*Journal of Language Studies* Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9

IRAQI Academic Scientific Journals
العراقية المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)
Journal of Language Studies
Contents available at: https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS

# The Impact of Response to Intervention Strategy on EFL Iraqi Primary School Pupils' Reading Comprehension

**Marwa Zuhair Hamed*[1]**

**Tikrit University /College of Education for Women**

**Marwa.Hamid23@st.tu.edu.iq**

**Prof. Manal Omer Mousa (Ph.D.)**

**Tikrit University /College of Education for Women**

**momsh89@tu.edu.iq**

**Received:** 01/06/2025, **Accepted:** 20/06/2025, **Online Published:** 30/12/2025

## Abstract

The current study aims to find out the impact of the Response to Intervention (RTI) strategy on improving reading comprehension skills of Iraqi primary school pupils learning English as a foreign language. Recognizing the critical role of reading comprehension in language acquisition, the study is based on two hypotheses: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group taught using the Response to Intervention strategy and the control group taught using the prescribed method in the posttest. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pretest and posttest. To achieve the aim of this study and verify its hypotheses, a non-randomized experimental group pretest-posttest group design has been chosen. The pupils have been taught during the academic year 2024-2025 in English subject. The

[1] ***Corresponding Author:** Marwa Zuhair Hamed, **E-mail:** marwa.hamid23@st.tu.edu.iq

**Affiliation:** Tikrit University - Iraq

*Journal of Language Studies* **Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)**
**DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9**

sample comprises 68 sixth-grade pupils selected from Al-Khansaa'1st School for Girls in Tikrit City. The experimental group, consisting of 34 pupils, was taught using the Response to Intervention strategy, while the control group, also consisting of 34 pupils, received instruction through the prescribed traditional method. A posttest contains six questions, which are constructed to collect data. Face and content validity have been achieved. The reliability coefficient has been verified, and the researcher herself teaches both groups. The data collected from the posttest results have been analyzed statistically by using a t-test to measure the pupils' performance. The results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and control group in posttest. Moreover, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group in pre and posttest. which indicates that Response to Intervention strategy is more effective than the prescribed method. The study ends with recommendations and suggestions for further studies based on the obtained results.

**Keywords:** Comprehension, EFL, Response to Intervention, Posttest

# أثر استراتيجية الاستجابة للتدخل على فهم القراءة لدى تلاميذ المدارس الابتدائية العراقيين في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

**مروة زهير حامد**

**جامعة تكريت / كلية التربية للبنات**

**أ.د. منال عمر موسى**

**جامعة تكريت / كلية التربية للبنات**

**المستخلص**

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى معرفة تأثير استراتيجية الاستجابة للتدخل (RTI) على تحسين مهارات فهم القراءة لدى تلاميذ المدارس الابتدائية العراقيين الذين يتعلمون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. مع إدراك الدور الحاسم لفهم القراءة في اكتساب اللغة، تستند الدراسة إلى فرضيتين: لا يوجد فرق ذو دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط درجات المجموعة التجريبية التي تم تدريسها باستخدام استراتيجية الاستجابة للتدخل ومتوسط درجات المجموعة الضابطة التي تم تدريسها باستخدام الطريقة التقليدية في الاختبار البعدي. ولا يوجد فرق ذو دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط درجات المجموعة التجريبية في الاختبار القبلي والبعدي. لتحقيق هدف هذه الدراسة والتحقق من صحة فرضياتها، تم اختيار تصميم تجريبي غير عشوائي لمجموعة اختبار قبلي–بعدي. تم تدريس التلاميذ خلال العام الدراسي 2024-2025 في مادة اللغة الإنجليزية.

تتكون العينة من 68 تلميذة من الصف السادس الابتدائي تم اختيارهن من مدرسة الخنساء الأولى للبنات في مدينة تكريت. المجموعة التجريبية، التي تتكون من 34 تلميذة، تم تدريسها باستخدام استراتيجية الاستجابة للتدخل، بينما تلقت المجموعة الضابطة، التي تتكون أيضًا من 34 تلميذة، التدريس من خلال الطريقة التقليدية المقررة. يتضمن الاختبار البعدي ستة أسئلة تم تصميمها لجمع البيانات. تم تحقق من صدق الاختبارين الظاهري والمضمون. كما تم التحقق من معامل الثبات، وقد قامت الباحثة

*Journal of Language Studies* **Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)**
**DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9**

بنفسها بتدريس كلا المجموعتين. تم تحليل البيانات التي تم جمعها من نتائج الاختبار البعدي إحصائيًا باستخدام اختبار "ت" لقياس أداء التلاميذ. أظهرت النتائج وجود فرق ذو دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط درجات المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة في الاختبار البعدي. علاوة على ذلك، يوجد فرق ذو دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط درجات المجموعة التجريبية في الاختبار القبلي والبعدي، مما يشير إلى أن استراتيجية الاستجابة للتدخل أكثر فاعلية من الطريقة التقليدية. وتختتم الدراسة بتوصيات ومقترحات لدراسات مستقبلية بناءً على النتائج التي تم التوصل إليها.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الفهم القرائي، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، الاختبار البعدي، الاستجابة للتدخل

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

Some primary school pupils need systematic support to develop reading comprehension and often struggle to organize their thoughts and ideas effectively when asked to produce written work in English. These difficulties stem in part from the absence of an explicit, structured approach to teaching reading. By employing well-designed instructional strategies, teachers can guide pupils' step by step through the processes of activating prior knowledge, decoding vocabulary in context, making inferences, and summarizing key ideas. Such strategies enable instructors to present material clearly, manage classroom time efficiently, and provide targeted feedback during guided practice. When the chosen strategy is engaging and interactive, pupils become more motivated to read and to apply comprehension skills independently. Therefore, every teacher should adopt a deliberate framework for improving pupils' reading comprehension. One comprehensive framework is Response to Intervention (RTI), which involves three tiers of support—high-quality classroom instruction for all pupils (Tier 1), small-group targeted interventions for those who need extra help (Tier 2), and intensive individualized assistance for pupils with the greatest difficulties (Tier 3). Response to Intervention has emerged as a practical, data-driven method for identifying learning needs early and delivering the right level of support to resolve academic challenges, particularly in reading comprehension.

