

## Utilization of Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) In Teaching Grammar among Grade 10 Students

Jelsin L. Dumape

---

### Abstract

Teaching of grammar plays a vital role in language teaching. One cannot communicate effectively when grammar is poor and weak. This study aimed at examining the effectiveness of Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) as an instructional tool in improving the English grammar skills of the Grade 10 students in a certain school in the Division of Bukidnon academic year 2019-2020. The quasi-experimental design was used to determine whether or not there is a difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the students after Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) was integrated in teaching grammar. Purposive sampling was utilized with pre-selected heterogeneous classes with 78 respondents, 39 for each of the two groups – control and experimental groups. A research-made instrument was distributed to the respondents comprising a 50 multiple choice-based questions. Frequency distribution, standard deviation, t-test, double difference and ANOVA were the statistical tools used to treat the data.

The overall pretest result revealed intermediate level for both the control and experimental groups. Overall post-test result for the control group remained as intermediate level, while the experimental group improved to advanced level. Hence, the result disclosed that there was a significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the experimental group after Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) was integrated in teaching grammar. The study also revealed no significant difference in students' demographic profile such as age, sex and academic performance and level of English general grammar skills.

Therefore, findings of this study indicate that Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) plays an important role in the present and future education of this generation and that there are other variables to consider for explaining significant differences in the level of their grammar skills.

---

**Keywords:** *Strategic Intervention Material (SIM), instructional tool, quasi-experimental, English general grammar skills*

### Introduction

In this globally competitive world, education plays a significant role in every individual's life. Through education a person is equipped with the necessary knowledge, attitude and skills needed for life-long learning and for employment (Diaz & Dio, 2017). Hence, one of the skills that a learner must master to prepare himself in the complex demands of the global world is the proficiency in using the English language as a medium of communication.

Since English is the second language in the country, it is used as a medium of instruction in most subjects. In fact, the Department of Education Order No. 36, Series of 2006 provides that English language shall be used as the primary medium of instruction in all public and private schools in the secondary level.

Consequently, the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum of the Department of Education in their English Curriculum Guide emphasized the ultimate goal of the Language Arts and Multiliteracies Curriculum. It is to produce graduates who apply the language conventions, principles, strategies and skills in interacting with others, understanding and learning other content areas, and fending for themselves in whatever field of endeavor they may engage in. Also, the goal of the current program is to develop language communicative skills both in oral and written communications (K to 12 English Curriculum Guide, 2013).

Moreover, it was seen from the results in the National Achievement Tests that the level of proficiency in English is low. The National Achievement Test (NAT) revealed very poor results in English. The MPS in 2018 is 43.48% lower to the result in 2012 which is 51.80% and much lower to the result in 2006 which is 47.73% and in 2005 which is 51.33%. In Region 10, the MPS in English is also quite low, which is 44.54%

in 2018. Also, in the Division of Bukidnon, the MPS in English in 2017 is 44.26% which is lower to the result in 2018 which is 41.73% in which the goal of 75% seems elusive at this point (Department of Education, 2013 & 2018).

Likewise, the researcher, being a Grade 10 English teacher, observed that many students have low grades in the subject as could be gleaned from the results of their written works, quarterly assessments and even in oral participation. The researcher also noted the difficulty of the learners in internalizing the rules of grammar. As such, students can hardly come up with grammatically correct structured sentences and difficulty in comprehension. Thus, they could not communicate their ideas well in functional English.

Some of the grammar topics which students need to master include verb tenses, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and modals which are the competencies found in the K to 12 Curriculum Guide in English 10. Considering that grammar plays an important role towards communicative competence, the five domains found in the Curriculum Guide are the coverage in the study. Also, these were the competencies least-mastered by the students as they were learning concepts of grammar.

In the case of Philippine educational system, there are several reasons that hamper the students to be active and successful learners. Some of the reasons are outnumbered teachers, insufficient classrooms and lack of instructional and learners' materials, low student achievements and performances of students (Salviejo, Aranes & Espinosa, 2014).

