



Classifying Parts of Speech to Improve Word Recognition in Reading

Raúl Andrés Pinela Cárdenas

Guide: María Rossana Ramírez Ávila

Presented as Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of Magíster en Pedagogía de los Idiomas

Nacionales y Extranjeros con Mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés. CES: RPC-SO-25-N°.416-

2016. Cohort 2018-2020. Guayaquil, August 19th, 2020.

Abstract

This research study implemented classifying parts of speech to improve word recognition in reading. The research was applied in a public school in Milagro. The sample was 11 students with an A1 – A2 English level, according to the CEFR. This action researched was supported by qualitative and quantitative instruments: pre and posttests, pre-and post-surveys, and observations. Results demonstrated that the impact of this innovation was Cohen $d= 0.53$, which is a positive indicator of learning. Quantitative data showed that after the application, students improved their vocabulary, and they were able to recognize the parts of speech. Through the qualitative analysis of the surveys about their perspectives in learning vocabulary, they confirmed that it is difficult to learn it unless they dedicate time to do it. Based on the results, it could be concluded that classifying parts of speech was appropriate for students to improve their word recognition in reading. Implications of this study involve other English teachers who want to apply the same strategy with students from other levels.

Keywords: parts of speech, word recognition, reading, vocabulary

Resumen

Este estudio de investigación implementó la clasificación de partes del habla para mejorar el reconocimiento de palabras en la lectura. La investigación se aplicó en un colegio público en Milagro. La muestra fue de 11 estudiantes con un nivel de inglés A1 – A2 según el MCER. Esta acción investigada fue apoyada por instrumentos cualitativos y cuantitativos: pre y post-pruebas, pre- y post-encuestas, y observaciones. Los resultados demostraron que el impacto de esta innovación fue Cohen d-0,53, que es un indicador positivo del aprendizaje. Los datos cuantitativos mostraron que después de la aplicación los estudiantes mejoraron su vocabulario y fueron capaces de reconocer las partes del habla. A través del análisis cualitativo de las encuestas sobre sus perspectivas en el aprendizaje del vocabulario, confirmaron que es difícil aprenderlo a menos que dediquen tiempo a hacerlo. Sobre la base de los resultados, se podría concluir que la clasificación de partes del habla era apropiada para que los estudiantes mejoraran su reconocimiento de palabras en la lectura. Las implicaciones de este estudio involucran a otros profesores de inglés que quieren aplicar la misma estrategia con estudiantes de otros niveles.

Palabras clave: partes del habla, reconocimiento de palabras, lectura, vocabulario

Classifying Parts of Speech to Improve Word Recognition in Reading

People read a variety of information for different purposes; reading helps grow mentally, emotionally, and psychologically. Besides that, every time people read, they learn something different. Reading aids in gaining more vocabulary in the EFL context. (Heid, 2019).

Furthermore, reading helps learners to be able to comprehend a wide range of passages as well as to communicate. As a result, they will become proficient in the language (Ellis, 2005).

One of the difficulties that L2 readers have is the capacity to expand or process L2 texts since most of their cognitive resources are spent on translations, and this is more common with beginners. As a result, they feel frustrated and block themselves with the learning of the target language. (Mandokoro, 2018).

Krashen (2013) pointed out that the way how people acquire language is when they understand messages that have parts of vocabulary and grammar; this means that if learners are capable of understanding these aspects, their input will be more comprehensible. As a result, their output will be more fruitful. Klein (1986, as cited in Eddy, 2004) stated that the way people acquire a new language is when they study it consciously, knowing how it works, and what the rules and principles are. Students are conscious when they produce, for instance, when they work on a writing or speaking activity.

In 2012, the Ministry of Education (Ministerio de Educación, 2014) presented a document entitled “The English Language Learning Standards” that showed the level of English that students must meet at the end of every school year. These standards were taken from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). They include standards for the four language skills: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Organizations like OECD, UNECLAC, DBA have conducted studies focused on reading skills. (Ministerio de Educación, 2014)

Studies conducted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, and Development Bank of Latin America showed that students in Latin America have a low rank in reading comprehension in L1 (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, & Development bank of Latin America, 2017). There is a similar situation in Latin America and the Caribbean, as reported by UNESCO (2009), where it showed that students have deficient reading levels. Recognized institutions like British Council in Quito have created reading corners to foster reading as they did in their project called “Book Corner at Henry Foundation for Children,” where they helped children by dedicating some time during the day to read. (BISEE Books, 2016).