### 1.2 Aim of the Study

The aim of the study is Finding out the impact of the Response to Intervention strategy on improving Iraqi EFL primary pupils' Reading Comprehension.

### 1.3 Hypotheses of the Study

This study hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group, who is taught using the Response to Intervention Strategy, and the control group, who is taught by the prescribed method, in the post-test. There is also no statistically

significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre- and post-tests.

1.4 Limits of the Study

This study is limited to the following:

1. Sixth-grade primary pupils at Al-Kansaa'1st School for Girls.
2. Units one and two in the "English for Iraq" textbook.
3. The academic year 2024 / 2025.
4. Fuchs and Fuchs' Model (2006) is adopted.

**1.5 Value of the Study**

The current study is hoped to be beneficial for :

1. EFL teachers who are required to transmit from conventional teaching methods to new and innovative ones , and adopt activities based on authentic communication and interaction.

**2.** RTI which allows pupils to receive instruction and interventions tailored to their individual needs. This personalized approach can be more engaging and effective for pupils as they receive the specific support that they require to succeed.

**3.** Curriculum designers who can create instructional materials and resources that are better aligned with the needs of pupils. This includes developing adaptable and flexible curricula that can be tailored to different tiers of intervention.

## Literature Review

**2.1 Historical Background of Response to Intervention Strategy** RTI originated from the medical field to address the needs of individuals with disabilities deemed "abnormal" (Park et al., 2021). It connects closely with education, gaining support as a way to help pupils with special learning disabilities (Wold, 2009). The prevalence of Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) has risen since the 1970s, currently affecting about 6% of school-age children (Fuchs, 2007). Many pupils identified as SLD often do not meet established criteria (Shinn, 2007). RTI provides a framework for educators to identify and support struggling students. Following the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) in 2004, RTI gained acceptance in U.S. schools as an alternative identification method (Hallahan, Pullen, & Ward, 2013). It is a multi-tiered approach aimed at improving student achievement and addressing behavioral issues through data-driven interventions (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010).

### 2.2 Response to Intervention

RTI is a significant process because "the overall goal is not to classify pupils, but rather to give them what they need to show academic growth. The design is powerful in that it can address all pupils in all contexts" (Hughes & Dexter, 2011), as cited in (Smith 2013, p: 4).

Fuchs & Fuchs (2006) point out that RTI is important in education to treat the following cases: pupils who have learning difficulties are defined as not being able to perform at grade level in subjects such as math, reading, writing, or other academic areas. Pupils who are falling behind their classmates in terms of performance and academic advancement. As well as pupils who cannot understand or apply important ideas and abilities, and have difficulties remembering and storing information. According to Fuchs & Fuchs (2006), RTI intervention helps the previous cases in the following ways:

- Allows educators to quickly identify and help pupils who may be struggling in the classroom
- Applies to both general and special education classrooms
- Encourages collaboration between educators and families
- The proactive nature of RTI ensures timely support for pupils facing academic or social-emotional challenges (Fuchs &Fuchs, 2006).

Each letter (R – T – I) stands for a whole process of testing, evaluating, screening, and defining the needs of some pupils who would fail if this approach had not been applied in their early school years. R (Response): This involves monitoring how pupils respond to interventions by observing changes in their academic performance, behavior, and engagement. The process begins by identifying at-risk pupils within the first month of school, using data such as previous test scores to assess their needs (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Campton, 2004). T (To): This emphasizes implementing structured, targeted interventions designed to meet the specific needs of students, especially in their early educational stages (Fuchs, Fuchs, and Zumeta 2008). While I (Intervention): This refers to the specific strategies employed to assist pupils facing academic or behavioral challenges. These interventions aim to address identified needs, primarily focusing on early reading difficulties, rather than behavioral issues (Al Otaiba & Fuchs, 2006).

### 2.3 The Basic Models of Response to Intervention Strategy:

#### 2.3.1 Deno's (1980) Model

In the 1980s, Michael R. Deno made significant contributions to the field of special education, particularly in the areas of assessment, intervention, and implementation of RTI. Particularly

known for developing Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM), a method for assessing a pupil's progress and performance. This tool is essential for RTI, as it provides reliable data to inform instructional decisions and monitor pupil growth over time.

#### 2.3.1.1 Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM)

A standardized procedure called curriculum-based measurement is used to evaluate pupils' academic development regularly and frequently, guiding decision-making regarding the pupils (Deno, 2003). Three main requirements define CBM, a broad category of curriculum-based assessment (CBA): (a) resources are linked to the curriculum of the school; (b) measurement takes place regularly; and (c) assessment results are utilized to inform instructional decisions (Tucker, 1987). Five phases comprise curriculum-based measurement: (a) choose relevant test probes; (b) administer and score the probes; (c) graph the scores; (d) establish objectives; and (e) share progress (Hosp, Hosp, & Howell, 2012).CBM is simple to use, sensitive to pupil success and growth throughout brief 10-hour educational periods, and continuously monitors learner progress and planning to make instructional decisions (Burns & Gibbons, 2008). Teachers can use progress data from standardized probes administered at regular intervals to assess pupils' development and set long-term objectives that will result in proficiency (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2010).