As a result, it is then strengthened by the Department of Education the continuity of implementing appropriate innovations and interventions particularly in English. In order to improve student's achievement, certain innovations and interventions are well-planned and crafted and primarily focus on how to make learning meaningful for students. As emphasized in the DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2012, the utilization of interventions is indispensable to address learning gaps and one of these interventions is the use of Strategic Intervention Materials (Dacumos, 2016).

Strategic Intervention Material refers to a teaching aid introduced into the teaching methods to stimulate the activity of the students and thereby increased their level of understanding and master the concept of the subject matter (Dy, 2011). In the utilization of SIM, the role of the teacher is a facilitator of learning, one who guides and assists students to work independently. Thus, it is a multifaceted approach to help students to become independent and successful learners (Togonon, 2011).

The aforementioned information prompted the researcher to develop and utilize Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) in improving the grammar skills of the grade 10 students in a certain public school in the Division of Bukidnon where she is teaching. As observed by the researcher, students would likely to fail and get low performance in English because they find learning grammar never fun, boring and burdensome which in turn causes relatively low performance. These situations bothered the researcher for she believes that the poor mastery in grammar affect student's performance in English especially when they move to the next higher grades and college.

With these reasons, it is expected that the teacher needs to think of effective ways and strategies to address this kind of circumstances. The teacher-researcher has to look for alternative measures on how to enforce the teaching-learning process without affecting the quality of education. To transfer learning effectively, teachers should utilize appropriate learning approaches and instructional materials during the teaching-learning process.

Hence, it is then the purpose of the study to test the effectiveness of Strategic Intervention Material as an instructional tool in improving students' grammar skills. Strategic Intervention Material was utilized as an intervention in improving students' grammar skills.

## **Methodology**

The quasi-experimental design was used to determine whether or not there is a difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the students after Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) was integrated in teaching English. Purposive sampling was utilized with pre-selected heterogeneous classes with a total of 78 respondents, 39 for each of the two groups – control and experimental groups. A research-made instrument was distributed to the respondents comprising a 50 multiple choice-based questions. A Cronbach Alpha result of 0.75 in pretest and 0.79 in posttest indicated the reliability of the instrument. Frequency

distribution, standard deviation, t-test, double difference and ANOVA were the statistical tools used to treat the data.

**Results And Discussion**

This section presents the findings of the study with interpretations and analyses.

This study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) as an instructional tool in teaching English grammar skills to grade 10 junior high school students of a certain school in the Division of Bukidnon academic year 2019-2020.

**1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of the following:**

**1.1 age,**

**1.2 sex,**

**1.3 academic performance in English subject during 1<sup>st</sup> grading period?**

**Respondents' Demographic Profile**

The demographic profile of the respondents is presented in Tables 1-3. It includes their age, sex, and academic performance in English subject during the 1<sup>st</sup> grading period.

**Table 1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Student-Respondents According to Age**

Age	Control		Experimental		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
15 years old	12	31	12	31	24	31
16 years old	21	54	20	51	41	53
17 years old	4	10	3	8	7	9
19 years old	2	5	3	8	5	6
20 years and above	0	0	1	2	1	1
Total	39	100	39	100	78	100

The data in table 1 signifies that the majority of the two groups, which is 41 out of the 78 student-participants in this study fall in the age bracket for grade 10 junior high school, set by the Philippine Standard Classification of Education which indicates the ideal age composition by level of education.

Table 2 presents the distribution of the respondents by sex. As shown in the table, the student-respondents were dominated by females.

**Table 2 : Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Student-Respondents According to Sex**

Sex	Control		Experimental		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Male	13	33	14	36	27	35
Female	26	67	25	64	51	65
Total	39	100	39	100	78	100

The Philippine Education for All Review Report on Gender Parity and Equality in Formal Education (2015) reported that the female participation rate among the student-respondents being higher than the male is a common observation. According to the 2010 Census that in terms of educational attainment, females tend to finish than males as there is a slightly higher percentage of females (10.6%) than males (7.8%) who had completed college or higher education (FLEMMS, 2008).

