activities that teachers or students perform in the classroom. Meanwhile, Brown (2001) claims that there are three broad categories in the taxonomy of techniques for language teaching as adapted from Crookes and Chaudron (1991); namely, controlled technique, semi controlled technique and free technique. He clarifies that controlled techniques involve activities that are teacher-centered, manipulative, structured, predicted student responses, have pre-planned objectives and set curriculum. Conversely, free techniques are activities that are student-centered, communicative, open-ended, unpredicted responses, negotiated objectives and cooperative curriculum. Meanwhile, semi controlled techniques are the combination of both techniques stated above. Sometimes, it is difficult to categorize the techniques according to its category. However, it is important to note that many techniques can fit in more than one category (Brown, 2001).

### Studies on Phonics Teaching Techniques

Recent research found that teachers use a variety of phonics program in their teaching and learning process. Each program has outlined its own techniques or activities. In a survey research conducted by Chapman, Greaney, Arrow and Tunmer, (2018) on 666 primary school teachers in New Zealand, they found that 51 phonics programs are being used by the teachers. However, based on extensive literature review, the most commonly phonics program used by teachers and researchers is Jolly Phonics (Ariati, Padmadewi, & Suarnajaya, 2018; Campbell et al., 2011; Dixon et al., 2011; Farokhbakht & Nejadansari, 2015; Khairul Azhar Jamaludin et al., 2015; National Reading Panel, 2000).

Jolly phonics suggests 9 weeks of intervention program. Jolly Phonics promotes playful, imaginative and adaptable teaching that fits well with whole language practice (The National Reading Panel, 2000). Students are taught to recognize the letter sounds at the beginning of the program. One letter sound is introduced per day. A variety of techniques have been arranged in the program as Lloyd (1998), the inventor of Jolly Phonics believe that young children learn quickly particularly when there is activity involved. The program employed a multi-sensory approach where students use their body movement, ears, eyes and speech to help them learn and remember better.

Songs and actions are among the techniques that could be used to teach letter sounds. Ariati et al. (2018) studied effective techniques to enhance students' literacy. In their study, they witnessed a female teacher in Bali, Indonesia teaching her

students the letter sounds using Jolly Phonics song. The students learn the letter sounds by singing the Jolly Phonics song with action. For example, the students learn the sound /a/ by singing and wiggling their fingers on their elbow, as if ants are crawling on them. Similarly, Chapman et al. (2018) also discovered in their survey study that teachers are using YouTube videos in order to teach letter sounds.

Next, Lloyd (1998) emphasizes that one of the effective ways of learning is through playing games. She suggested few activities to teach letter sounds like *Hunt the Letter Sound* and *Pair Game*. In *Hunt the Letter Sound*, students are required to search for the targeted sounds in the storybook around the classroom whereas students are required to match letter cards that have the same sounds in *Pair Game*. Meanwhile, students could play board games in order to practice blending sounds to read words.

Book reading is another technique that has been frequently implemented by teachers and researchers. In a survey study conducted by Campbell et al. (2011), they discovered that 95% of their samples are teaching phonics using picture book reading. Besides that, in a quasi-experimental study conducted in India, Dixon et al. (2013) implemented book reading as one of the interventions to practice decoding skills. Meanwhile, McGeown, Johnston and Medford (2012) exploit the use of big book and story time in their experimental study.

Teachers and researchers also use a lot of flashcards and lettercards in teaching early reading through phonics approach. A variety of activities could be implemented with the use of flashcards and lettercards. For instance, a teacher in a study conducted by Ariati et al. (2018) utilizes flashcards as the main material in teaching blending. Usually, she plans a list of words needed to be blended by the students to make it easier during the teaching and learning process. Then, she explains how to blend the letter sounds. After that, the students practice to blend in a small group where teacher will give one flashcards to each student to be blended.