Although probes may differ in that they are based on the curriculum, they consistently measure reading fluency, accuracy, and automaticity (Roehrig, Nettles, S.M., Hudson, & Torgesen, 2008). The results are graphed so that teachers can easily determine if pupils meet their reading goals or if their educational programs are effective (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Compton, 2004).

### 2.3.2 Fuchs and Fuchs' Model (2006)

Fuchs defines RTI as a tiered system of support that aims to meet the diverse learning needs of pupils and ensure that all learners receive effective instruction and targeted interventions (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). He highlights the importance of data utilization for monitoring pupils' progress and identifying those needing more intensive support (Fuchs et al., 2010). Fuchs further emphasizes the need for a systematic approach to assessing pupil progress and advocating for evidence-based interventions tailored to individual needs. She stresses the necessity of collaboration among educators, families, and specialists to foster a supportive environment that promotes academic growth. Both professors view RTI as a proactive strategy for early identification of at-risk pupils, aiming to intervene before academic difficulties become entrenched. Their collective work underscores that effective RTI implementation not only enhances teaching strategies but also addresses equity issues in education, ensuring that all pupils have access to the support they need to succeed (Fuchs et al., 2010). This commitment is to

informed decision-making and collaborative support systems that have the potential to transform educational practices and improve outcomes for struggling learners.

### 2.4 Components of the Response to Intervention Strategy

As far as the components of RTI, it includes the following:

#### 2.4.1 Universal Screening

Universal screening is essential in RTI to identify pupils at risk for poor learning outcomes through brief assessments, typically conducted in the fall, winter, and spring (Jenkins, Hudson, & Johnson, 2007). These screenings consider student strengths and cultural factors, with a focus on skills predictive of future performance, such as phonological awareness (Jenkins, 2003). While primarily used for reading, universal screening also benefits writing, math, and behavior (Jenkins et al., 2007). Early identification, ideally in kindergarten or first grade, allows for timely interventions, although challenges like false positives and false negatives can complicate risk determination (Fuchs et al., 2007). There is currently no consensus on the criteria for identifying at-risk pupilswithin Tier 1 of RTI, with ongoing debates about percentile ranks and cut scores (Hintze, 2007; McMaster & Wagner, 2007; Torgesen, 2000). Accurate identification is crucial for providing appropriate tiered interventions (Jenkins, 2003).

#### 2.4.2 Progress Monitoring

According to Dexter and Hughes (2009), progress monitoring is used to evaluate how well pupils are performing in at-risk subjects like reading, math, and social conduct. It is a technique used by educators to assess whether children are benefiting correctly from a standard curriculum, and identify pupils who are not progressing at a sufficient rate. It also allows educators to provide guidance for the development of successful intervention programs for those pupils who are not making money from conventional training (Fuchs & Stecker, 2003). A pupil's progress is tracked in relation to Tier 1 instruction as soon as they are identified as at risk by the universal screening measure ( Fletcheret al., 2007). Regular progress monitoring is recommended, preferably weekly or biweekly, but at least once a month (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006).

According to Fuchs, Fuchs, and Zumeta (2008), a pupil's progress is assessed by contrasting his actual and expected rates of learning (such as local or national norms). These measurements can be used by a teacher to assess the efficacy of their instruction and modify their methods to suit the needs of each individual pupil. A pupil advances to Tier 2's progressively severe levels of intervention and education (such as small group training and supplementary instruction) as well as more frequent progress monitoring if they are not responding appropriately to Tier 1 instruction.

### 2.4.3Tiered Instruction

This component has three levels or tiers that provide progressively more specific and intensive instruction. It employs a multi-tiered approach where pupils receive targeted interventions informed by collected data. The framework is intended to complement the standard reading curriculum, with Tier I instruction during regular reading time, while Tier II and III offer additional resources outside the daily reading blocks (Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005, as cited in Samples, 2013).

**2.4.3.1 Tier 1 instruction:** (stage 1, universal),

All pupils receive high-quality instruction in the general instruction and progress monitoring. Pupils who continue to struggle, as indicated by progress monitoring data, receive supplemental instruction at the additional education classroom for 45-90 minutes each day. A universal screening is administered to identify pupils who may be struggling with learning English after six to ten weeks of subsequent high-quality intervention (Bollman, Silberglitt, & Gibbons, 2007; Graden, Stollar, & Poth, 2007; Peterson, Prasse, Shinn, & Swerdlik, 2007). Hence, the general education teacher provides instruction to all pupils. This instruction is given using whole group instruction, cooperative learning groups, paired instruction and independent practice.

**2.4.3.2 Tier 2 Instruction or** (stage 2, supplemental)

Pupils who do not progress sufficiently at the primary instruction level receive different or additional support in addition to their participation in core instruction; roughly 10%–20% of the class falls into this category. Teachers in the classroom, other educational professionals, or interventionists are the ones who deliver this teaching. 3–4 people receive this small group lesson twice a week, for thirty minutes, with pupils. As homogeneous groups, these are formed. Pupils that have similar difficulties are placed together, for instance, whether they struggle with reading or math (Bollman et al., 2007; Graden et al., 2007; Peterson et al., 2007).