Table 3 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of student-respondents according to their academic performance in English during the 1<sup>st</sup> grading period of academic year 2019-2020. It can be observed from the table that most of the student-respondents attained a fairly satisfactory academic performance in English with an average ranging from 75-79.

**Table 3 : Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Student-Respondents According to Academic Performance in English subject during 1<sup>st</sup> Grading Period SY 2019-2020**

Range	Description	Control		Experimental		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
90-100	Outstanding	4	10	7	18	11	14
85-89	Very Satisfactory	6	15	9	23	15	19
80-84	Satisfactory	14	37	8	21	22	28
75-79	Fairly Satisfactory	15	38	15	38	30	39
Below 75	Did Not Meet Expectation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		39	100	39	100	78	100

As emphasized by Dy (2011), the role of teachers cannot be undermined in the process of learning and also they are the ones who will provide, craft, and utilize necessary materials needed by the students. Lee Vu-Je (2008) in his article, “A Study of the Influence of Instructional Innovation on Learning Satisfaction and Study Achievement”, concluded that teaching innovation has a significant and positive influence on learning satisfaction and study achievement as well.

**2. What is the level of the grammar skills of the respondents during pretest and post-test according to the following:**

- 2.1 Verb Tenses,**
- 2.2 Pronouns,**
- 2.3 Prepositions,**
- 2.4 Conjunctions, and;**
- 2.5 Modals?**

**Respondents’ Level of Grammar Skills**

The data presented in table 4 reveals the respondents level of grammar skills in the pretest and posttest of the control and experimental groups in terms of verb tenses.

**Table 4 : Mean Distribution of the Respondents’ Level of Grammar Skills in Pretest and Posttest in Verb Tenses**

Respondents	Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level
Control Group	4.58	Intermediate	5.64	Intermediate
Experimental	5.07	Intermediate	8.82	Advanced

Group				
-------	--	--	--	--

Legend: Advanced – 9-10; Upper Intermediate 7-8; Intermediate – 5-6  
Lower Intermediate – 3-4; Elementary; 1-2

It can be seen that the experimental group had a level of advanced proficiency while the control group belongs to intermediate level after the intervention was made. This implies that the intervention employed had something to do with the improvement of the proficiency level on the topic tenses of verbs.

Based on the observations of the researcher during the conduct of the study, students who were taught using Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) enjoyed accomplishing the tasks given from the material and increased their level of understanding of the concepts which helped them gained better scores.

This is supported by Hogan (2000) and Woodward (2004) who stated that the utilization of intervention materials gives students relevant and direct activities that provide students better learning of concepts.

The data presented in table 5 reveals the respondents level of grammar skills in the pretest and posttest on pronouns.

The data shows an increase of score of both from the posttest in grammar skills particularly on pronouns. It can be seen that the experimental group had advanced level while the control group belongs to intermediate. This implies that the said intervention employed in the experimental group is more effective compared to the lecture method used in the control group.

As reflected from the enrichment card found in SIM, students were able to write sentences correctly as they answered the tasks and activities in sentence construction. They learned even without an explicit explanation of the rules of pronouns from the teacher because students were guided to understand concepts of pronouns using SIM.

**Table 5 : Mean Distribution of the Respondents’ Level of Grammar Skills in Pretest and Posttest in Pronouns**

Respondents	Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level
Control Group	4.46	Intermediate	5.74	Intermediate
Experimental Group	5.12	Intermediate	8.71	Advanced

Legend: Advanced – 9-10; Upper Intermediate 7-8; Intermediate – 5-6  
Lower Intermediate – 3-4; Elementary - 1-2

This is supported by the study of Garcia (2016) when he employed an intervention in teaching pronouns to English language learners. The results of the study indicated an improvement towards the usage of pronouns in writing as they changed their individual approach to defining what a clear subject was in their sentences. Similarly, the study of Seow and Tacy (2004) showed big improvement from the scores of the experimental group when pronouns were taught in informal method where in there was no explicit explanation of pronoun rules and the formal aspects of the language.