Authors like Jarra and Binti (2018) have conducted studies in this field where they consider the need to look for the factors that affect learners’ performance in reading. On the other hand, Meniado (2016) stated that motivation plays an essential role in students’ motivation. Furthermore, Garcia (2019) mentioned in her study that all of the teachers applied identical procedures of teaching reading comprehension, like giving tasks and asking students to answer the questions correctly. Similarly, a study conducted by Contreras (2019) concluded that learners have excellent reading skills because they practice it by themselves.

After results in the proficiency test of the participants of this study, it appears that their weakest skill in the language is reading because they were not able to answer comprehension questions correctly. Therefore, this study focused on classifying parts of speech so that they can recognize vocabulary in texts.

Akyo et al. (2017) stated that readers that have difficulty with word recognition might lose the meaning of the text; these students tend to feel more anxious during reading tasks. On the

other hand, there is very little literature indicating that classifying parts of speech improve word recognition in reading (Shanahan, 2010, as cited in Orton Gillingham Online Academy, 2017).

Furthermore, literature that evidences the contrary has not been found, specifically regarding classifying parts of speech to improve word recognition in reading. Although some studies have proved a different opinion about parts of speech in word recognition, Hayes (2016) indicated that sight words are a foundation for other reading skills such as fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Whereas Ehri (2017) indicated that phonological recoding is translating letters to sounds by application of letter-sound rules so readers can recognize the identities of words.

Therefore, the present study aimed at analyzing the effects of classifying parts of speech to improve word recognition in reading. Furthermore, the study's objective was to know students' perspectives on learning vocabulary through the classification of words into parts of speech.

Literature Review

In this section, it is mainly considered the literature that involves the study conducted, how people learn a new skill, especially in reading comprehension by classifying parts of speech. There were also comparisons between different theories and authors.

When students learn a new language, they are exposed to many factors: motivation, attitude, and cognition. They have a high impact on the process of learning a second language (Khasinah, 2014). According to Tomlinson (2013), some of the elements that facilitate the acquisition of a new language is the affective and cognitive engagement since these help students to interact among others (Tomlinson, 2013). Teachers should implement these elements when they are planning their classes so students are engaged, and they will be more likely to participate.

Long (2012, as cited in Tomlinson, 2013) stated that it is necessary to encourage learners to interact with their classmates since this creates favorable conditions for the acquisition of the

language. As a result, students will produce more in classes, and they will use the target language more as well as they will improve it.

Another theory that could help students to be willing to learn more things is motivation. Motivation could help in the students' learning process. Krashen (2003, as cited in Lessard-Clouston, 2018) mentioned that the affective filter hypothesis could block any input for acquisition; this means students will not continue learning if they feel uncomfortable or nervous, or if they even have self-esteem issues. Therefore, a high affective filter blocks any student from learning, whereas a low affective filter does the opposite.

Teachers should motivate students, select the right material, and make the classes more interactive because these will help learners become more familiar with the target language. It is necessary to review what the authors have proved in the studies they have conducted when it comes to classifying parts of speech. Knowing the parts will facilitate its understanding and how teachers could use the correct methodology in the classes.

Word Recognition

Vocabulary is a crucial component of reading comprehension, and several techniques facilitate the development of core vocabulary with students, for instance, instructions of words that activate students' schemata developing links between meanings and letters, and lexical transfer that helps to the process of learning words with L2 translation. (Pan, 2017).

According to Proctor et al. (2012, as cited in Almache, 2019), vocabulary depth involves knowledge of semantic and syntactic of each word. This knowledge is useful in writing and reading because this facilitates better comprehension of texts. The knowledge of parts of speech promotes syntax.

Goh et al. (2016) pointed out that the goal of reading is semantic of the message, in other words, understanding the meaning or interpretations of words, for instance, the word human can be referred to as a female, male, baby, child, and the extent of which words co-occur

with other words in the language. Furthermore, the word-form similarity between the target word with other words in the mental lexicon has shown to influence recognition latencies.

One of the branches of grammar is the syntax that refers to the rule in how phrases, clauses, and sentences are formed. It is also one of the significant components in grammar since it is how questions start or how a noun is described or how nouns are used before verbs (Mandokoro, 2018).

Another branch in grammar, according to Marantz (2016), is morphology that refers to the study of word structures, especially of morphemes, which are the smallest units of a language. They build words and phrases, for instance, suffixes or affixes. Augustyn (2016) stated that morphology also includes the grammatical process of inflection and derivation where inflection refers to person, tense, and case; for example, “works” has a final “s,” which indicates it belongs to the 3rd person singular. In contrast, the derivation is the form of new words from existing words; for example, “teacher” from “teach.”