**2.4.3.3 Tier 3 Instruction** (stage 3, individual)

Assistance is provided for those pupils who fail to make progress in regards to the intervention they are receiving. These interventions are delivered either one-to-one or one-to-three across the programs (Bollman et al., 2007; Graden et al., 2007; Peterson et al., 2007). All pupils participate in Tier I during a ninety-minute instructional period in the regular education classroom. This level is designed to accommodate children with varying needs while focusing on the core reading curriculum, differentiated instruction, classroom procedures, and accommodations (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2009). When pupils fail to satisfy the requirements for the incremental baseline data collection, additional intensive interventions take place outside of the planned reading block. For pupils who fall short of benchmark targets, Tier II education consists of 30 extra minutes of teaching per day for eight to twenty weeks. During this time, progress should be checked at least once a week (Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005).

*Journal of Language Studies* **Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)**
**DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9**

## 2.5 Reading Comprehension

Reading is one of the primary goals of studying English at our colleges, and it is one of the most crucial language acquisition abilities. In addition, many kinds of reading, one of them is reading comprehension. Reading comprehension is the ability to understand what we read where words have context and texts have meaning. Sweet and Snow in Salehi et al. (2003, p.241) state that

> The comprehension becomes especially important to the pupils in the later elementary grades, because it provides the foundation for further learning in secondary school. A student's academic progress is profoundly shaped by the ability to understand what is read.

According to Rivers (1981), reading is the most crucial activity in any language class since it helps pupilsconsolidate and expand their language knowledge in addition to being a source of information and a fun pastime . Reading English serves as both the main way for many pupilslearning English as a second or foreign language to become familiar with the subject matter they are studying and the most significant way for them to keep improving their language skills (Celce-Murcia, 1979). As much exposure to reading materials as time and each student's capacity permit should be the main goal of reading comprehension, the other reading program component.

Directly deriving meaning from the written discourse is a necessary component of an appropriate interactive reading. Sound does not mediate mature reading for understanding; rather, the reader must actively participate. "When reading, the reader's mind is just as active as when speaking." (Widdowson, 1990 , P. 214,). Active discussion work and focused contact with a text alone may provide a significant portion of the foundation for reading proficiency. Pupilsnever engage in reading with inattention or lack of focus, and reading for comprehension does not always entail reading quickly. However, reading efficiently involves both comprehension and speed.

## 2.6 Reading Comprehension and Response to Intervention Strategy

RTI aims to raise pupils' academic performance. Reading comprehension is very important for pupils to succeed in academic and, eventually, professional contexts (Hagaman & Reid, 2008; Kirsch et al., 2002; Snow, 2002). The ability to comprehend the meaning of a document coherently is known as reading comprehension (Graesser et al., 1994; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Scholastic, 2008). In order to create a cohesive comprehension of the text, involves cognitive processes such as drawing inferences from the text and connecting it to previously learned information (Graesser et al., 1994; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Scholastic, 2008.as cited in

Jennings et al., 2015), reading comprehension requires comprehension, processing, reasoning, and prior knowledge—all of which contain a variety of abilities, ideas, and applications for a student. Since every student learns differently and at a different rate, educators depend on differentiated instruction to help them attain favorable learning outcomes.

Several abilities are fundamental to a student's success in reading comprehension. These include working memory, vocabulary, fluency, automaticity in word identification, phonological awareness, and more (e.g., National Reading Panel, 2000; Rapp et al., 2007).

The five reading elements highlighted in our country's educational system are vocabulary, phonics, comprehension, fluency, and phonemic awareness. These elements, known as "The Big 5," are the most crucial to guaranteeing readers' success (American Institute for Research, 2004). The effective acquisition and application of these skills predict later reading comprehension. The current study is especially concerned with increasing understanding through vocabulary and fluency training.

The ability to read a text accurately, rapidly, and with the right prosody is known as fluency (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; NICHD, 2000). It is also often seen as a necessary "building block" of reading comprehension (Pikulski & Chard, 2005). Vocabulary, which refers to knowledge of words, is also highly related to reading comprehension. Without understanding the meaning of words, it is difficult to fully comprehend what a text is conveying. Thus, individuals who receive instruction to improve vocabulary knowledge demonstrate increased reading comprehension achievement (Beck & McKeown, 1991).

**Fluency.** The idea that reading fluency is crucial for comprehension has drawn much attention in the last 10 years. According to (Penner-Wilger , 2008 as cited in Jennings et al. , 2015), reading fluency is crucial because it links decoding and understanding by strengthening decoding abilities. Numerous studies have discovered supporting evidence that raising fluency can raise achievement and understanding levels. This is probably because fluency frees up pupils' already few cognitive and attentional resources, allowing them to focus on understanding.

**Vocabulary**. Reading comprehension heavily relies on vocabulary and the understanding of word meanings. According to research by Roberts et al. (2008), older pupils with learning disabilities typically have more difficulty with fluency because they have a harder time recognizing unfamiliar and new words. According to the authors, pupils who have trouble learning new words should concentrate on developing the ability to deconstruct challenging terms into manageable chunks and utilize the definitions of the word's constituent pieces to pick up new vocabulary. Pupils can focus on the skills required to improve their fluency after being more comfortable with the vocabulary.

**Phonological awareness and phonics:** Skills in recognizing and manipulating sounds and letter–sound relationships, which support decoding and word recognition (National Reading Panel, 2000).

*Journal of Language Studies* Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9

**Working memory and automaticity:** The capacity to hold and process information while reading, and to recognize words automatically, enabling focus on meaning (Rapp et al., 2007).

