

The Effectiveness of the Inference Strategies in Developing the Reading Skills of the Grade 5 Learners in Siruma District, Division of Camarines Sur

Jessa N. Antonio¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Inference Strategies Reading Skills Grade 5 Comprehension Teacher Ratings Siruma	The study examined inference strategies employed by Grade 5 teachers and their perceived effectiveness in developing reading skills in Siruma District, Division of Camarines Sur, during School Year 2024–2025. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design involved 47 teachers in public elementary schools and a researcher-made questionnaire. Weighted means, frequencies, percentages, ranks, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance with chi-square tests were used at the 0.05 level. Building knowledge, studying genre, modeling thinking, teaching specific inferences, and setting important purposes in reading were classified as Very Much Employed. Indicators of decoding, fluency, vocabulary, sentence construction, sentence cohesion, and background knowledge were classified as Very Much Effective. Significant rank-order agreement was reported for every instructional and learner domain. The findings informed recommendations for purposeful reading, explicit modeling, contextualized materials, vocabulary development, and sentence-level revision. The results describe teacher perceptions and concordance in rankings. They do not provide a direct estimate of change in reading proficiency or establish that inference instruction caused the perceived outcomes.

1. Introduction

Inferential reading connects information stated in a text with relevant knowledge and reasoned interpretation. Teachers can make this process more visible by explaining how evidence supports a conclusion, comparing plausible interpretations, and asking learners to revisit an initial judgment. These practices address meaning construction, but they operate alongside decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and knowledge of language. Treating inference as a substitute for foundational word reading would blur the distinct demands of reading instruction. Baker et al. (2014) recommend attention to academic vocabulary, integration of oral and written language with content teaching, structured writing opportunities, and small-group support for English learners. Their framework is relevant to the language demands within reading lessons, although the study did not classify its respondents' learners according to that guide. Foorman et al. (2016) distinguish sound–letter learning and word analysis from broader language and comprehension activities. This distinction is useful when interpreting a questionnaire that includes contextual inference within a domain labeled decoding.

The study examined five instructional dimensions: building knowledge, studying genre, modeling thinking, teaching specific inferences, and setting important purposes in reading. Together they describe preparation, demonstration, and purposeful engagement with texts. The assessed learner domains extended from decoding and fluency to vocabulary, sentence construction, cohesion, and background knowledge. Some of these indicators cross the boundary between reading and writing, so their interpretation requires attention to the actual statements rather than the domain headings alone.

The study investigated the extent to which Grade 5 teachers in Siruma District employed inference strategies and perceived them as effective in developing reading skills. It also examined rank-order agreement and formulated policy recommendations. Its contribution is a local description of reported instructional practice and perceived effectiveness. The analysis does not establish that a particular inference strategy independently produced a change in reading performance.

2. Methods

2.1 Research design and scope

The study used a descriptive-evaluative-correlational research design in public elementary schools in Siruma District, Division of Camarines Sur. The stated study period was School Year 2024–2025.

The study assessed reported practices and perceived outcomes through questionnaire responses. Allocation to an intervention, a comparison condition, and repeated outcome measurement were not reported. The findings are interpreted as descriptive evaluations and rank-order analyses; the design label alone does not establish a tested relationship or a causal effect.

2.2 Participants and setting

The study involved 47 Grade 5 teachers in public elementary schools in Siruma District, Division of Camarines Sur. The respondents were the raters of the questionnaire indicators; the number of learners represented by their judgments was not reported.

The sampling frame, selection procedure, eligibility criteria, number invited, and response rate were not specified. Consequently, the representativeness of the respondents and the extent to which their judgments describe all schools in the setting cannot be established. No unreported school-level or respondent-group sample sizes were inferred.

2.3 Instrument and measures

The main data-gathering instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire. It assessed the domains presented in the Results, using indicator-level weighted means and verbal classifications. The response anchors, full scoring rules, interpretation cutoffs, validation procedures, pilot testing and reliability estimates were not reported. Category labels are therefore presented as the study's classifications rather than assigned from an assumed rating scale.