Modelling is another technique frequently employed by teachers and researchers in teaching early reading through phonics approach. Johnston and Watson (2004) teach students to blend the letter sounds through modelling. They claim that the experimenter demonstrated how the words could be read through blending. The students will then join the letter sounds together smoothly without pausing between each sound by saying each letter sound in a word distinctly from left to right. Instead, Beck and Beck (2013) strongly recommend modelling using a technique called successive blending. Compared to Johnston and Watson's sound by sound technique, in successive blending, students say the first two sounds in a word and immediately blend those two sounds together. Then they say the third sound and immediately blend that sound with the first two sounds. Meanwhile, Hines (2009) found onset-rime technique helpful in assisting students with reading

difficulties. Using onset-rime technique, students learn to read by breaking the syllables into onset (everything before the vowel) and rime (the vowel and everything after it) first before they blend them into recognizable words.

### III. METHOD

#### Research Design

This study employed an Explanatory Sequential Mixed Method design. It was conducted in two phases. Quantitative data was collected in Phase I through a survey questionnaire. Meanwhile, qualitative data was collected in Phase II through email interviews and documents.

#### Samples

There were two groups of samples in this study which were the respondents for the survey questionnaires in Phase I and the participants for the email interviews in Phase II. All Year 1 and Year 2 English teachers in Malaysia were the target population in this study. According to Education Performance and Delivery Unit (PADU), there are 15,516 Year 1 and Year 2 English teachers in Malaysia. It is impossible to study all members of the target population. Hence, the respondents of the survey questionnaire in Phase I were selected via chain referral sampling. By referring to Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) estimation of sample size, the chain referral sampling was stopped when 382 respondents had responded to the online survey. Meanwhile, the participants in Phase II were purposively chosen from the respondents in Phase I based on the criteria that they were: TESL trained, trained to use phonics approach and had experience teaching struggling readers who have developed to emergent or successful readers.

#### Instruments

The instruments employed in this study were a survey questionnaire, interview protocol and documents. The survey questionnaire was developed using PollDaddy software. It is a 3-point Likert Scale questionnaire which was adapted from Pressley, Rankin & Yokoi (1996). The questionnaire comprised of 15 items. 11 items were close ended questions whereas 4 items were open ended questions. It focused on the techniques that teachers had employed in teaching reading through phonics approach. The survey questionnaire was shared on Facebook and Telegram. Two experts in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) were consulted to obtain their expert opinion on the content validity of the survey questionnaire. Amendments were made accordingly based on the experts' comments and suggestions. The internal reliability of the questionnaire was determined through Cronbach Alpha reliability test. The Coefficient Alpha Value was 0.826. Nunnally (1978) asserts that reliabilities of 0.70 or higher was considered as a reliable measure.

The interview protocol for this study was adapted from Prasad (2016). A semi-structured e-mail interviews were conducted with the participants using the interview protocol. Meanwhile,

two documents were collected from the participants which were their lesson plans and their students' Literacy and Numeracy Screening (LINUS) results which are in the form of checklist. The internal validity of the e-mail interviews and the documents were established through member checking and triangulation of data.

#### Data Analysis

A total of 382 Year 1 and Year 2 English teachers responded to the survey questionnaire. However, there were 93 incomplete responses. Thus, only 289 responses were analysed. Data obtained from the questionnaire for item 1 to 5 and 8 to 13 were analysed using descriptive statistics whereby frequency and percentage were calculated. Meanwhile, item 6,7,14 and 15 were analysed thematically according to the categories in taxonomy of techniques for language teaching as adapted from Crookes and Chaudron (1991). Meanwhile, the data collected from the e-mail interviews and documents were analysed using ATLAS.ti 8.