## Methodology

### 3.1 Experimental Design

This section presents the work of the conducted experiments to achieve the objectives of the current study and verify its hypotheses, it explains the detailed steps, its procedures followed and conducted by the researcher in the experiment. A Non-Randomized Pre-Posttest Design is used. Two groups are employed , one group represents a control group and the other group as an experimental one, as shown in Table 1. The independent variable RTI is administered to the experimental group, whereas the traditional method is given to control group.

**Table1:** *The Experimental Design*

| Group | The test | Independent Variable | Dependent Variable | The test |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EG | pretest | RTI Strategy | Improving performance | Posttest |
| CG | pretest | Prescribed method | Improving Performance | posttest |

### 3.2 The Population and Sample Selection

The population of the present study consists of EFL Iraqi primary pupils of the sixth class for girls in Tikrit. The total number of the sixth class pupils' population is 175 girls distributed into four primary schools for girls in Tikrit, as shown in Table 2.

*Journal of Language Studies* Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9

**Table 2:** *The Population of the Study*

| No. | No. Name of School | No. of Pupils |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Hey AL Arbaaen | 25 |
| 2 | AL-Khansaa'1st | 68 |
| 3 | AL-Khansaa'2nd | 42 |
| 4 | AL- Aisha | 40 |
| Total | | 175 |

The sample is a subset of the target population that the researchers intend to evaluate in order to generalize to the target population. Ideally, a survey is selected to represent the population as a whole (Creswell, 2012). Al-Khansaa'1st Primary School for Girls has been chosen as the sample of the study. The sample consists of (68) pupils will divide into two sections. Section (A) has randomly been chosen to be the experimental group, section (B) will be the control group. Each section consists of (34) pupils.

### 3.3 Pupils' Scores in the Pre-Test

The pre-test has been conducted for equalization. Both of the experimental and control groups are submitted to the same pre-test. The mean pre-test score for the experimental group is (50.852), while the mean pre-test score for the control group is (51.441), with standard deviations of (14.346) and (10.073), respectively, for the two groups. At the degree of freedom (66) and the level of significance (0.05), the calculated t-value is determined to be (0.196), which is lower than the tabulated value (2.00). As indicated in the table, this result implies that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups in the pre-test, as shown in Table 3 below :

*Journal of Language Studies* Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9

**Table 3** *The T-Test Value of the Two Groups in the Pre-test*

| Group | No. | Mean | S.D. | T-Value | | DF | Level of Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EG** | 34 | 50.852 | 14.346 | Calculated | Tabulated | 66 | 0.05 |
| **CG** | 34 | 51.441 | 10.073 | 0.196 | 2.00 | | |

**3.4 Post-Test Construction**

The instrument involves creating a performance post-test to assess the experiment's degree of success. A test is defined by Bachman (1990 , P.20) as "a measurement instrument designed to elicit a specific sample of an individual's behavior…. a test necessarily quantifies characteristics of individuals according to explicit procedures". A test is a tool used to assess a student's performance in specific activities or show that they have mastered a skill or subject (Linn, 2008). The most crucial role of the test is to determine the course objectives at the end of the period of instruction. The performance post–test is given to pupils, and there are six questions. Each question consists of five items. The first question consists of two branches, which are (A)and ( B), that contain (5) items, while the second, third, and fourth questions consist of ( 5) items. The fifth question consists of two branches (A) that contain ( 5) items and (B) consists of (1) item. The sixth consists of 1 one item.

**3.5 Validity of The Test**

Validity is a term used in research to determine whether or not a study's findings can be trusted. The National Association of the Directors of Educational Research developed the definition of validity in 1921 and defined it as "the extent to which a test measures what it aims to measure" (Rogers, 1995, p. 25; cited in Urbina, 2004). According to Gronald (1998), validity is the extent to which the conclusion drawn from the evaluation's findings is appropriate, practical, and significant for valuation purposes. Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure, ensuring that the results accurately reflect the specific content or objectives being assessed (Lodico et al., 2006).

Typically, the main types of validity used are face, content, construct, and criterion. In this study, the face and content validity were evaluated to determine the instrument's validity and reliability so that it could be measured as intended.

### 3.5.1 Face Validity

As articulated by Harris (1967, p:7), face validity refers to "the perception of the test as it appears to the participants, test administrators, educators, and similar stakeholders." At the same time, Mousavi (2009, p:247) asserts that "face validity refers to the extent to which an examination appears suitable and ostensibly evaluates knowledge or skills, as determined by the subjective assessment of the examinees." To ensure the face validity of the test, it has been exposed to a jury members of English Language specialists in linguistics and methods of teaching English, They have been asked to assess whether or not the formula of the sixth question is appropriate. The jury members decided that the test questions are acceptable for pupils, with some modifications and notifications taken into account.

### 3.5.2 Content Validity

Content validity is the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behavior domain to be measured (Anastasia & Urbina, 1997). The purpose of content validity is to ascertain whether an instrument for evaluation is sufficient or whether its items represent all potential content (Oluwatayo, 2012).