Morphemes are important for phonics in both reading and spelling. As stated by Carrell (1998, as cited in Gamboa, 2017), reading was perceived as a decoding process of printed letters and words, and as a result, authors see it as an attachment to oral skills. On the other hand, authors such as Rumelhart (1980), Johnson (1981), among others, stated that the reading process is not only extracting information from the texts but a process in which reading activates learners’ previous knowledge (Grabe, 1988).

Chard and Osborn (2019) stated that for students to improve their word recognition, teachers should provide opportunities to become familiar with a wide range of aspects of reading. For instance, alphabetic knowledge, phonemic awareness, sound-symbol relation, spelling, and writing connections, where writing connections and alphabetic knowledge belongs to parts of speech. Each of these characteristics will help students understand and be able to write their own words and messages to show they comprehended the topic.

Parts of Speech

Haslam (2019) mentioned that there are eight traditional classifications of parts of speech in English: noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection, where nouns are words for a name, place, or thing. Pronouns are words that take place after the nouns, and prepositions are words to describe information about location, purpose, and direction. Also, adjectives are words that describe or modify other words, and verbs are words to describe an action, state, or occurrence. Adverbs are words that qualify an adjective, verb, or other adverbs. Conjunctions are words used to connect clauses or sentences. Interjections are exclamations.

Furthermore, there are two main types of word classes in parts of speech, content words, and function words. Content words carry real meaning, for instance: noun, verb, adjective, and adverb, whereas function words carry grammatical meaning, for instance: prepositions, auxiliaries, and quantifiers (Anastassiou & Andreou, 2017). Besides, Nugues (2006) mentioned that parts of speech could be clustered into two main classes: the closed class and the open class. The former are words that have a functional role, for instance, the articles. The latter are words that appear or disappear with the evolution of the language.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

According to Richards (2015a), the way how students learn a language has changed drastically, and CLT is a response to the changes in understanding. In the last years, language learning is seen as a result of different processes, for instance, collaborative creation of meaning, negotiation of meaning, trying out and experimenting with different ways of saying things. These help learners improve their skills and engage more in classes (Richards, 2015b).

Adobe Spark

When teachers use technology in class, learners tend to be more curious and engaged in what the teacher will present. Adobe Spark is a tool that could help students learn more

vocabulary through flashcards. Arnhem and Pieta (2017) indicated that Adobe Spark is a potential tool that helps to create template-driven pages, posts, and video projects. Moreover, it is a host of educator resources in the classroom since they are useful for lesson plans, and examples of student work, among others.

Backward Design

Yurtseven and Altun (2017) indicated that Backward Design is a curricula planning framework that reflects the research for both cognitive psychology and neuroscience. Moreover, it is based on the transfer on learning, long term outcomes, when learners can perform the understanding through real situations. Regular reviews of the curricula of Backward Design enhance curricular excellence, leading to a more in-depth grade of learning and understanding; that is why it is essential to adjust the curriculum and instructions to magnify students' learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Gender

The American Psychological Association in this article "Gender Differences in Reading and Writing Achievement: Evidence from the National Assessment of Educational Progress" mentions that there is almost no difference in cognitive abilities in males and females. However, Dwyer (1973, as mentioned in Reilly et al., 2018) mentioned that girls have a faster rate of maturation and may obtain higher proficiency, making reading enjoyable and more comfortable. That means that as the brain matures, it begins to choose what information is essential or not, and that happens faster with girls than with boys.

It was necessary to analyze the different elements like CLT, Backward Design, Parts of speech that formed part of the innovation because this helps teachers apply better methodologies in class, and be able to understand how the learning process is developed.

After revising students' results with a low score in the tests applied and the literature gap mentioned previously, it was necessary to implement an innovation to solve this issue. As a

result, the following hypothesis emerges “Classifying parts of speech improves word recognition in reading.” This hypothesis led to these research questions:

- To what extent does classifying parts of speech improve word recognition in reading?
- Does classifying parts of speech change students’ perspectives in learning vocabulary?
- Is there a difference in reading between gender?

Innovation

The innovation consisted of classifying parts of speech to enhance word recognition in reading. For the implementation, the researcher used the backward design model. Participants of this study belonged to a public school in Milagro. They were tenth graders. The sample was a group of 11 participants. The experimental group learned how to recognize the different parts of speech to expand their vocabulary and facilitate reading.

The material that the researcher worked with is the book given by the educational authorities and extra materials. The additional materials were consciously thought to help strengthen students’ performance in reading comprehension activities, taking into consideration the structure of sentences.