The data presented in table 6 reveals the level of grammar skills in the pretest and posttest of the control and experimental groups on prepositions. It was observed in the posttest that only the experimental group had accelerated to another level. This means that the said intervention used in the experimental group has something to do for the improvement of the grammar skills of the respondents particularly on prepositions.

**Table 6 : Mean Distribution of the of Respondents’ Level of Grammar Skills in Pretest and Posttest in Prepositions**

Respondents	Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency

				Level
Control Group	4.64	Intermediate	5.35	Intermediate
Experimental Group	5.35	Intermediate	8.92	Advanced

*Legend: Advanced – 9-10; Upper Intermediate 7-8; Intermediate – 5-6  
Lower Intermediate – 3-4; Elementary - 1-2*

The data also reveals that the traditional lecture method used in teaching prepositions has lesser impact in improving the grammar skills of the students. Lam’s (2009) study revealed that students who were taught using this traditional method had little confidence in their ability to properly use prepositions, and had minimal retention rates.

Moreover, it was also observed by the researcher after the intervention was implemented to the experimental group, students gained better scores and increased confidence level in class activities. Similarly, when students were asked about their insights after using SIM in learning prepositions their ability to use prepositions in sentence construction has improved. Thus, it was evident that the utilization of SIM in teaching prepositions improved students’ scores and performance.

This is similar to the study of Togonon (2011) on the development and evaluation of project – based strategic intervention materials (PB-SIMs), PB-SIM is a valid instructional material in teaching high school students. Results showed a significant difference between the achievement of the students before and after being exposed to PB – SIMs.

The data presented in table 7 reveals the respondents grammar skills in pretest and posttest on conjunctions.

**Table 7 : Mean Distribution of the Respondents’ Level of Grammar Skills in Pretest and Posttest in Conjunctions**

Respondents	Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level
Control Group	4.46	Intermediate	5.12	Intermediate
Experimental Group	5.07	Intermediate	8.92	Advanced

*Legend: Advanced – 9-10; Upper Intermediate 7-8 ; Intermediate – 5-6 Lower Intermediate – 3-4; Elementary;1-2*

The data revealed in their posttest that the mean score of the experimental group had increased and accelerated to advance level, while the control group means score had also increased yet still belongs to intermediate level. Thus, the results showed that the intervention is very effective compared to the traditional lecture method used in the control group.

The results of the study were in line with the findings of Hogan (2000) and Woodward (2004) as cited in Soberano (2010) who found out that intervention materials contributed to better learning of the concepts among students. She also mentioned that PB-SIMs improved the perceptions of students toward the subject.

The data presented in table 8 reveals the respondents grammar skills in the pretest and posttest on modals. As shown in the table, only the experimental group had accelerated the next level. This means that the said intervention had something to do on the improvement of the grammar skills of the respondents.

This result is similar to the study of Iranmanesh & Branch (2015) on teaching modal verbs using task-based versus traditional approaches. The results of their study indicated that there is a statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group, meaning that teaching modal verbs through task-based approaches has been more effective than teaching them in traditional ways.

**Table 8 : Mean Distribution of the Respondents’ Level of Grammar Skills in Pretest and Posttest in Modals**

Respondents	Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level
Control Group	4.25	Intermediate	4.94	Intermediate
Experimental Group	4.89	Intermediate	9.25	Advanced

*Legend: Advanced – 9-10; Upper Intermediate 7-8 ; Intermediate – 5-6  
Lower Intermediate – 3-4; Elementary - 1-2*

Consequently, the effectiveness of SIM was evident in the study of Lorenzana (2014) where he found out that the Strategic Intervention Material which was developed on English Grammar for Grade 8 of Tagudin National High School was very much acceptable to alleviate the performance of the students in English grammar.