Straub (1989) states that determining content validity usually involves going through relevant material and speaking with groups or judges of experts. Although empirical evaluation is typically unnecessary, Lawshe (1975) provides a method for assessing this validity. The cognitive domain begins with the lower level of cognition (remembering, understanding, applying, and analyzing) and ends with the higher level of cognition, which is creation, as shown in the table below

**Table 4***: Number of Test Items for Each Level of Bloom's Taxonomy*

**3.6 Reliability of the Post Test**

| Test items | Remembering | Understanding | Applying | Analyzing | Creating | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | 10 | 10 | / | / | / | 20 |
| **2** | / | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 15 |
| **3** | 3 | 6 | 6 | / | / | 15 |
| **4** | / | 6 | 9 | / | / | 15 |
| **5** | 5 | 5 | 5 | / | / | 15 |
| **6** | / | / | / | / | 20 | 20 |
| **Total** | 18 | 30 | 26 | 3 | 23 | 100 |

One of the most important characteristics of a good test is reliability. When a test's level of correctness remains constant and steady under the same circumstances for the same group of pupils, it is considered trustworthy (Veram & Beard, 1981). The Alpha-Cronbach formula is the most common statistical way to measure reliability by taking an instrument's average of all possible split-half reliability estimates (Crocker & Algina, 1986). The obtained result after applying Cronbach's alpha formula is (0.80), indicating the test is highly reliable.

**3.7 Application of the Experiment**

The researcher has followed the following procedures in teaching RTI strategy:

1- Begin the lesson by warmly greeting the pupils, accompanied by a smile and direct eye contact with each individual.
2- Briefly ask an engaging question: "Who read something interesting this week?"
3- Encourage a few responses to establish a positive and interactive tone.
4- Introduce the RTI strategy with a simple explanation: "RTI is a way to ensure everyone understands what we are learning. It has three levels: support for everyone, extra help for those

who need it, and special support for specific students." (National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010, p. 12).

5- Write the three RTI tiers on the board: Tier 1: Whole class teaching. Tier 2: Small group support for pupils needing extra help. Tier 3: Individualized help for those who need it the most.
6- Emphasize that the strategy is there to support all pupils.

### 4.1 Results Related to the First Hypothesis

All mean scores are obtained and compared to find out if there is any significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and those of the control group in the post-test. Statistics show that the mean score of the experimental group is (75.352) and the standard deviation is (12.067). While the mean score of the control group is (56.29), and the standard deviation is (10.732).

The calculated t-value of (6.881) is higher than the tabulated t-value of 2.00, with a degree of freedom of 66 at a significance level (0.05). Observing the values of T-calculated above, it is found that the calculated T-value (6.881) is much greater than the tabulated T-value of the field 2.00, and from this, it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the control group, who is taught according to the prescribed method and the mean score of the experimental group, who is taught by RTI strategy, for the benefit of the experimental group. Thus, the hypothesis, which states that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and that of the control group in the pos test, is rejected, as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4** *Means, Standard Deviation, and T-values of the Two Groups in the Posttest*

| Group | N. | Mean | S.D. | T-Value | | DF | Level of Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Calculated | Tabulated | | |
| Experimental | 34 | 75.352 | 12.067 | 6.881 | 2.00 | 66 | 0.05 |
| Control | 34 | 56.29 | 10.732 | | | | |

### 4.2 Results Related to the Second Hypothesis

To analyze the data related to the second hypothesis, namely, *there is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group in the pre-posttest*. Will be achieved.

*Journal of Language Studies* **Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)**
**DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9**

According to the following results in Table 15, the mean score of the experimental group in the pretest is 50.852, and the standard deviation is 14.346. while the mean score of the experimental group in the post-test is 75.352, and the standard deviation is 12.067. The calculated t-value (10.364) is higher than the tabulated t-value (1.69) with a degree of freedom (33) at a significance level (0.05), as shown in Table (15). It can be inferred that there is a significant difference between experimental pupils' performance in the pre and post-test. So, the second hypothesis is rejected.

**Table 15***: Pupils' Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, and T-Value of the Pupils' Performance in the Pre and Posttest.*

| | N. | Mean | S.D. | T-Value | | DF | Level of Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Calculated | Tabulated | | |
| Posttest | 34 | 75.352 | 12.067 | 10.364 | 1.69 | 33 | 0.05 |
| Pretest | 34 | 50.852 | 14.346 | | | | |

### 4.3 Discussion of Obtained Results

The results of the first hypothesis, which is stated as "*There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group who is taught by using response to intervention strategy and a control group who is taught by the prescribed method in the post-performance test*, show that the mean score of pupils in the experimental group is (75.352) while the mean score of the control group is (56.29), so there are apparent differences between the two groups. The findings suggest that the RTI strategy is more effective, which enhances primary pupils' performance than prescribed methods. This aligns with existing literature that emphasizes the benefits of modern instructional strategies, particularly for learners who struggle in conventional settings. The structured support provided by the RTI framework likely addresses individual learning needs, fostering a more conducive environment for language teaching.

The performance of the experimental group is higher than the control group according to the following:

1. RTI strategy identifies learning challenges early, allowing for immediate support that can prevent others' academic difficulties.

2. Continuous assessment helps track pupils' progress and informs adjustments to interventions, ensuring that the strategy is effective.

3. RTI strategy provides pupils, especially those at risk, with the support they need to succeed and helps them to close achievement gaps.

4. RTI strategy encourages teamwork among teachers, promoting a more cohesive approach to pupil support.

5. RTI strategy reduces the likelihood of pupils developing long-term academic challenges, leading to better overall performance.

The results of the second hypothesis show that the mean score in the pretest is less than it is in posttest, this indicates that there is a significant difference between pupils' performance in the pre-post test, and the benefit of the posttest. The significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores highlights the effectiveness of the strategy implemented to enhance pupils' performance. These findings contribute valuable insights into effective teaching practices and the potential for improving pupils' outcomes in educational settings.