The innovation included a general review of the parts of the speech. During the implementation, students got familiar with word recognition strategies through the practice of exercises for five weeks. During this period, they had five hours of class per week, and each class lasted 35 minutes.

Students classified new words into the parts of the speech according to the context of the reading. Students looked at the different parts of speech by seeing examples created on Adobe Sparks. Students worked on the tasks individually, and in groups, each week, there was a newly updated list of words according to the passages worked in classes.

Moreover, the researcher included worksheets, warm-ups, and a variety of activities to engage students in the process. See the lesson plan in Appendix 1 for further information.

Materials and Methods

The researcher applied Action Research (AR). Ravid (2015) pointed out that the methodology in the proposal was designed to describe and clarify the way how the researcher conducted the study.

Participants

Eleven students formed the sample for this study. Their level was A1-A2, eight students got A1, and three got A2 according to the CEFR. The participants were from a public high school in Milagro. Participants were tenth graders; there were 11 participants in total where 4 are boys, and 7 are girls. Their range age was between 13 – 16 years old.

Instruments

Before the study, students took a placement test from Education First to know their English level according to the CEFR. The instruments to collect data and answer the research questions were observations, pre and posttest, and a survey.

Pre and posttest.

This instrument answered the research question one (improvement in word recognition) and three (difference in reading because of gender). At the beginning of the research, participants took a pretest to know what the average score in the class is, and posttest to know if the innovation applied with the sample had an impact in students' learning process. The pre and posttest consisted of three questions each. Students had to classify the different parts of speech by analyzing some passages as well as a reading comprehension question.

Results of the pre and posttest indicated an improvement in reading comprehension, which was also reported in students' results of the survey and the observations done.

Observations.

For this method, field notes were used to collect the data required. The researcher observed students' behavior during the class as well as their attitude towards the tasks in everyday session.

Some of the observations were that students could not continue doing the different exercises where they did not understand a keyword in the order that was given. Also, students were able to recognize cognates, which are words that are similar to their L1. (Appendix 4)

Survey.

Participants took a survey before and after the innovation to know if, in the end, they change their perspectives. The survey was taken from a peer review study conducted by Almache (2019).

Ethical Standards

It is relevant for the study to specify the ethical standards the researcher took before conducting the implementation. The principal of the high school was contacted to obtain approval and permission to collect data.

The principal was informed about the aim of the study and the amount of time required to execute it. Furthermore, participants and their parents were informed about the activities, and the use of the data collected. Additionally, the anonymity of participants was protected by assigning numbers to each of them, keeping the identity of the individuals confidential.

Data Analysis

RQ1: To what extent does classifying parts of speech improve word recognition in reading?

Participants took a pre and posttest to get the results from this research question, where the researcher got the maximum, minimum, median, and standard deviation using excel at first to collect all the data. Then the information was introduced in the SPSS program. Also, this information was used to get the Cohen's d, where it was analyzed the difference between two means, and know the impact the innovation had on the study.

RQ2: Does classifying parts of speech change students' perspectives in learning vocabulary?

To obtain the results from this research question, students took a pre and post-survey; this information showed if participants have acquired vocabulary while they were receiving the training. The researcher analyzed each item and decided what the ones that were related to the study conducted were. To raise the validity of these answers, observations, and field notes were made.

The results of the pre and posttest, survey and observations were triangulated to support the results. Methodological triangulation refers to the process by which the researcher put together the data provided by the instruments applied in the study.

RQ3: Is there a difference in reading between gender?

Students took a demographic survey where they specified their gender. Also, when classifying the data in SPSS, for both genders, it was assigned a number. This information was used to make a t-test of independent samples and determine if there is a difference between genders.

Results

Q1. To what extent does classifying parts of speech improve word recognition in reading?

Table 1 displays the number of pretest and posttest values, standard deviation, and the effect size. The effect size value ($d=0.53$) is considered as a medium effect. Data from the pretest displays a mean of 5.36 ($SD=2.79$). Contrary, data collected from the posttest displays a mean of 6.64 ($SD=1.87$). The p -value was 0.01, so that means, it is statistically significant, the results were positive due to the intervention and not to any other variable.

Table 1

Pre and posttest descriptive statistics

| |
|---|
| Pre and posttest descriptive statistics |
|---|

| | N | Mea n | Std. Deviation | Effect size | P-value |
|-----------|----|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|
| Pre-test | 11 | 5.36 | 2.79 | 0.53 | 0.01 |
| Post-test | 11 | 6.64 | 1.87 | | |

Results of the pre and posttest were also recognized by students in the results of the survey.