The data presented in table 9 shows the summary of all the domains and overall pretest and posttest results in grammar comprehension skills of the respondents.

**Table 9 : Summary Table of Respondents’ Grammar Skills during Pretest and Post-Test**

Grammar Skills	Control Group				Experimental Group			
	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level	Mean	Proficiency Level
Verb Tenses	4.58	Intermediate	5.64	Intermediate	5.07	Intermediate	8.82	Advanced
Pronouns	4.46	Intermediate	5.74	Intermediate	5.12	Intermediate	8.71	Advanced
Prepositions	4.64	Intermediate	5.35	Intermediate	5.35	Intermediate	8.92	Advanced
Conjunctions	4.46	Intermediate	5.12	Intermediate	5.07	Intermediate	8.92	Advanced
Modals	4.25	Intermediate	4.94	Intermediate	4.89	Intermediate	9.25	Advanced
Overall	22.20	Intermediate	27.15	Intermediate	25.28	Intermediate	44.76	Advanced

*Legend: Advanced – 41-50; Upper Intermediate 31-40; Intermediate – 21-30  
Lower Intermediate – 11-20; Elementary - 0-10*

The data reveals that the overall mean score of the experimental group had increased and accelerated to advanced proficiency level during posttest, while the control group overall mean score had also increased yet did not accelerate to the next level. It signifies that the experimental group performed well in the post-test after the intervention was implemented.

This implies that the utilization of Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) in teaching grammar lessons is effective. From the interview conducted by the researcher, students responded these statements verbatimly, “the use of SIM helped me understand grammar lessons because the activities and tasks were easy”, “I enjoy reading and doing all the activities found in SIM because information were presented creatively”.

This is supported by Bunagan (2012) when he claimed that the use of Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) helped students to become independent and successful learners. Further, these studies revealed that the use of SIMs plays a pivotal role in elevating the memory level of the students, in grasping the different concepts, and with the integration of various strategies in the implementation of the material, the teaching-learning process becomes interesting.

**3. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents?**

**Significant Difference of Respondents’ Pretest and Posttest Scores**

Table 10 presents the summary of the t-test for the comparison on the grammar comprehension level of students taught using Strategic Intervention Materials and those who were taught using lecture method. The result shows that the mean level of the control and experimental group in pretest and posttest had a difference of 3.08 in favor of the experimental group. The improvement of the control group is only 4.95 during posttest. It also shows that the p-value is .000 which is lower than the .05 level of significance.

**Table 10 : Significant Difference between Pretest and Posttest Results**

Group	Pretest		Posttest		T	p	Interpretation
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Control	22.20	5.53	27.15	5.73	-16.464	.000	Significant
Experimental	25.28	5.73	44.76	2.64	-25.766	.000	Significant

Hence, the data is sufficient enough to reject the hypothesis. There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest of the control group.

In the experimental group, analysis revealed a mean of 25.28 in the pretest and 44.76 in the posttest. There is a big difference of 19.48 which indicated that the mean score has significantly improved; thus, improving their proficiency level as well. From the intermediate level in pretest, they moved up to the advanced level. The analysis further revealed that the p -value is 0.000 which is less than the significance level of 0.05. This means that there is indeed a significant difference between the grammar comprehension levels of the experimental group in pretest and posttest. This discloses that Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) significantly improved the level of students’ grammar comprehension skills in the experimental group. The result of the study is similar to the findings of Lorenzana (2014) that his developed Strategic Intervention Material was very effective in improving the performance of his students in English grammar. The use of intervention material in English grammar helps students become independent and self-directed learners.