### IV. RESULTS

#### Techniques used by teachers to teach early reading through phonics approach

Table 1 demonstrates that 214 respondents (74%) asserted that they would always teach their students how to enunciate each letter sound in order to enhance the students' phonemic awareness. 243 respondents (84%) declared that they would always teach letter sounds by asking their students to repeat the sounds orally. Only 5 respondents (2%) admitted that they would never teach their students the letter sounds by asking the students to repeat the sounds orally. Besides that, 151 respondents (52%) established that they would always use hand gestures to help the students remember the letter sounds. Most of the respondents would use songs to help their students remember the letter sounds. Only 14 respondents (5%) would never use songs to help their students remember the letter sounds. Meanwhile, majority of the participants would use a variety of videos to teach the letter sounds occasionally.

**Table 1 Techniques in raising students' phonemic awareness**

Item	Question	Category	N	S	A
1	I teach how to enunciate each letter sound.	C	0 0%	75 26%	214 74%
2	I teach the letter sounds by asking the learners to repeat the sounds orally.	C	5 2%	41 14%	243 84%
3	I use hand gestures to help the learners remember the letter sounds.	C/SCF	20 7%	118 41%	151 52%
4	I use songs to help the learners remember the letter	C/SC/F	14 5%	137 47%	138 48%

	sounds.				
5	I use a variety of videos to teach the letter sounds.	C/SC/F	34 12%	178 62%	76 26%

Note. N= Never, S= Sometimes, A= Always, C= Controlled, SC= Semi controlled, F= Free

Table 2 indicates that 208 (72%) of the respondents verified that they would always teach their students to blend the letter sounds orally in order to enhance their decoding skill. More than half of the respondents revealed that they would always use alphabet cards when they teach the students to blend the letter sounds. Meanwhile, 131 (54%) respondents affirmed that they would always use picture cards when they teach the students to blend the letter sounds. Besides that, 162 (56%) respondents would seldom teach blending through group work activities. In fact, 36 (12%) respondents declared that they would never teach blending through group work activities. 88 (31%) respondents verified that they would always teach blending through kinaesthetic activities. Nevertheless, 56 (19%) respondents admitted that they would never teach blending through kinaesthetic activities. 89 (31%) respondents admitted that they would always teach blending using specific blending worksheet whereas 162 (56%) respondents declared that they would use specific blending worksheet occasionally.

**Table 2 Technique to enhance students’ decoding skills**

Item	Question Items	Category	N	S	A
8	I teach how to blend the letter sounds orally.	C	1 0.3 %	80 27.7 %	208 72%
9	I teach how to blend the letter sounds with the help of alphabet cards.	C/F	10 4%	127 44%	152 52%
10	I teach how to blend the letter sounds with the help of picture cards.	C/F	13 5%	145 50%	131 54%
11	I teach blending through group work activities.	SC/F	36 12%	162 56%	91 32%
12	I teach blending through kinaesthetic activities (e.g.; arm blending)	SC/F	56 19%	145 50%	88 31%
13	I teach blending using specific blending worksheet.	SC	38 13%	162 56%	89 31%

Note. N= Never, S= Sometimes, A= Always, C= Controlled, SC= Semi controlled, F= Free

In the open ended items, 128 (44%) respondents revealed 91 games that they have conducted to enhance students’ ability to recognize letter sounds. Next, 89 (31%) respondents stated 54 other techniques that they had employed to teach letter sounds. Meanwhile, 78 (27%) respondents disclosed 62 games that they had carried out in teaching blending. In addition, 32 other techniques in teaching blending had been listed by 52 (18%) respondents. All the techniques mentioned above were classified as a combination of controlled, semi-controlled and free techniques.

The analysis showed an abundant of techniques that respondents had employed to enhance students’ phonemic awareness and decoding skills. However, it was noted that majority (77%) of the respondents constantly rely on controlled or teacher centered techniques like modelling, demonstration and drilling which may be inadequate to enhance students’ reading performance. In the background information of the survey questionnaire, 63% of the respondents admitted that their students were still struggling to read. This implies that teachers should not employ one category of teaching techniques regularly during the teaching and learning process. Teachers should employ more techniques that are in line with the students’ interest to provide opportunity for the students to practice reading. Sousa (2014) highlights the importance of meaningful practice by stressing that meaningful practice allows the brain to build and strengthen the neural pathways required to learn the targeted skill.