Q.2. Does classifying parts of speech change students' perspectives in learning vocabulary?

A Likert scale survey was taken at the beginning and at the end of the implementation period to analyze participants' perceptions in learning vocabulary. Table 2 shows the results of the pre and post-survey. It was evidenced by the mean from the pretest (3.6) and posttest (4) that students felt more capable of understanding a short, simple text after the implementation.

Table 2

Pre-survey and post-survey results in learning vocabulary.

| | Mean Pre-survey | Mean Post-survey |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| Q1. I can understand a short, simple text. | 3.6 | 3.8 |
| Q2. I understand single phrases at a time. | 4 | 4.6 |
| Q3. I pick up familiar words or phrases in passages. | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| Q4. I understand a short text with the first reading. | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| Q5. I understand a short text by rereading it. | 3.8 | 4 |
| Q6. I can classify words according to their function in a sentence. | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| Q7. I can recognize a noun. | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Q8. I can recognize a verb. | 3.8 | 3.7 |

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| Q9. I can recognize an adjective. | 3.3 | 3.5 |
| Q10. I can recognize an adverb. | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Q11. When I read, I translate all the words? | 3.2 | 3.8 |

Overall, there is an improvement in the results' means of the pre and post-survey.

Students at the end of the intervention felt more capable of recognizing parts of the speech as it is observed in statements 6, 7, 9, and 10. Furthermore, statements regarding vocabulary learning showed an improvement in pre and post results as it is observed in statements 2, 4, 5.

However, some items reduced their means, and some of them had not much difference as in the pre-survey. For instance, in items 3 and 8, the means in the pre-survey were higher than in the post-survey, this might be due to students' perspectives in learning vocabulary since they thought their vocabulary was better at first. It is observed that students continue translating words because of their lack of vocabulary in item 12. In item 6, the mean in the pre-survey was 3.1, and in the post-survey, it was 3.2, so there was not much difference, this is related to the following questions where there is not a significant increase in students' English levels.

Table 3

Pre-survey and post-survey results in vocabulary knowledge.

| | Pre – survey | Post - survey |
|---|---|---|
| Q12. I feel the knowledge of vocabulary in English is | 60% Intermediate 30% Basic 10% Beginner | 36.4 % Intermediate 54.5% Basic 9.1% Beginner |

In question 12, before the intervention, students thought their English level was good, but after it, they thought they still needed to learn many things about the language, especially

vocabulary. Moreover, there was an increase in the number of students who have a basic level, and the intermediate level decreased.

Table 4

Pre-survey and post-survey results in learning vocabulary perspectives.

| | Pre – survey | Post - survey |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Q13. I think learning vocabulary is complex? | 70% Yes 30% No | 81.8% Yes 18.2% No |

In question 13, at the end of the intervention, students changed their perspectives in learning vocabulary; they thought it was easier only if they dedicate time to study the language. Some of their answers were:

“It is difficult because of the writing and pronunciation.”

“Some words are pronounced exactly the same, but the writing is different, vocabulary is necessary to understand texts.” At the beginning of the intervention, 70% of students thought learning vocabulary was complex, and at the end of the study, the percentage increased.

The survey also included open questions, relevant quotes by questions are presented:

Q14 focused on how students feel when they see a passage. Some of their answers were:

“I feel stressed” – “I am attracted to know what it means.” Their answers to this question might be due to a lack of vocabulary and because they are curious to learn more words.

Question 15 focused on students’ perspectives about English words if they think English was or not easy to learn. Some of their answers in the pre-survey were:

- “They are not easy because the writing is sometimes confusing: god – good.”
- “Some of them are easy because they are similar to Spanish, and some others are not.”
- “They are not easy because I still do not know much about the topic.”

Whereas in the post-survey, their perspective changed since one of their answers was: “Most of them are easy and others not because of their pronunciation.” That varies according to each student's perspective; for some, they are easy if they study; for others, they are difficult due to the content.

Moreover, field notes were taken to analyze students' behavior. The researched coded the categories, for instance: feelings, difficulties, and questions. It was observed that when students were working on different tasks, and they did not understand a word in the exercise, they felt frustrated and immediately asked for help. When they worked on reading passages, they had to recognize to what category the word belonged, it was difficult for them at first, but then they got familiar with this kind of exercise. Vocabulary played a vital role during this innovation since this could help them understand the goal of the tasks.

Q3. Is there a difference in reading between gender?