**4. Is there a significant difference in differences between pretest and posttest scores of the respondents?**

**Significant Difference in Differences of Respondents’ Pretest and Posttest Scores**

Table 11 shows the pretest scores on the grammar skills of the control and experimental groups. It can be observed in the data that the students from the experimental group had better improved their grammar comprehension skills after the intervention.

**Table 11 : Significant Difference between the Control and Experimental Groups’ Grammar Skills in Posttest Scores and DID Result**

Group	Experimental	Control	Difference	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
-------	--------------	---------	------------	---------	---------	----------------



Pretest	25.28	22.20	-3.08	-10.1	0.00	Significant
Posttest	44.76	27.15	-17.61			
Difference	19.48	4.95	-14.53			

This result implies that the lecture method used in presenting the lessons in the control group has a lesser impact in improving the respondents' grammar comprehension compared to the experimental group where utilization of SIM was employed. That is to say that lecture method is still an effective method in the teaching-learning process because it still helps students to improve their scores; only the effectiveness was lesser compared to the SIM intervention.

As reiterated by Killen (2007), lecture method is good for teaching specific facts and basic skills and good for introduction of new subject or topic to learners. However, he also mentioned that lecture method may not be effective for higher order thinking skills. It can stifle learner's creativity and often turn to passive learners (Killen, 2007; Freiberg and Driscoll, 2000).

As shown in the table, during posttest the experimental group had very high mean scores compared to the control group. This implies that the difference on the level of students' grammar comprehension skills between control and experimental groups may be attributable to the interventions made.

**5. Is there a significant difference in the level of grammar comprehension skills of the respondents when grouped according to profile?**

**Significant Difference in the Level of Grammar Skills of the Respondents According to Profile**

Table 12 displays the analysis of variance of the students' level on grammar comprehension skills when grouped according to their age. The data revealed that there was no significant difference on the students' level on grammar skills when classified according to their demographic profile specifically on age.

This result exposes that the age of the students does not have a significant difference on the level of the grammar comprehension skills of the respondents. It may imply that various factors affect the socio-cultural and psychological adjustment of the students most especially in learning English grammar lessons. Though there are studies found out a significant relationship between age and proficiency level of students yet there are also some studies found no significant relationship between age and students' achievement.

One of these studies is the study of Krausz et al. (2005), who revealed that there is no superior association between students' performance in the initial required graduate financial accounting class and their TOEFL scores. The study explored that language proficiency was not significantly associated with the variables: age, gender or year of study.

**Table 12 : Analysis of Variance in the Grammar Comprehension Level when Grouped According to Demographic Profile in Terms of Age**

Demographic Profile	Grammar Comprehension Level	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Tense of Verbs	0.073	0.942	Not Significant
	Pronouns	.349	.170	Not Significant
	Prepositions	0.400	0.689	Not Significant
	Conjunctions	-0.047	0.963	Not Significant
	Modals	0.254	0.800	Not Significant
	Overall	0.236	0.814	Not Significant

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 Level

Table 13 displays the analysis of variance of student’s grammar comprehension level when grouped according to their sex. The data reveals that there was no significant difference on the student’s grammar comprehension level when classified according to their demographic profile in terms of sex. This result exposes that sex of the students does not have a significant difference on their grammar comprehension level.

As Wheldall and Limbrick (2010) maintain these findings are consistent with Hyde’s (2005) hypothesis of gender similarities, which suggests that boys and girls are more alike than different on most psychological variables, including reading, based on a review of 46 meta analyses covering a variety of cognitive abilities and psychological traits.