The unit represented in each descriptive table is the stated questionnaire indicator. Reported item means are retained without calculating new domain composites. Duplicate statements remain separate reported entries, and an unreported item value is identified as such where applicable. The ratings do not constitute independently scored learner assessments or administrative measures of school performance.

2.4 Data collection and analysis

Questionnaire administration was the stated data-collection approach. The administration mode, collection dates, instructions to respondents, procedures for incomplete responses, and evidence used by raters were not specified. Ethics review, institutional permission, consent and confidentiality procedures were not reported; no approval or consent process is asserted.

The reported analyses were weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) with corresponding chi-square tests. The significance level was 0.05. The tables retain the reported W values, chi-square values and probability thresholds; exact probabilities were not inferred from inequalities. The group-level ranks, degrees of freedom, tie adjustments and statistical software were not specified.

Kendall's W describes concordance in rankings. The reported significance decisions address agreement in indicator orderings; they do not test causal effects, equality of mean ratings, or the relationship between strategy use and outcomes. No direct strategy–outcome correlation coefficient was reported. Nonsignificant concordance is not interpreted as evidence that an activity was unused or that a learner skill was low.

3. Results

The tables present the reported findings by domain, with interpretation immediately after each presentation. Item statements and values remain in their reported order. Uniform verbal classifications appear in table notes; mixed classifications are displayed by item. No missing numerical results or composite scores have been imputed.

Table 1. Strategy employment in Building Knowledge

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teachers encourage learners to draw connections between the text and real-world events or issues	4.82
The teachers pose higher-order questions that require integrating existing knowledge with new information	4.82
The teachers consistently check for understanding and adjust instruction to deepen conceptual clarity	4.82
The teachers pre-teach key vocabulary essential for understanding implicit ideas in texts	4.81
The teachers activate learners' prior knowledge before introducing new texts or concepts	4.80
The teachers integrate relevant background information to help learners connect with the reading material	4.79
The teachers use multimedia resources to expand learners' understanding of the topic or setting	4.77
The teachers design activities that foster schema-building around central themes or topics	4.72
The teachers engage learners in collaborative discussions to share diverse perspectives and knowledge bases	4.68
The teachers scaffold complex texts by embedding contextual clues and explanatory notes	4.66

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Employed."

Table 1 shows reported item means from 4.66 to 4.82. Connecting texts with real-world events was prominent in knowledge building, while embedding contextual support occupied the lower end. The pattern suggests that teachers endorsed relevance and activation of knowledge. It does not show whether learners' prior knowledge was accurate or sufficient for a particular inference, which would require attention to their responses.

Table 2. Strategy employment in Studying Genre

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher scaffolds learners' understanding of unfamiliar genres by connecting them to known text types	4.71
The teacher assesses learners' ability to use genre knowledge to justify interpretations and inferences drawn from the text	4.71
The teacher incorporates texts with overlapping genre characteristics to challenge learners' inferential reasoning	4.70
The teacher introduces a wide range of genres and guides learners in identifying their unique features and structures	4.64
The teacher explicitly teaches how genre conventions shape the way meaning is conveyed within a text	4.62

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher encourages critical discussion about how genre affects author choices, tone, and intended meaning	4.62
The teacher facilitates guided practice where learners analyze how genre influences character development, plot, or argument structure	4.61
The teacher prompts learners to compare and contrast different genres to uncover patterns that support inferential thinking	4.61
the teacher models how to use genre knowledge to make predictions and draw inferences while reading	4.55

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Employed.”

Table 2 shows reported item means from 4.55 to 4.71. Scaffolding unfamiliar genres through known text types received the strongest rating. Modeling genre-based predictions was relatively lower. This suggests a distinction between introducing genre features and demonstrating how those features support an interpretation. Both may matter, but the study does not estimate their separate contributions to comprehension.