A paired sample t-test was carried out to answer this question, comparing the pretest and posttest means from the male and females. A $p=0.000$ means that there is a statistically significant difference, which means there is a difference between gender in this innovation.

Discussion

The results show the success of the implementation in classifying parts of the speech to improve word recognition in reading. Students demonstrated progress at the end of the innovation since they could understand more content in reading as well as recognize the different words in it, as Proctor et al. (2012, as cited in Almache, 2019) mentioned vocabulary depth involves knowledge of semantic, syntactic, and morphological components of each word.

In a study conducted by Chard and Osborn (2019) stated that for students to improve word recognition, teachers should provide opportunities to become familiar with a range of aspects of reading. As he proposed, in this study, students became familiar with the function of words; hence, they were able to improve their reading comprehension skills.

According to the first research question: To what extent does classifying parts of speech improve word recognition in reading? The results were positive since students studied a wide range of aspects of reading, like alphabetic knowledge and writing connections. Chard and Osborn (2019) sustained, to improve word recognition, teachers should provide opportunities to students, so they become familiar with the different contents.

Moreover, students became more familiar with the different parts of speech as Haslam (2019) stated, there are eight traditional classifications of parts of speech in English: noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection, during the intervention students, had the opportunity to practice the different parts of speech since they were exposed to different contents where they had to recognize them.

For the second question: Does classifying parts of speech change students' perspectives in learning vocabulary? Most of the students changed their perspective in learning vocabulary; some of them considered it was difficult to learn because of their pronunciation. However, only if they dedicate time, they could improve their vocabulary. To illustrate, before the application, 70% of the participants responded that learning vocabulary is complex. After the intervention, the percentage increased to 81.8% of participants who thought that learning vocabulary is not easy. Furthermore, during the implementation, students showed motivation to learn the language. According to Long (2012, as cited in Tomlinson, 2013) indicated that it is necessary to encourage learners to interact with their classmates since this creates favorable conditions for the acquisition of the language; hence, they were likely to participate more in class.

Finally, for the last research question: Is there a difference in reading between gender? Based on the results, it showed there is a difference between genders since girls performed better in the different tasks, and this compares to the study conducted by Dwyer (1973, as mentioned in Reilly et al., 2018) where it is showed that girls have a faster rate of maturation. Therefore, they may obtain a higher proficiency in reading, making it more enjoyable and more comfortable.

Although students found classifying parts of speech difficult at first since they felt nervous or anxious when working on the tasks, at the end of the training, they felt more capable, and they expressed that this strategy helped them understand messages better. This supports Goh et al. (2016) affirmation that the goal of reading is semantic of the message, that means to understand the meaning and interpretations of words, and as many researches in the area (Akoy et al., 2017; Hayes, 2016) suggested that in word recognition, specifically, sight words are a foundation for other reading skills such as fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Therefore, the implementation of classifying parts of speech to improve word recognition seems to have a positive impact on students' performance in reading.

Conclusion

After the five weeks of the implementation, the pre and post results, survey and observations, demonstrated that most of the participants had improved their reading comprehension skills as well as to recognize the different parts of speech. The study showed a positive effect on students since they can recognize better how to construct sentences/questions. Moreover, since they studied a wide range of topics, they are aware of the different cultures around the world.

In the study, most of the innovation focused on content words since students did exercises on recognizing nouns, verbs, and adjectives. However, they also reviewed function words since they learned what prepositions are as well. Through surveys, students' perspectives were evidenced when they expressed their opinions if learning vocabulary in English is complex or not, they mentioned that if they dedicate time, they will be able to improve their vocabulary.

When responding to *Can statements survey*, most of the students presented positive results after the innovation in contrast to the pretest results. The results were positive since students felt more capable of recognizing words, although some students changed their perspective in learning vocabulary as it was explained in the discussion section.

For the most part, it was demonstrated that classifying parts of speech can be seen as an effective strategy to improve word recognition in reading. Even though this study was conducted in a public school with tenth graders whose English levels were A1-A2, it could also be implemented with students from different institutions and levels so that students can improve their reading skills, as in a study conducted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, and Development Bank of Latin America where it showed that students in Latin America have a low rank in reading comprehension (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, & Development bank of Latin America, 2017)

Limitations

Although the implementation had positive results, some limitations arose when working on the innovation.

First, it was very laborious to adapt to this new way of learning, because some of the students were novel in technology; therefore, they had to learn how to work on different platforms. Also, some of them did not have a good internet connection, so sometimes it was difficult for them to join the classes. Second, students' prior knowledge about the topics explained as well as their English level. Since some of them were A2, they finished the different activities before the others, as well as when explaining them the topics they understood things faster.

Third, the researcher could not compare the results with a control group since it was difficult to reach other students, and it was only possible to work with one group, which was the one that had the training. Finally, the sample was short. In the beginning, it was expected to work with 35 students, but because of the current situation, it was only possible to contact 11 students.

This situation might affect the reliability of the study. For further research, it should be considered to have a larger sample.

Recommendations

It would be recommendable that for future research, it is considered a more extensive sample as it was mentioned in the limitations section because this increases reliability and empowers statistical results.

Furthermore, having a control group should be taking into consideration to compare the results of both groups and re-affirm that the implementation was positive. Also, more instruments like interviews and recordings could be included for the triangulation method.

Future studies should consider working on a more extended period of time for the training since this demands much time to cover with all the different parts of the study. Specifically, when it comes to classifying the different parts of speech.

References:

- Almache, G. (2019). *Classifying Vocabulary to Improve Reading Comprehension in EFL Learners* (Master's thesis. Casa Grande University, Guayaquil, Ecuador). Retrieved from <http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/handle/ucasagrande/1806>.
- Akyol, H., Çakiroğlu, A., & Kuruyer, H. G. (2017). A study on the development of reading skills of the students having difficulty in reading: Enrichment reading program. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(2), 199-212.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262289985_A_Study_on_the_Development_of_Reading_Skills_of_the_Students_Having_Difficulty_in_Reading_Enrichment_Reading_Program
- Anastassiou, F., & Andreou, G. (2017). Speech Production of Trilingual Children: A Study on Their Transfers in Terms of Content and Function Words and the Effect of Their L1. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(6), 30-37. doi:10.5539/ijel.v7n6p30
- Augustyn, A. (2016) *Morphology*. The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/morphology-linguistics>
- Jarrah, H., & Binti, N. (2018). Reading Comprehension Difficulties Among EFL Learners in Higher Learning Institutions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(7), 32-35. doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n7p32
- Arnhem, V., & Pieta, J. (2017). *Mobile Apps for Libraries Adobe Spark: An All-in-One Content Creation Tool for Today's Production Needs* [Ebook] (p. 4). The Charleston Advisor. <https://doi.org/10.5260/chara.18.4.59>
- BISEE books. (2016). *Bisee Books' Activities*. Retrieved from <http://www.biseebooks.org.uk/our-activities/4585299504>

- Contreras, R. (2019). *Classifying Parts of the Speech to Improve Reading Comprehension in EFL University Learners* (Master's thesis. Casa Grande University, Guayaquil, Ecuador) Retrieved from <http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/handle/ucasagrande/1820>
- Chard, D., & Osborn, J. (2019). *Phonics and Word Recognition Instruction in Early Reading Programs: Guidelines for Children with Reading Disabilities*. Retrieved March 1, 2020, from <https://www.readingrockets.org/article/phonics-and-word-recognition-instruction-early-reading-programs-guidelines-children-reading>
- Eddy, E. (2004) *On the relationship between selected aspects of English grammar and cognitive processes in Slovak learners. English Matters II, 63*. [eBook edition]. University of Prešov. <https://www.pulib.sk/web/kniznica/elpub/dokument/Kacmarova2/subor/eddy.pdf>
- Ehri, L. C. (2017). Reconceptualizing the development of sight word reading and its relationship to recoding. Gough, P. & Treiman, R (Eds.), *Reading acquisition* (pp. 107-143). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781351236904/chapters/10.4324/9781351236904-5>
- Ellis, Rod. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System, 7*, 209-224. 10.1016/j.system.2004.12.006.
- Gamboa, Á. (2017). Reading Comprehension in English as a Foreign Language Setting: Teaching Strategies for Sixth-Graders Based on the Interactive Model of Reading. *Revista Folios, 45*,159-175. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3459/345949158012.pdf>
- García, D. (2019). *Classifying Vocabulary to Improve Reading Comprehension* (Master's thesis. Casa Grande University, Guayaquil, Ecuador) Retrieved from <http://dspace.casagrande.edu.ec:8080/handle/ucasagrande/2260>

- Goh, W. D., Yap, M. J., Lau, M. C., Ng, M. M., & Tan, L. C. (2016). Semantic richness effects in spoken word recognition: A lexical decision and semantic categorization megastudy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, pages 976. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00976>
- Grabe, W. (1998). Reassessing the term interactive. In P. Carrell, J. Devine & D. Eskey, (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 56- 70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haslam, M. (2019). Parts of Speech. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–8. doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0088
- Hayes, C. (2016). *The effects of sight word instruction on Students' reading abilities*. Retrieved from:
https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1327&context=education_ETD_masters
- Heid, M. (2019). *Why reading a book is important for the brain?* Retrieved from:
<https://elemental.medium.com/why-reading-books-is-important-for-the-brain-d6468dc0a26a>
- Hudson J. (2016) *What is the difference between content & function?* Retrieved from
<https://thesoundofenglish.org/content-function-words/>
- Johnson, P. (1981). Effects on reading comprehension of language complexity and cultural background of a text. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(2), 169-181. doi:10.2307/3586408
- Khasinah, Siti. (2014). Factors Influencing Second Language Acquisition. *Englisia Journal*, 1, 257-267. doi:10.22373/ej.v1i2.187.
- Krashen, S. (2013). *Second Language Acquisition* (p. 13). Stephen Krashen. Cambridge University Press. Mexico City, Mexico
- Lessard-Clouston, M. (2018). *Second language acquisition applied to English language teaching*. Virginia: TESOL Press.

- Mukarromah, I. (2020). A Morphosyntactical Analysis of University Students' Writing: Indonesian Case. *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 14(1), 33-43. doi:10.24843/e-jl. 2020.v14.i01.p04
- Mandokoro, R. (2018). *Effects of Reading Purposes on EFL Reading Comprehension: Comparing Reading for Multiple-Choice Tests and Essay Tests* [Ebook] (p. 21). Japan: Japan Language Testing Association. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.20622/jltajournal.21.0_23
- Marantz, A. (2016). *Neurobiology of Language: Morphology*. [eBook edition]. Academic Press. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780124077942000134?via%3Dihub>
- Meniado, J. C. (2016). Metacognitive Reading Strategies, Motivation, and Reading Comprehension Performance of Saudi EFL Students. *English Language Teaching*. 9(3), 117-129. doi: 10.5539/elt. v9n3p117
- Ministerio de Educación. (2014). *Curriculum Nacional [National Curriculum Guidelines]*. Retrieved from: <https://educacion.gob.ec/wpcontent/uploads/downloads/2014/09/01-National-Curriculum-Guidelines-EFL-Agosto-2014.pdf>
- Nugues, P. (2006) *Words, Parts of Speech, and Morphology*. In: *An Introduction to Language Processing with Perl and Prolog*. Cognitive Technologies. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. New York, USA
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, and Development Bank of Latin America (2017), *Perspectivas económicas de América Latina 2017: Juventud, competencias y emprendimiento [Economic prospects of Latin America 2017: Youth, skills and entrepreneurship]*, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/leo-2017-es>

- Orton Gillingham Online Academy (2017). *The importance of grammar in reading comprehension*. Retrieved from: <https://ortongillinghamonlinetutor.com/the-importance-of-grammar-in-reading-comprehension/>
- Pan, Y. C. (2017). Teaching vocabulary to improve reading comprehension. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 15(4), 38-40.
<http://www.cscanada.org/index.php/sll/article/view/10013/10555>
- Ravid, R. (2015). *Practical Statistics for Educators*. Rowman & Littlefield. Plymouth, UK
- Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2018). Gender differences in reading and writing achievement: Evidence from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 445-446. doi: 10.1037/amp0000356
- Richards, J. C. (2015). The changing face of language learning: Learning beyond the classroom. *RELC Journal*, 46(1), 5-22. Retrieved from: <https://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/The-Changing-Face-of-Language-Learning-RELC.pdf>
- Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). *Theoretical models and processes of reading*. Newark de: International Reading Association.
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Applied Linguistics and Materials Development. Second Language Acquisition and materials development*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- UNESCO. (2009). *Regional overview: Latin America and the Caribbean*. Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/gem-report/sites/gem-report/files/178428e.pdf>
- Yurtseven, N., & Altun, S. (2017). Understanding by Design (UbD) in EFL teaching: Teachers' professional development and students' achievement. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 17(2), 438 – 457. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1147498.pdf>

Appendix. No 1

Design from Your Goals¹

Available upon request.

¹ This unit design process was adapted from the Guillot Design Process worksheet (2017) *Design from Your Goals* based on Wiggins-McTighe Backward Design.

Appendix. No 2

Demographic Survey

Available upon request.

Appendix 3

Pretest survey

Students' perspectives toward vocabulary.

Available upon request.

Appendix 4

Teacher's field notes

Students' behavior towards tasks in class

Available upon request.