**The implementation of the effective techniques**

The techniques employed by five participants that were purposively chosen from the respondents in Phase 1 were perceived as effective techniques because their students who were struggling to read had developed into emergent or successful readers. This study discovered that all five participants had implemented a combination of controlled, semi-controlled and free techniques during their teaching and learning process as display in Table 3. The findings demonstrated in Table 3 were triangulated with the participants’ responses in the survey questionnaire, e-mail interviews and their lesson plans.

**Table 3 Effective Techniques implemented by the participants**

Participant/Technique	Controlled Technique	Semi-controlled Technique	Free Technique
T1	modelling, sound by sound blending, drilling, songs	Ladybird book series (find the letter/words), flip cards, alphabet cards, songs, sound by sound blending	hopscotch, big dice throw, 3 dices, flip cards
T2	modelling,	group/individual	Chinese

	sound by sound blending, drilling, songs	guide, Simon Says, phoneme booklet, songs, sound by sound blending	Whisper, snake and ladder, listen and rearrange Simon Says
T3	modelling, successive blending, drilling, songs	one to one guide, songs, charade, successive blending, worksheets	hopscotch, puzzle matching, charade, worksheets
T4	modelling, onset-rime blending, drilling, songs, videos	songs, onset-rime blending	reading buddy, word search puzzle
T5	modelling, successive blending, drilling, songs, video clips with audio	Simon Says, songs, successive blending	find your friends, car blending, Simon Says

All participants taught their students to read through modelling. Students learn better through modelling since the students are not familiar with the letter sounds and blending as those skills are something new to them. Hence, the teachers assisted through *modelling, demonstrating and teaching*. T1 declared that *“through phonics, [she taught] pupils to blend the sounds orally... model them [on] how to blend the sound”*. Besides that, T2 stated that *“at first, [she] taught the learners to blend the phonemes by drilling them to sound out each phonemes and then combine the phonemes”*. Similarly, T4 said that *“every Friday, [they] practiced blending one-word family. Usually, [she] blend[s] the phonemes and [her] pupils will repeat after [her]. Then, they will practice blending the words in groups”*.

Besides that, all participants except for T1 conveyed that they provided different level of supports for their students during the teaching and learning process. T2 indicated that she would guide her students in groups or as an individual if she noticed that they were having difficulties to blend the phonemes or read on their own. In the same way, T3 also did one to one teaching to help her students practice blending. She had a huge advantage to conduct one to one teaching as she was teaching in a low enrolment school. She had only 6 students in her class. In contrast, T4 has 27 students in his class. So, he provided support to his struggling readers using the successful and emergent readers in the class. He created a ‘Reading Buddy’ system where the successful and emergent readers assisted the struggling readers to read. The implementation of

the Reading Buddy system is clearly outlined in his lesson plans.

In enhancing students’ phonemic awareness, all participants used songs. They agreed that the use of songs could help their students to remember and recall the letter sounds. T2 usually started her lesson by asking her students to sing the phonics songs with action or gestures to recall all the basic sounds. She claimed that it only took 3 minutes to conduct the activity. Similarly, T3 and T5 employed the use of actions or gestures in their lesson. Their students were taught to do an action for each letter sounds. The students could recall the letter sounds by either do the actions or sing the phonics songs with the actions at the same time. T3 and T5 revealed that they taught their students the actions or gestures as outlined in the LINUS module prepared by the Ministry of Education.