**5.1 conclusion**

Regarding the findings of the present investigation, the subsequent conclusions have been reached:

1. The RTI strategy has significantly improved pupils' academic performance in four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Many pupils demonstrated measurable progress, indicating that targeted interventions can effectively address learning gaps.
2. The study's findings stressed the importance of collaboration between teachers and parents. Communicating frequently and working together is crucial to ensure the interventions are applied coherently and effectively.
3. Continuous monitoring and assessment are fundamental to the RTI process. Using data to track pupils' progress allowed for timely intervention adjustments, ensuring that support is responsive to individual needs.
4. The performance test of the experimental group who used the Response to the intervention strategy is better than that of the control group, which is taught using the prescribed method.
5. RTI fosters an inclusive learning environment that addresses diverse pupil needs, ultimately promoting academic success and personal growth.
6. The results have enabled the researcher to comprehend that effective teaching is achieved when the strengths and weaknesses of individual pupils are recognized and addressed.
7. The most critical language pedagogies of the communicative approach and Response to Intervention are:

- The activation of pupils
- The presentation of color cards
- The viewing of videos in daily classroom participation

8. The teaching materials presented to pupils are appropriate for their needs and abilities, as they perceive their linguistic and cultural proficiency to be enhanced and developed.

## References

1. Al Otaiba, S., & Fuchs, D. (2006). Who are the young children for whom best practices in reading are ineffective? An experimental and longitudinal study. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39*(5), 423–436.
2. American Institute for Research. (2004). *A closer look at the five essential components of effective reading instruction: A review of scientifically based reading research for teachers*. American Institute for Research.
3. Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
4. Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (1991). Social studies texts are hard to understand: Mediating some of the difficulties. *Language Arts, 68*, 482–490.
5. Bollman, K. A., Silberglitt, B., & Gibbons, K. A. (2007). The St. Croix River district model: Incorporating systems-level organization and a multi-tiered problem-solving process for intervention delivery. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *Handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of assessment and intervention* (pp. 319–330). Springer.
6. Brown-Chidsey, R., & Steege, M. W. (2005). *Response to intervention: Principles and strategies for effective practice*. Guilford Press. (Cited in Tammy J. Samples, 2013)
7. Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. A. (2008). *Implementing response to intervention in elementary and secondary schools*. Routledge.
8. Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
9. Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College.
10. Deno, S. L. (2003). Developments in curriculum-based measurement systems for data-based special education problem-solving. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 19*, 1–16.

11. Dexter, D. D., & Hughes, C. A. (2009). Progress monitoring within a response-to-intervention model. Retrieved March 10, 2010, from http://www.rtinetwork.org
12. Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2007). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention*. Guilford Press.
13. Fuchs, D., Deshler, D. D. (2007). What we need to know about responsiveness to intervention (and shouldn't be afraid to ask). *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 22*, 129–136.
14. Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Compton, D. L. (2004). Identifying reading disability by responsiveness-to-instruction: Specifying measures and criteria. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*, 216–227.
15. Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Stecker, P. M. (2010). The "blurring" of special education in a new continuum of general education placements and services. *Exceptional Children, 76*, 301–322.
16. Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2006). Introduction to responsiveness-to-intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 93–99.
17. Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Zumeta, R. O. (2008). A curricular-sampling approach to progress monitoring: Mathematics concepts and applications. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 33*(4), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534508407313484
18. Graesser, A. C., Singer, M., & Trabasso, T. (1994). Constructing inferences during narrative text comprehension. *Psychological Review, 101*, 371–395.
19. Grimes, J. (2002). Responsiveness to interventions: The next step in special education identification, service, and exiting decision making. Paper presented at the Office of Special Education Programs LD Summit Conference, Washington, DC.
20. Hagaman, J. L., & Reid, R. (2008). The effects of paraphrasing strategy on the reading comprehension of middle school pupilsat risk for failure in reading. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(4), 222–234.
21. Hallahan, D. P., Pullen, P. C., & Ward, D. (2013). A brief history of the field of learning disabilities. In H. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 15–32). Guilford Press.
22. Harris, D. R. (1967). *Teaching English as a second language*. McGraw-Hill.

23. Hintze, J. M. (2007, September). Conceptual & empirical issues related to developing a response-to-intervention framework. Paper presented at the National Center on Pupil Progress Monitoring, Washington, DC. Retrieved May 26, 2008.
24. Hosp, K. M., Hosp, J. L., & Howell, K. W. (2012). *A practical guide to curriculum-based measurement*. Guilford Press.
25. Hughes, C. A., & Dexter, D. D. (2011). Response to intervention: A research-based summary. *Theory Into Practice, 50*(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2011.534934 (Cited in Smith, 2013)
26. Jenkins, J. R. (2003, December). Candidate measures for screening at-risk students. Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention symposium, Kansas City, MO.
27. Jenkins, J. R., Hudson, R. F., & Johnson, E. S. (2007). Screening for at-risk readers in a response to intervention framework. *School Psychology Review, 36*, 582–600.
28. Kovaleski, J. F., VanDerHeyden, A. M., Runge, T. J., Zirkel, P. A., & Shapiro, E. S. (2022). *The RTI approach to evaluating learning disabilities: Second edition*. Guilford Press.
29. LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology, 6*, 293–323.
30. Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology, 28*, 563–575.
31. Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational research*. Jossey-Bass.
32. McMaster, K. L., & Wagner, D. (2007). Monitoring response to general education instruction. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *Handbook of response to intervention* (pp. 223–233). Springer.
33. Mellard, D. F., & Johnson, E. (2008). *RTI: A practitioner's guide to implementing response to intervention*. Corwin Press.
34. Mousavi, S. A. (2009). *An encyclopedia dictionary of language testing* (4th ed.). Tehran: Rahnama Press.

35. National Center on Intensive Intervention. (2013). *Data-based individualization: A framework for intensive intervention*. https://intensiveintervention.org/resource/data-based-individualization-framework-intensive-intervention
36. National Center on Response to Intervention. (2010, March). *Essential components of RTI—A closer look at response to intervention*. U.S. Department of Education.
37. National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (Report No. 00-4754). National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
38. Oluwatayo, J. A. (2012). Validity and reliability issues in educational research. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*.
39. Penner-Wilger, M. (2008, February). Reading fluency: A bridge from decoding to comprehension. Retrieved from http://www.autoskill.com/pdf/fluency_research.pdf
40. Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(6), 510–519.
41. Rapp, D. N., Sandoval, S., & Berman, M. (2007). Working memory and comprehension. In M. J. Snowling & C. Hulme (Eds.), *The science of reading: A handbook* (pp. 327–342). Blackwell Publishing.
42. Roberts, G., Torgesen, J. K., Boardman, A., & Scammacca, N. (2008). Evidence-based strategies for reading instruction of older pupils with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 23*(2), 63–69.
43. Rivers, W. M. (1994). *Teaching foreign language skills*. University of Chicago Press.
44. Roehrig, A. D., Petscher, Y., Nettles, S. M., Hudson, R. F., & Torgesen, J. K. (2008). Not just speed reading: Accuracy of the DIBELS oral reading fluency measure for predicting high-stakes third-grade reading comprehension outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 343–366.
45. Shinn, M. R. (2007). A five-step model for implementing response to intervention. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 1051–1065). National Association of School Psychologists.

46. Smith, S. J., & Okolo, C. (2010). Response to intervention and evidence-based practices: Where does technology fit? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 33*(4), 257–272. https://doi.org/10.1177/073194871003300404
47. Snow, C. E., & Sweet, A. P. (2003). Reading for comprehension. In A. P. Sweet & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension* (p. 241). Guilford Press.
48. Straub, D. W. (1989). Validating instruments in MIS research. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(2), 147–169.
49. Verma, G. K., & Beard, R. M. (1981). *What is educational research? Perspectives on techniques of research*. Gower Publishing Company.
50. Vellutino, F. R., Scanlon, D. M., Sipay, E. R., Small, S., Chen, R., Pratt, A., & Denckla, M. B. (1996). Cognitive profiles of difficult-to-remediate and readily remediated poor readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*, 601–638.
51. Widdowson, H. G. (1979). Reading and communication. In *Teaching English as a foreign/second language*. Newbury House Publishers.
52. Wold, K. (2009). *Response to intervention: A guide for educators*. Pearson Education.

## Questions of Posttest for Sixth Class

**Q1A/ Read the text carefully, then write (T) for true items and (F) for false ones.**

**(choose 5) (10M)**

Hello, I am James. I am from England. I am fourteen, and I am at school. My favorite lesson is history; it is an interesting subject. I live with my parents in London city. London has got expensive markets ,but it's got cheap food. My favorite food is a chicken sandwich, but my favorite drink is tea. I have got two sisters and one brother.

1- James is Englishman(  ).

2- James's favorite lesson is Sports (  ).

3- James lives with his father and mother (  ).

4- Food in Cambridge is expensive (  ).

5-James likes chicken sandwich (  ).

6- London is too expensive (  ).

*Journal of Language Studies* **Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)**
**DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9**

**B/ Answer the following questions using information from the above text passage. (choose 5) (10M)**

1-Where is James from?

2-How old is he?

3- What is his favorite lesson?

4-What is his favorite food?

5-Where does he live?

6- what is his favorite drink?

## Grammar and Functions

**Q2/ Do as required (choose 5) (15M)**

1- Spring is sunny and hot ( change the sentence to negative).
2- Wool comes from goats and sheep (change the sentence into question)
3- Write a sentence in the present continuous
4- In the room, there is a (black, leather, big) sofa (re-arrange the sentence)
5- Both of my parents is farmer. ( correct the mistake)
6- I (was) a doctor (change the verb between brackets in present simple)

**Q3/ Identify the correct answer (choose 5) (15 M)**

1- Those are the balloons I ( bought – boat)for the party yesterday.
2- My feet (hard -hurt) because these trainers are small.
3- Did the customer like the (new – knew) invention?
4- He (as -has ) a brother and a sister
5- Ammar gets (bored – board) because there is nothing to do.
6- I (see – sea ) a beautiful cat

**Q4/ Complete the following sentences by using the suitable words (choose 5)(15M)**

(clay -seed – to - cotton - China - chicken )

1- I'm going ------- school
2- A pot is made from ----------
3- They are colorful ----------towels
4- The first paper was made in --------
5- A plant comes from a ----------
6- I eat --------- for dinner

**Q5 A/Rewrite the sentence in modern simple handwriting (5 m)**

(( hello how are you i dont feel well i have a headache ))

*Journal of Language Studies* **Vol.9, No.4, Part 2, 2025, Pages (164-188)**
**DOI: https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.9**

**B/ Listen to the sentences carefully, then write down the missing words in the blanks (10M ).**

Ali wakes up early in the ----------and goes to the ----------to get some --------. He buys some ---------- and ---------- for the breakfast.



milk

market morning bread food

**Q6/Write about yourself and express your ideas about your favorite hobby. (20 M)**