Table 3. Strategy employment in Modeling Thinking

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teachers highlight the use of background knowledge, textual clues, and logical connections to model inferential thinking	4.69
The teachers use varied texts and genres to model how inference strategies apply across different reading contexts	4.67
The teachers revise initial inferences in real-time to show how understanding deepens as new information is encountered	4.63
The teachers provide multiple examples of how different inferences can be drawn from the same passage	4.60
The teachers engage learners in guided practice by prompting them to articulate their own reasoning based on modeled strategies	4.59
The teachers verbalize their reasoning process when drawing conclusions from textual evidence	4.57
The teachers think aloud while reading to demonstrate how to make inferences from text and context	4.56
the teachers explicitly link modeled thinking to specific reading objectives and comprehension goals	4.56

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Employed.”

Table 3 shows reported item means from 4.56 to 4.69. The model-thinking profile emphasizes linking background knowledge, textual evidence and reasoning. Connecting the demonstration to a specific reading objective was relatively lower. Instructionally, an explicit explanation of why a strategy is used may help learners select it independently, but transfer was not directly assessed in the study.

Table 4. Strategy employment in Teaching Specific Inferences

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teachers design prediction tasks that require learners to anticipate outcomes based on narrative evidence	4.72
The teachers model how to determine the implied main idea when it is not directly stated	4.71
The teachers use graphic organizers or prompt to help learners track and justify specific types of inferences	4.70
The teachers assess learners' ability to identify and apply distinct types of inferences during reading exercises	4.66
The teachers differentiate instruction to target learners' development in particular inference categories, such as interpreting irony or figurative language	4.64
The teachers provide structured activities to help learners draw conclusions from incomplete or suggestive details	4.64
The teachers teach how to identify the author's tone and purpose through subtle textual cues	4.62
The teachers guide learners in recognizing implied cause-and-effect relationships within a text	4.56
the teachers explicitly teach how to infer character traits based on actions, dialogue, and internal thoughts	4.53

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Employed.”

Table 4 shows reported item means from 4.53 to 4.72. Prediction tasks based on narrative evidence were prominent, while inference about character traits was relatively lower. The profile shows that specific inference types may receive different emphasis. A high utilization classification does not establish that learners can justify predictions or distinguish a warranted inference from an unsupported guess.

Table 5. Strategy employment in Setting Important Purposes in Reading

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teachers differentiate reading purposes depending on genre, task, or learner readiness to foster strategic comprehension	4.85
The teachers use pre-reading discussions to activate prior knowledge aligned with the intended reading objective	4.82
The teachers provide reflective prompts after reading that tie directly to the original purpose, reinforcing comprehension depth	4.72
The teachers assess learners' ability to achieve the stated reading purpose through performance tasks or inferential questions	4.72
The teachers frame guiding questions that encourage learners to read with intent and extract targeted information	4.71
The teachers connect reading objectives to real-world applications or content-area goals to deepen relevance and motivation	4.71
The teachers clearly state the specific purpose for reading before engaging with a text to guide learners' focus	4.69
The teachers encourage learners to annotate texts based on set purposes, such as tracking evidence or identifying authorial intent	4.66
the teachers monitor and adjust the purpose for reading as learners uncover new textual information or shift focus	4.66

Note. All reported indicators were classified as "Very Much Employed."

Table 5 shows reported item means from 4.66 to 4.85. Differentiating reading purposes by genre, task and readiness was prominent. Annotation and adjustment of purposes occupied the lower end of the profile. This suggests that setting an initial goal and revisiting it during reading are distinct practices. The study does not observe how flexibly learners monitored a purpose as new information emerged.

Table 6. Rank-order agreement for inference-strategy employment

Domain	Kendall's W	Chi-square	Reported probability
Building Knowledge	0.86	23.22	p<0.01
Studying Genre	0.91	21.84	p<0.01
Modeling Thinking	0.94	19.74	p<0.01
Teaching Specific Inferences	0.84	22.68	p<0.01
Setting Important Purposes in Reading	0.91	21.84	p<0.01

Note. Significance level = 0.05. Numerical strings and probability notation are retained as reported; no p-values were recalculated.