All participants also conducted games in order to enhance their students’ phonemic awareness. Some participants conducted games that are quite similar. For instance, T1 and T3 allowed their students to play hopscotch in order to recall the letter sounds that they have learnt. T1 explained that she *“also let them play hopscotch by stepping on the letters that represents the sounds”*. At the same time, T1 also used big dices with letter cards on each side of the dices where pupils can throw the dice and say the sounds. On the other hand, T3 also prompted her students to play puzzle in order to recall the letter sounds. In addition, T2, T4 and T5 frequently conducted a game called ‘Simon Says’. T2 explained that in playing ‘Simon Says’, she *“would do the action/gestures and the pupils had to say aloud the sounds and vice versa”*. In contrast to other participants, T2 conducted a game called ‘Chinese Whisper’ in her classroom to teach the letter sounds and also oral blending and segmenting. She claimed that *“pupils took turn to whisper the sound to their friends. The last person in the line would come to the front and say aloud the sound. [She] used the same steps like [she] stated above for blending and segmenting activities”*.

Other than the techniques explained above, there are few other techniques that the participants had implemented in the classroom that vary from one another. Firstly, T1 utilized levelled books called Ladybird Books as a tool to introduce the letters and letter sounds. She declared that she *“also used the Ladybird series...introduced letters/sounds by asking the pupils to find words that have the same letter/sounds in the book”*. Besides that, T4 exploited YouTube videos as a tool for his students to blend orally. He affirmed that his students watched YouTube videos to practice blending by repeating what was presented in the videos. Lastly, T5 used flashcards not only during the teaching and learning process as he stated in his lesson plans where his students play a game called ‘Listen and Show’ by listening to a sound and pick the correct flashcards and show it to their friends. He also pasted the flashcards around the classroom as a reference for the students to recall the sounds.

Next, all participants have their own techniques to enhance the students' decoding skills. T1 and T2 taught the students to blend the letter sounds using the usual blending technique which is sounding out each letter sound and blend them from left to right. T1, encouraged her students to practice blending using flip cards. However, she discovered that the blending technique that she had implemented could not help all of her students to read. She discovered that some of her students could not blend the sounds. Thus, she decided to teach those students who still could not read using a whole language approach where she would insert the targeted words that the students should learn during big book reading. Meanwhile, T2 thought her students to blend the letter sounds by drilling them to sound out each letter sound and then combine the letter sounds one by one. Then, she conducted variety purposive activities like Chinese whisper game and phonemes booklet to assist her students to practice blending deliberately.

T3 and T5 taught their students to blend using a technique that resembles successive blending technique as suggested by Beck and Beck (2013). Students are taught to combine the first two phonemes. Then, they combine the first two phonemes with the last phoneme. For instance, in order to read the word 'mat', students have to blend /m/ and /a/ first. Then, they have to say aloud /ma/ for several time before they combine it with the last sound which is /t/. T3 stated that her students practice blending by playing puzzle matching game where students picked any pieces of jigsaw puzzle at random, blend the phonemes as stated behind the jigsaw puzzle, read the word aloud and match them on the puzzle. Besides that, her students also played hopscotch where students hop on any spaces, blend the phonemes stated on the word cards and read them aloud. Later, they completed a worksheet by matching the word that they have blended to the correct pictures. Meanwhile, T5 encouraged his students to practice blending through car racing activities. Usually, he conducted the car racing activity as an enrichment activity after the students have learnt to blend the words using successive blending technique as stated above. Students participated in the activity in pairs.

In contrast to other participants, T4 applied the onset-rime technique in order to enhance his students' decoding skills. T4 asserts that students have to sound out the last phoneme followed by the phoneme in the middle. Then, they need to combine it with the first phoneme. For example, in order to read the word 'cat', the students need to combine 'a' and 't' to form 'at'. After that, they will combine 'c' and 'at' to read the word 'cat'. He used word families' module prepared by a local teacher and made it a routine for his students to practice blending using the module every Friday.

The findings revealed that the participants also rely on modelling, demonstration and drilling as the main teaching techniques. However, they provided opportunity for their

students to get involved in meaningful practices through other activities that are in line with their students' needs and interest. They also emphasized on collaborative learning during the teaching and learning process. This implies that teachers should vary the teaching techniques to develop the students' reading performance. Teachers should also conduct activities that allow students to cooperate and learn from their friends.

### **Impact of effective techniques on the students' reading comprehension**

The findings reveal that all participants agreed that the techniques that they employed had positive contribution towards students' reading performance. Their responses in the interviews were triangulated with the analysis of their students' LINUS results. It was evident in the LINUS results that their students had gradual development in the second screening compared to the first screening.

All participants except for T4 believe that the techniques implemented had positive impact on their students' reading comprehension. The participants recognized that the techniques implemented helped their students to decode the printed word. They asserted that their students' capability to recognize and read the words contributed to their ability to comprehend the words. This finding is in agreement with Gough and Tunmer (1986) idea that improving decoding or word reading skills may lead to an increase in reading comprehension. Besides that, T1 and T2 agreed that their students' reading comprehension developed when they used pictures during the teaching and learning process.

However, T4 was unsure of the effect of his techniques towards his students' reading comprehension. He is confident that his teaching techniques were able to help his students to read as he noticed that his struggling readers had developed the ability to read. But, he could not decide whether the technique could contribute to his students' reading comprehension because he witnessed that some of his students could not match the sentences that they have read to the correct pictures. Lack of vocabulary may be one of possible explanation for this result. Armbruster (2010) emphasizes the importance of vocabulary in reading comprehension. She declares that some vocabulary must be taught directly to enhance the students' reading comprehension. This implies that teachers need to teach new vocabulary from time to time to expand the students' vocabulary together with other reading comprehension strategies to enhance the students' reading comprehension.

### **V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study has found that generally teachers have implemented a variety of teaching techniques in teaching early reading through phonics approach. However, the implementation of one category of teaching technique is insufficient to enhance the students' reading performance. The