**Table 13 : Analysis of Variance in Grammar Comprehension Level when Grouped According to Demographic Profile in Terms of Sex**

Demographic Profile	Grammar Comprehension Level	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Sex	Tense of Verbs	0.153	0.842	Not Significant
	Pronouns	0.320	.340	Not Significant
	Prepositions	0.400	0.689	Not Significant
	Conjunctions	-0.027	0.363	Not Significant
	Modals	0.260	0.700	Not Significant
	Overall	0.128	0.778	Not Significant

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 14 displays the analysis of variance of student’s grammar comprehension level when grouped according to their academic performance. The data reveal that the grammar skills and the scores from all the domains of grammar and its overall scores indicated that student’s academic performance in English during the 1<sup>st</sup> grading period had nothing to do with their level of grammar comprehension skills. This result exposes that academic performance of the students does not have a significant difference on their grammar comprehension level.

**Table 14 : Analysis of Variance in Grammar Comprehension Level when Grouped According to Demographic Profile in Terms of Academic Performance**

Demographic Profile	Grammar Comprehension Level	F-value	p-value	Interpretation
Academic Performance	Tense of Verbs	2.434	0.089	Not Significant
	Pronouns	1.260	0.280	Not Significant
	Prepositions	0.716	0.672	Not Significant
	Conjunctions	2.153	0.236	Not Significant
	Modals	0.643	0.253	Not Significant
	Overall	1.879	0.302	Not Significant

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 level

This result implies that students’ grades are not a measurement of student’s achievement particularly in learning grammar lessons. This is because there are other factors that affect students’ performance such as learning styles, socio-economic status, educational and family background, emotional and social aspects and teacher factor.

Comparable results reported by Bashosh et al. (2013) revealed that there was no remarkable correlation between shyness, foreign language anxiety and students' readiness to communicate with their proficiency of English language. The results also did not observe any statistically significant association between language proficiency and academic achievement.

### 6. What are the benefits that students gained from Strategic Intervention Material?

Table 15 presents the benefits gained by the respondents in the experimental group during the interview.

**Table 15 : Benefits Gained by the Students from Strategic Intervention Material (SIM)**

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
1. Better understanding on the basic concepts of grammar	8	21
2. Increased self-confidence	8	21
3. Improved sentence constructions and usage of grammar	7	17
4. Improved reading comprehension skills	6	15
5. Overcome difficulties in English subject	5	13
6. Improved ability to use the English language	5	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>

As disclosed in the interview, there are 6 benefits mentioned by the respondents in the integration of Strategic intervention Material (SIM); better understanding on the basic concepts of grammar, increased self-confidence, improved sentence constructions and proper usage of grammar, improved reading comprehension skills, overcome difficulties in English subject, and improved ability to use the English language. These imply that the use of Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) made a great impact to the students in learning grammar lessons and the English language as well. It provides meaningful benefits that help students to become successful learners.

This is supported by Jerome Bruner's constructivist theory of learning in which the learners construct new ideas or concept based upon their current/past experience or knowledge. It advocates the notion that learners are constructors of their own knowledge and not passive recipients of knowledge. Further, Berger (2006) stated that providing appropriate approaches and strategies in teaching grammatical rules, forms patterns and structures, the primary goal of teaching grammar will be achieved which is the competency in communication. Thus, the use of non-threatening, imaginative and useful activities in teaching grammar has been tried through the efforts of many teachers within the English curriculum (Ho & Caroline, 2011).

### Conclusion

The study concludes that Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) can bring effective teaching and learning process. Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) may ensure some pedagogical issues confronting teachers' principles, methods, and strategies in teaching and learning and may alter traditional classroom practices. Nonetheless, the potential impact of SIM aided instruction in teaching and learning is beyond measure. Therefore, it has been proven in this study that Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) has an important role to play in the present and future education of the learners of this generation.

Moreover, the study confirms Jerome Bruner's Theory that learning is an active process in which the learners construct new ideas or concept based upon their current or past experience or knowledge. As Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) was used in the teaching-learning process, the students were observed to be more engaged and highly motivated. The activities and tasks presented in the materials allow students

to discover and explore their own learning and work independently in solving problems and helped students better comprehend English language rules, structures and forms.