Table 6 addresses the research question on rank-order agreement. All five instructional domains were reported to show significant concordance. This suggests a shared ordering under the reported analysis, while leaving the size and definition of respondent groups unspecified. It does not demonstrate identical teaching practices or identify the strongest strategy for improving reading. A comparison of strategy effectiveness would require outcome-linked analysis beyond the rankings reported here.

Table 7. Perceived effectiveness in Decoding

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners recognize patterns in spelling-sound correspondences, enabling them to decode words with greater fluency	4.84
The learners accurately sound out new vocabulary with minimal teacher prompting by making informed guesses based on surrounding information	4.75
The learners make connections between background knowledge and textual evidence to decode figurative or implied meanings in reading passages	4.72

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners consistently apply phonemic and morphemic analysis to decipher multisyllabic or compound words	4.72
The learners articulate their reasoning when decoding difficult words, indicating metacognitive awareness of inference strategies	4.71
The learners demonstrate the ability to self-correct misread words by using syntactic and semantic cues from the sentence or paragraph	4.71
The learners are able to decode unfamiliar words by drawing logical connections from contextual clues provided in the text	4.70
The learners show improved reading fluency and confidence when decoding content with embedded inferential elements	4.68
the learners employ visual and structural strategies, such as identifying root words and affixes, to make sense of unfamiliar terminology	4.67

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 7 shows reported item means from 4.67 to 4.84. The strongest decoding statement concerns spelling–sound patterns, but other entries address contextual meaning and inference. The favorable ratings should therefore be interpreted at item level rather than as a uniform measure of word decoding. Contextual interpretation and accurate word analysis require distinct assessment evidence.

Table 8. Perceived effectiveness in Fluency

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners demonstrate consistent accuracy in word recognition, even when encountering complex sentence structures or unfamiliar vocabulary	4.64
The learners self-correct fluently when misreading a word, drawing on surrounding information to restore meaning without disrupting flow	4.63
The learners show improved reading speed without sacrificing comprehension, indicating strategic processing of inferential content	4.63
The learners maintain a steady reading rhythm across different types of texts, suggesting familiarity with varied textual forms and structures	4.61
The learners read aloud with smooth pacing and natural intonation, reflecting comprehension of meaning beyond the text	4.60
The learners pause appropriately at punctuation marks, signaling an understanding of sentence boundaries and intended meaning	4.58
The learners confidently engage with dialogue or descriptive passages, reflecting their ability to interpret subtext and implied tone through fluent delivery	4.58
The learners read with minimal hesitation, using contextual clues to predict and smoothly integrate unfamiliar words	4.56
the learners exhibit expressive reading, adjusting tone and pitch to match inferred emotions or narrative shifts in the text	4.55

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 8 shows reported item means from 4.55 to 4.64. Accuracy and self-correction were prominent within the fluency profile, while expressive delivery was relatively lower. This pattern distinguishes efficient word processing from prosody. Teacher judgments suggest favorable perceptions across both, but no timed reading, accuracy counts or independent prosody scoring is reported.

Table 9. Perceived effectiveness in Vocabulary

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners apply newly encountered vocabulary appropriately in both spoken and written discourse, indicating conceptual mastery	4.68
The learners engage in reflective discussions about word choice and its impact on tone, intent, or meaning in various texts	4.63

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners accurately predict word meanings before formal instruction, using textual evidence and inferential reasoning	4.62
The learners connect new vocabulary to prior knowledge and real-life experiences, reinforcing deeper comprehension	4.58
The learners identify synonyms, antonyms, or word relationships by analyzing patterns within the text	4.57
The learners demonstrate an increased ability to explain and paraphrase challenging vocabulary using their own words	4.56
The learners derive the meaning of unfamiliar words using contextual clues from the sentence or paragraph	4.55
the learners infer nuanced meanings of polysemous words based on how they are used in different contexts	4.55

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 9 shows reported item means from 4.55 to 4.68. Applying vocabulary in speech and writing received the strongest rating, whereas contextual derivation and nuanced meanings occupied the lower end. The pattern suggests a relative distinction between using learned words and interpreting less familiar uses. Direct tasks would be needed to establish vocabulary depth and transfer.