evidence from this study suggest that teachers should explore and try new techniques that are in line with students' interest and needs. It is recommended that a combination of controlled, semi-controlled and free techniques should be implemented to enhance students' reading performance. In addition, the findings of this study suggest that other reading comprehension strategies should be included to further enhance students' reading comprehension. Although the study demonstrated that the effective techniques implemented by the participants seemed to contribute positive impacts towards the students' reading comprehension, the findings of this study are limited to only five participants that participated in the second phase of this study. Therefore, it is recommended that further explorative or experimental study on techniques to enhance students' reading comprehension involving more participants could be conducted.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Anthony, E. M. (1963). Approach, method, and technique. *ELT Journal*, 17(2), 63-67.
- [2] Ardila, A., & Rosselli, M. (2013). Illiterates and cognition: The impact of education. In Uzzell, B. P., Ponton, M., & Ardila, A. (Eds), *International handbook of cross-cultural neuropsychology* (pp. 191-208). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [3] Ariati, N. P. P., Padmadewi, N. N., & Suarnajaya, I. W. (2018). *Jolly phonics: effective strategy for enhancing children English literacy*. In SHS Web of Conferences (Vol. 42, p. 00032). EDP Sciences.
- [4] Armbruster, B. B. (2010). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read: Kindergarten through grade 3*. Darvy, PA: Diane Publishing.
- [5] Beck, I. L., & Beck, M. E. (2013). *Making sense of phonics: the hows and whys*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- [6] Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- [7] Campbell, S., Torr, J., & Cologon, K. (2012). Ants, apples and the ABCs: The use of commercial phonics programmes in prior-to-school children's services. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 12(4), 367-388. doi: 10.1177/1468798411417377
- [8] Chapman, J. W., Greaney, K. T., Arrow, A. W., & Tunmer, W. E. (2018). Teachers' use of phonics, knowledge of language constructs, and preferred word identification prompts in relation to beginning readers. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404158.2018.1467937
- [9] Crookes, G. & Chaudron, C. (1991). Guidelines for classroom language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 46-67). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [10] Dixon, P., Schagen, I., & Seedhouse, P. (2011). The impact of an intervention on children's reading and spelling ability in low-income schools in India. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(4), 461-482. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2011.625125
- [11] Farokhbakht, L., & Nejadansari, D. (2015). The effect of using synthetic multisensory phonics in teaching literacy on EFL young learners' literacy learning. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 4(4), 39-52. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2015.1196
- [12] Gough, P., & Tunmer, W. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7(1), 6-10. doi:10.1177/074193258600700104
- [13] Hines, S. J. (2009). The Effectiveness of a color-coded, onset-rime decoding intervention with first-grade students at serious risk for reading disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 24(1), 21-32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2008.01274.x
- [14] Johnston, R. S., McGeown, S., & Watson, J. E. (2012). Long-term effects of synthetic versus analytic phonics teaching on the reading and spelling ability of 10 year old boys and girls. *Reading and Writing*, 25(6), 1365-1384. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.160
- [15] Johnston, R. S., & Watson, J. (2004). Accelerating the development of reading, spelling and phonemic awareness. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 17, 327-357.
- [16] Khairul Azhar Jamaludin, Norlidah Aliasa, Roselina Johari Mohd Khira, Dorothy DeWitta & Husaina Banu Kenayathulaa. (2015). The effectiveness of synthetic phonics in the development of early reading skills among struggling young ESL readers. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, doi: 10.1080/09243453.2015.1069749
- [17] Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308
- [18] Lloyd, S. 1998. *The phonics handbook*. Chigwell: Jolly Learning.
- [19] McGeown, S. P., Johnston, R. S., & Medford, E. (2012). Reading instruction affects the cognitive skills supporting early reading development. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(3), 360-364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.01.012
- [20] Nadiah Yan Abdullah, Napisah Kepol & Mariyattunnitha Shari. (2014). Implementing the Teaching of Phonics in Malaysian Primary Schools. *Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 2, 1-16.
- [21] National Reading Panel. (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Report of the subgroups*. Retrieved from https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/documents/report.pdf
- [22] Nee, W. O. Y., & Nooreiny Maarof (2017). *Teachers' knowledge and readiness in using systematic phonics instruction in ESL classroom*. Paper presented at the World Conference on Integration of Knowledge 2017.
- [23] PADU (2014). *Malaysia education blueprint: Annual report 2014*. Retrieved from http://www.padu.edu.my/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/PADU-ENG-LoRes-Full.pdf
- [24] Prasad, R. D., Nooreiny Maarof., & Hamidah Yamat. (2016). Implementing phonics in Malaysia. *International Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics (IJELTAL)*, 1(1), 1-18.
- [25] Prasad, R. D. (2016). *Factors affecting the teaching of the phonics approach in the new standard-based English language primary curriculum* (Doctoral Thesis). Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [26] Pressley, M., Rankin, J., & Yokoi, L. (1996). A survey of instructional practices of primary teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(4), 363-384. https://doi.org/10.1086/461834
- [27] Roe, B., Smith, S. H., & Burns, P. C. (2012). *Teaching reading in today's elementary schools* (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- [28] Sousa, D. A. (2014). *How the brain learns to read* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [29] Su, S. C. S., & Hawkins, J. (2013). Thras phonics: a case study of Thomas as an emerging reader in English. *The English Teacher*, 42(1), 52-73.
- [30] Yeung, S. S. S., Siegel, L. S., & Chan, C. K. K. (2013). Effects of a phonological awareness program on English reading and spelling among Hong Kong Chinese ESL children. *Reading and Writing*, 26(5), 681-704. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-012-9383-6

## AUTHORS

**First Author** – NurFatin Nadiera, Postgraduate Student, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia, nurfatinnadiera@gmail.com

**Second Author** – Hamidah Yamat, Assoc. Professor Dr, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia, hamidah\_yamat@ukm.edu.my