## References

1. Bashosh, S., et. al. (2013). The relationship between shyness, foreign language classroom anxiety, willingness to communicate, gender, and EFL proficiency. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 2098-2106. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.11.2098-2106>
2. Berger, J. (2006). Transforming writers through grammar study. *English Journal*, 95(5), 5359.
3. Bunagan, F. (2012). *Science intervention material*. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/felixbunagan/strategicintervention-material>
4. Caroline, & Ho, M. (2011). Empowering English teachers to grapple with errors in grammar. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. IX, No. 3.
5. Dacumos, L.P.N. (2016). Perspective of secondary teachers in the utilization of Science Strategic Intervention Material (SIM) in increasing learning proficiency of students in science education. *AsTEN Journal of Teacher Education*, 1 (2).
6. DepEd Order No. 8, s.2015. [www.deped.gov.ph](http://www.deped.gov.ph). Date Retrieved: May 19, 2016.
7. Diaz, E. & Dio, R. V. (2017). Effectiveness of tri-in-1 strategic intervention materials for grade 9 students through Solomon four-group design. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 4 (1), 79-86.
8. Dy, L. (2011). *Teaching Physics through strategic intervention materials* Retrieved from <http://jhody.hubpages.com/hub/teaching-physics-through-strategic-intervention-materials-sim>
9. EFA Global monitoring report 2005. Retrieved from [http://www.unesco.org/education/gmr\\_download/chapter2.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/education/gmr_download/chapter2.pdf)
10. Freiberg, H.J. & Driscoll, A. (2000). *Universities teaching strategies*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. London: Allyn & Bacon.
11. Garcia, E. (2016). English language learners writing: Influencing use of pronouns. *Capstone projects and Master's Theses*. 570. Retrieved from [https://digitalcommons.csumb.edu/caps\\_thes/570](https://digitalcommons.csumb.edu/caps_thes/570)
12. Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60, 581–592. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.6.581>
13. Iranmanesh, H. & Branch, K. (2015). Teaching modal verbs: Task-based vs. traditional approaches. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research – Volume 3, Issue 11*.
14. Killen, R. (2007). *Teaching strategies for quality teaching and learning*. RSA: Shuman printers.
15. Krausz, J. et al. (2005). The impact of TOEFL scores on placement and performance of international students in the initial graduate accounting class. *Accounting Education*, 14(1), 103-111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0963928042000256671>
16. Lam, Y. (2009). Applying cognitive linguistics to teaching the Spanish prepositions *por* and *para*. *Language Awareness*, 18 (1), 2-18.
17. Lee, V. J. (2008). A study of the influence of instructional innovation on learning satisfaction and study achievement. *The Journal of Human Resources & Adult Learning*, Volume 4, No. 2.
18. Lorenzana, A. L. (2014). Grammatical competencies in English of grade 8 students of Tagudin National High School: Input for strategic intervention material. *MSE Thesis*. Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Tagudin, Ilocos Sur.
19. Salviejo, E. I., Aranes, F.Q. & Espinosa, A.A. (2014). Strategic intervention material-based instruction, learning approach and students' performance in Chemistry. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 2 (1), 91-123.
20. Seow, A. and Tay, G. (2004) The acquisition of English personal and possessive pronouns in two classroom learning environments. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 8 (3). Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej31/a1.html>. Accessed June 2007.
21. Soberano, A. (2009). *Strategic intervention materials in Chemistry: Development and effectiveness*. Muntinlupa: SEAMEO RECSAM.

22. Togonon, I. (2011). Development and evaluation of Project – Based SIM (PB – SIM) in teaching high school Chemistry. *Master's Thesis*. Technological University of the Philippines.
23. Wheldall, K., & Limbrick, L. (2010). Do more boys than girls have reading problems? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 43, 418–429. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022219409355477>
24. 2011-12 National achievement test: Year four institutional performance profile. Retrieved from <http://depedpines.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/SEC.NAT-2012.pdf>
25. (2013). K to 12 English Curriculum Guide. *Department of Education*.