Table 10. Perceived effectiveness in Sentence Construction

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners apply appropriate conjunctions and transition words, inferred from textual models, to show logical relationships between ideas	4.71
The learners demonstrate improved subject-verb agreement and tense consistency by analyzing patterns observed in exemplar sentences	4.71
The learners generate descriptive and detailed sentences, inferring effective word choices from literary and informational texts	4.71
The learners infer tone, perspective, or intent in a text and reflect these elements in the structure and style of their own sentences	4.71
The learners draw on mentor texts to emulate stylistic sentence features such as parallelism, rhetorical questions, or repetition for emphasis	4.69
The learners use inference to deduce the appropriate punctuation and capitalization within different sentence types	4.68
The learners construct grammatically correct sentences by inferring proper word order and syntactic patterns from modeled texts	4.67
The learners vary their sentence structure using simple, compound, and complex forms—based on cues drawn from sentence function and context	4.67
The learners enhance sentence clarity and coherence by revising awkward or ambiguous constructions using contextual understanding	4.66
the learners self-monitor and edit their sentence constructions by comparing their output with contextual models and peer or teacher feedback	4.66

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 10 shows reported item means from 4.66 to 4.71. Conjunctions, agreement, descriptive detail and inferred tone shared the highest reported rating. Revision and self-monitoring were relatively lower. These items concern written expression as well as reading, suggesting that the domain captures a broader literacy judgment. It does not independently establish grammatical growth attributable to inference instruction.

Table 11. Perceived effectiveness in Sentence Cohesion

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners revise disconnected or choppy sentence sequences by inferring the intended flow of thought and inserting appropriate linking expressions	4.63
The learners infer appropriate paragraph-to-sentence transitions, effectively connecting ideas across paragraph boundaries for smoother discourse	4.62

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners maintain logical ordering and development of ideas, reflecting an understanding of how sentences build on or relate to one another	4.62
The learners ensure thematic progression by using repeated key terms or synonymous phrases to reinforce the topic and maintain coherence across a passage	4.61
The learners signal shifts in time, focus, or argument using temporal and logical connectors (e.g., “meanwhile,” “in contrast,” “as a result”), derived from contextual clues	4.61
The learners apply syntactic parallelism when comparing or listing ideas, contributing to structural unity and rhythm in sentence construction	4.61
The learners use appropriate cohesive devices such as conjunctions, pronouns, and adverbial phrases to logically link sentences and maintain flow of ideas	4.60
The learners maintain consistency in pronoun reference, ensuring clarity in subject or object identification across multiple sentences	4.60
the learners apply transitions that reflect inferred relationships, including cause-effect, contrast, and sequence, to connect sentences meaningfully	4.59

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 11 shows reported item means from 4.59 to 4.63. Repairing disconnected sequences and connecting ideas were prominent in cohesion. Applying transitions according to inferred relationships occupied the lower end of a narrow profile. The findings suggest favorable perceptions of text linking, but direct analysis of written or reading responses is needed to establish the quality and appropriateness of cohesive choices.

Table 12. Perceived effectiveness in Background Knowledge

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learners infer unstated ideas or cultural references by drawing from their real-world experiences and contextual understanding	4.63
The learners connect new information from the text to existing knowledge frameworks, enhancing comprehension and retention	4.61
The learners activate relevant prior knowledge to make predictions about the text’s content, structure, or purpose	4.60
The learners apply knowledge from one text to comprehend another, showing transfer of conceptual understanding through inference	4.59
The learners demonstrate improved understanding of texts by relating characters, events, or concepts to historical, social, or scientific knowledge	4.58
The learners engage in pre-reading activities that build and refine background knowledge, leading to more informed interpretations	4.58
The learners identify implicit assumptions or perspectives in texts by leveraging their background knowledge and inferential reasoning	4.58
the learners revise misconceptions by integrating new textual information with existing beliefs or experiences using guided inference	4.57

Note. All reported indicators were classified as “Very Much Effective.”

Table 12 shows reported item means from 4.57 to 4.63. Interpreting unstated ideas through experience was prominent, while revising misconceptions was relatively lower. This distinction matters because prior knowledge may support or misdirect comprehension. The profile suggests that connecting knowledge and evaluating it should both be considered, without claiming that the study demonstrated conceptual change.

Table 13. Rank-order agreement for the perceived outcome domains

Domain	Kendall’s W	Chi-square	Reported probability
Decoding	0.70	18.90	p<0.05
Fluency	0.87	20.88	p<0.01
Vocabulary	0.90	18.90	p<0.01

Domain	Kendall's W	Chi-square	Reported probability
Sentence Construction	0.83	22.41	p<0.01
Sentence Cohesion	0.70	16.80	p<0.05
Background Knowledge	0.88	18.48	p<0.025

Note. Significance level = 0.05. Numerical strings and probability notation are retained as reported; no p-values were recalculated.

Table 13 addresses the research question on rank-order agreement. All six learner-skill domains were reported to show significant agreement. The result is consistent with shared priorities within the questionnaire, but does not establish improvement in independently tested skills. Differences in W across domains should also be interpreted cautiously because item counts vary and the analysis details are incomplete. The tests do not establish that strategy use caused the favorable learner ratings.

4. Discussion

The study indicates broad teacher endorsement of inference instruction across planning, modeling, and text engagement. Significant concordance in all strategy domains suggests reported similarity in the ordering of indicators. It does not show equal implementation levels across schools or agreement about every instructional decision. The findings are most useful as a descriptive account of which practices respondents prioritized within each domain.

The learner domains span several components of literacy. Vocabulary and background knowledge are conceptually compatible with inferential understanding, whereas sentence construction and cohesion also concern written expression. Baker et al. (2014) support connecting language and content instruction, which helps explain why reading activities may be discussed alongside writing tasks. However, the inclusion of related abilities in one questionnaire does not demonstrate that one common mechanism explains them all.

Decoding requires particular care. Several statements concern contextual meaning, figurative interpretation, or informed guessing. These are not identical to accurately translating written forms into spoken words. Foorman et al. (2016) emphasize sound–letter connections and word analysis in foundational instruction. Although their guide targets younger learners, the conceptual distinction helps prevent the study's favorable contextual-inference ratings from being interpreted as proof of phonological decoding competence in Grade 5.

The recommendations for think-aloud demonstrations, purposeful reading, contextualized texts, vocabulary logs, and revision routines are consistent with the study's instructional focus. They remain recommendations rather than tested program components. Implementation could be accompanied by direct measures aligned with each outcome: word reading for decoding, connected-text reading for fluency, and explicit scoring criteria for inferential responses or written cohesion. Such alignment would make future effectiveness claims more interpretable.

5. Implications for practice and further research

The study supports using the indicator-level pattern as a starting point for local review. Decisions should connect a stated need with a feasible response and a criterion for judging progress. Relative positions within a favorable profile are not equivalent to measured deficits, and a significant ranking result is not evidence that a proposed policy will work. Recommendations should be implemented with attention to context and evaluated rather than assumed effective.

Further research should use clearly defined outcomes and document how they are measured. Direct performance tasks, observations, or independently recorded school indicators could complement questionnaire ratings. A longitudinal or comparative evaluation could examine change over time, provided the design addresses baseline differences and alternative explanations. These are proposed directions for future work, not procedures undertaken in the study.

6. Conclusion

The study concluded that the five inference-strategy domains were Very Much Employed and that the six learner-skill domains were rated Very Much Effective. Significant rank-order agreement was reported across all domains. The findings support continued attention to explicit inference instruction and related literacy support as recommendations, while preserving the distinction between teacher-rated effectiveness and demonstrated gains. Causal effects and independently measured reading improvement remain unestablished.

References

- [1] Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/practiceguide/english_learners_pg_040114.pdf
- [2] Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf