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Abstract

The present study sought to determine the current skills, competencies, and needs of the Senior High School (SHS) students in a public school in Metro Manila, Philippines, regarding academic reading and writing through needs analysis (NA). The NA uses two approaches: (1) present situation analysis (PSA), with a purpose of pointing out the English proficiency of students and their level in reading and writing in the second language at the onset of the course (Dudley-Evans & St Johns, 1998; Robinson, 1991 as cited in Ibrahim, 2016), and (2) learning needs analysis (LNA), which is referred to as, “what the learner needs to do to learn” (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987 as cited in Ibrahim, 2016, p.2). The researchers conducted a survey among 100 SHS students and triangulated the results through an item analysis of Reading and Writing diagnostic test administered to the participants and interview sessions with three English teachers, seven diagnostic test high scorers, and seven students with low scores. For reading, researchers identified these skills to be the main struggles of SHS students: (1) recognizing different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description, narration, etc.) in texts; (2) evaluating the coherence, organization, grammar, and mechanics of a text; (3) having poor vocabulary knowledge; and (4) identifying ways on how to select and organize information. For writing, the main challenges are (1) lack of topic-relevant background knowledge and topic-specific paper on texts, (2) insufficient knowledge and practice on writing with proper citation, (3) incorrect grammar, (4) shallow vocabulary, and (5) use of different patterns of development when writing. The present study recommends explicit instruction, utilization of text-based approach, and inclusion of authentic and collaborative tasks in teaching Reading and Writing in SHS in the Philippines.
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Introduction

To date, it is observable that 21st century learners are more culturally and linguistically diverse, which may be attributed to the constantly changing world. Understanding towards literacy has as well innovated as it is now regarded to be an integrated skill that leads to global competitiveness. This view of literacy now takes more than being proficient and knowledgeable in reading and writing in the language, but also being able to utilize multimodal ways and use them simultaneously alongside other 21st century skills to succeed in the information age (Kist, 2005; Kres, 2003; Gee & Hayes, 2011). Sensitive to the 21st century literacy needs of the learners, the Department of Education in the Philippines had rolled out the K to 12 curriculum which added two additional years in basic education—the Senior High School (SHS). SHS offers general education subjects that students would not have otherwise studied until after one or two years in college. One of which is the Reading and Writing course that intends to develop skills in reading and writing, using materials beyond drama, fiction, and drama (DepEd, 2013). Other language courses in the SHS are Oral Communication and English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP). These courses aim to develop and improve Filipino learners’ 21st century literacy skills. They also seek to improve learner’s global competitiveness.

In response to the inclusion of Reading and Writing as a course under the SHS program, Jaca et al. (2019) investigated the perception of SHS teachers towards such course. From their qualitative study, a number of concerns emerged leading to a recommendation of revisiting the present curriculum. One of the important issues addressed in the present study are the topics and targeted competencies in the Reading and Writing curriculum being “idealistic, complex, and demanding” (Jaca et al., 2019, p.309), giving students very high expectations in the absence of acknowledging their context. Additionally, it is necessary to note that beyond the Reading and Writing curriculum, proficiencies in reading and writing has proven to be a struggle among students for those skills are not readily available to ESL/ESL learners due to the complex nature of those skills (Atanacio-Blas et al., 2018; Farkas & Jang, 2019; Graham, Harris, & Beard, 2019; Gustilo & Magno, 2015; Gustilo, 2013; Hall, 2012; Nueva, 2016; Nusrat, 2016; Sadeghi, 2007; Tenri Ampa & Quraisy, 2017). In this light, Pablo and Lasaten (2018) offered an explanation to the situation explaining that the learners’ diversity in terms of their socio-cultural background, coupled with their varied linguistic backgrounds, results to students’ difficulties in English. This reality, therefore, poses a problem in the instruction of academic reading and writing for the SHS students in the Philippines. Nevertheless, Pablo and Lasaten (2018) suggested that this problem may be addressed with teachers attempting to understand the background of their students in relation to their experienced difficulties and the quality of their outputs. Through this attempt, teachers’ choice of strategies for teaching reading and writing may be better informed. With all these concerns, needs analysis comes undeniably necessary.

Needs analysis for language curriculum

Needs analysis (NA) is viewed to be a crucial aspect of educational planning. In fact, Otilia (2015) regarded NA to be the key in ensuring students’ meaningful learning, given that it serves as the foundation from where curriculum content, methods, and materials for teaching are generated. Furthermore, NA is believed to be an important aspect of well-developed and well-prepared language curriculum. It is also a vital part of a language curriculum which focuses on tasks (Juan, 2014; Long & Crookes, 1993; Long & Norris, 2000, as cited in Susanto, Syafiqiyah & Ratih, 2015). To illustrate, results of NA help educators identify learners’ current language
proficiency in order to bridge the gap between their acquired literacy skills and expected skills necessary to cope with the current digitization.

This requires students to be globally interconnected with information technology. This also makes them aware of things that will prepare them for living and working in the 21st Century- acquisition of new avenues of learning, knowledge, and skills (Kuhlthau, 2010). NA’s implementation, therefore, provides an opportunity for curriculum developers and language teachers to come up with informed decisions for a course, create learner-centered-teaching materials and tasks, and develop fair assessments (Jordan, 1997; Juan, 2014). In sum, Widodo (2017) claimed that it is NA, above all procedures, that allows the enhancement of a “ready-made” curriculum through a close negotiation between the teacher and the learner on what topics are to be taught and how such are to be taught realistically for optimal learning.

To illustrate, Wahyono and Puspitasari (2016), through their Present Situation Analysis (PSA) and Target Situation Analysis (TSA), investigated the needs of students in reading for academic purposes. These analyses provided the researchers insights on the learners’ expectations about the reading course, as well as their difficulties and experienced limitations regarding the availability of materials. With these data, specific recommendations for curriculum writers were generated. For one, suggestions as regards the time allotment for the course and changes in the schedule were provided. Moreover, the necessity of further studying students’ needs and weaknesses was noted.

Additionally, a number of local studies in the Philippines was conducted utilizing NA as a basis for reading intervention or enhancement programs (Martizano, 2017; Pernito-Amor, 2018; Ventic & Eslit, 2018). Firstly, Martizano (2017) designed a contextualized reading intervention program which focused on the reading difficulties of Grade 7 public school students. REAL (Reading Assessments Across Levels), a reading intervention program created based on the reading proficiency of junior high school students (Pernito-Amor, 2018). Finally, Ventic and Eslit (2018) looked into the reading comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency competence of Grade 12 senior high school students in Iligan City, Philippines. Through their study, an enhancement program was designed to assist the Grade 12 students with their needs. Overall, these local studies provide basis for the value of NA in designing reading programs for students.

In the same light, Ampa and Quraisy (2018) conducted an NA among 330 fourth semester students, focusing on their writing skills. Results of their NA provided empirical decisions for the writing class, like ensuring focus on students’ exposure towards definition texts and descriptive texts. In addition, findings of their study gave basis for recommending explicit instruction of English language structure as part of the needs of students in the writing class.

Similarly, Nusrat (2016) utilized NA to develop the writing skills of ESL learners. Specifically, she conducted an explanatory study that focused on the participants’ perception of writing and their actual writing performance. Resulting from her NA, Nusrat (2016) concluded that teachers and curriculum writers should focus on fluency-oriented pedagogical practices in order to maximize students’ development in writing.

Furthermore, Nueva (2016) illustrated the importance of using NA as a basis for a language program, in her study’s case, a language intervention program. In particular, she investigated the essays of 317 first-year college students in a university in Bukidnon, Philippines, and utilized the error analysis as basis for an intervention program. From such analysis, she strongly suggested the inclusion of a bridging program for students to meet the ideal writing competency in the college level.

Moreover, in the work of Saeli and Cheng (2019) wherein they qualitatively investigated Iranian learners’ L1 and L2 writing perception, one of their strongest conclusions is the necessity of including different forms of NA in the writing classes to inform both teachers and students alike with their actual L1 and L2 writing skills.
Finally, in Cunningham’s (2015) NA among Cambodian students, he sought to explore students’ specific needs in developmental reading, writing, and grammar courses that were offered in the participants’ school. His study offered notable results about students’ preference on how grammar should be taught, students’ discomfort with the purpose of the texts they are reading, and students’ difficulties with regard to their fluency and automaticity when writing. More so, he recommended adopting a literature-and-text-based approach in teaching reading, writing, and grammar to the students.

It is in this note that the researchers claim the necessity of conducting an NA particular for the Reading and Writing course of the Philippines’ SHS program. For one, the value that previous literature accord towards NA provides basis for utilizing such method to address the gap mentioned in the study of (Jaca et al., 2019), together with the gap on ESL learners’ reading and writing. Second, the observable lack of NA literature in the Philippine setting, particularly in the language courses in the SHS level, indeed call for the present study to further inform decisions for language curriculum and planning. As a result, the researchers gathered data and conducted an NA for the SHS students in a public school in Metro Manila, Philippines. With the end goal of addressing the discrepancy between the present competencies of senior high school students and the literacy skills demanded from them under the K to 12’s Reading and Writing curriculum guide, the present study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What are difficulties of SHS students in writing and in reading?
2. What are the instruction preferences of SHS students for a Reading and Writing course?

Framework of the Study

The principles of NA guided the present study; therefore, the prime is given on recognizing the difficulties and preferences of learners (Sönmez, 2019). In particular, guided by the conclusion of Sönmez (2019) about the lack of NA that makes use of both qualitative and quantitative needs of students and teachers, the present study made sure to use both methods in collecting data. Meaning to say, both qualitative and quantitative data were collated and used for this NA.

For the researchers to determine the reading difficulties of students, the researcher-made questionnaires administered in the study and interview guides were framed from the work of Sadeghi (2007). Sadeghi (2007) reiterated the internal and external factors that play in the reading comprehension of L2 learners. Further, he identified that cognitive abilities and strategies, background knowledge, and linguistic knowledge are internal factors that associate to the reader himself/herself. External factors include variables influenced by text, context, and even the writer (text-producer). For the purposes of the study, reader variables covering students’ linguistic knowledge and background knowledge were measured in the researcher-made questionnaire. In addition, observation of textual variables affecting students’ reading were included in the study. Also, context variables possibly affecting students’ reading were measured.

In determining the writing difficulties of the students, Gustilo and Magno’s (2015) framing of writing predictors on their cognitive process framework was adopted. Through their framework, topic knowledge, linguistic knowledge, text production, and writing experience processes of the learners were explored to deduce students’ difficulties in writing. It shall be noted here that the measurement of writing predictors were also delimited to the prescribed content of the K to 12 Curriculum guide provided by DepEd.

Finally, to gauge the preference of learners in terms of the teaching approach for Reading and Writing, the text-based approach to teaching was used as a framework. This framing is an attempt to explore the suggestion of Cunningham’s (2015) NA that a text-based approach is deemed appropriate for a reading, writing, and grammar class. Therefore, in this
study, it is assumed that text-based approach to teaching which involved using authentic text-types for instruction (Mickan, 2011) will fit the preference of learners and may, therefore, guide the development of a syllabus for the course, Reading and Writing.

Methodology

Research Design

The language needs analysis in this present study used both quantitative and qualitative data. This method makes sure that the matter at hand is seen in not only one lens but through multiple lenses. This then permits a number of aspects of the phenomenon to be unveiled and realized (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Quantitative data were employed in identifying the reading and writing competency level of learners and in getting the frequency of errors in the diagnostic test. Qualitative data include the opinions of the teachers and learners obtained through interviews and document analysis of the diagnostic test. The data gathered from interviews and document analysis were used as a form of triangulation on the quantitative analysis.

Participants

Two sets of participants were utilized in the present study. The first set of participants provided the quantitative data for the study, therefore taking the whole population of a public grade 11 senior high school in Metro Manila, Philippines, totalling to 100 students, specifically 51 female students and 49 male students, who were also present at the time of the data collection. There were three sections coming from General Academic Strands (GAS) and Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM) programs during the first semester of SY 2019-2020 which comprised the 100 participants. The students’ ages ranged from 15-19 years old. For ethical purposes, an Informed Consent Form (ICF) was given to the participants before proceeding to the next stage, which is data gathering.

The second set of participants was composed of English senior high school female teachers in the school and neighbouring school in the city who provided both quantitative and qualitative data for the study. Teacher A has been teaching English subjects for eight years, Teacher B for five years, and Teacher C for four years. The three teacher-participants were first surveyed, then interviewed with regard to the perceived difficulties of their students. Likewise, fourteen select students coming from the same first set of participants were interviewed about their opinions on the difficulties they encounter in reading and in writing.

Instruments and Data Sets

The present study utilized three instruments for its NA, specifically: questionnaire, interview, and diagnostic test.

(1) Perceived Reading and Writing Difficulty Questionnaire. This four-part, researcher-made questionnaire aimed to measure the perceived difficulties of students when reading and writing academic texts and their preferred teaching-learning strategies employed inside the classroom. Items in the questionnaire were framed on the discussions of Sadeghi (2007), Gustilo and Magno (2015), and Cunningham (2015). Also, some items were adapted from the survey questionnaire utilized by Akyel and Ozek (2010), and Cunningham (2015).
The first part covers the demographic profile of the students. The second part, which has 20 items, covers the perceived reading difficulties of the students. Items were categorized as falling under content schema, textual schema, linguistic schema, and literacy in L1, following the study of Sadeghi (2007).

The third part has 20 items covering the perceived writing difficulties of the students. Items were categorized under writing experience, topic knowledge, linguistic knowledge (discourse, genre conventions, grammar, spelling, and vocabulary), and writing strategies following the study of Gustilo and Magno (2015). Finally, the last part of the questionnaire measured the preferred teaching-learning strategies in a Reading and Writing class which were categorized under text-based approach and context variables (time, means, personal preferences/interests).

The responses were measured in a four-point Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), and Strongly Agree (4) for each item. To ensure the reliability of the items, Cronbach’s alpha was computed for each section of the questionnaire. Cronbach’s alpha for reading is 0.85, 0.88 for writing, and 0.77 for preferred teaching strategies, all interpreted to have good internal consistency.

(2) Interview. The interview guide for both the teachers and students is composed of five items which focused on the perceived difficulty of students when reading and writing texts, as well as the preferred teaching strategies of the teachers.

(3) Diagnostic Test. A teacher-made diagnostic test for reading and writing was administered to the student participants. It is a 60-item test which covers grammar rules, skills, and competencies required and enhanced when studying Reading and Writing Course. Specifically, the course has three main content topics, namely: 1) Reading and Thinking Strategies Across Text Types; 2) Text and Context Connections; 3) Purposeful Writing in the Disciplines and Professions.

Procedure

The Perceived Reading and Writing Difficulty Questionnaire was administered on the first day which lasted for half an hour. The following day, students answered a diagnostic test to gauge their level of competencies in reading and writing. The students took fifty minutes to finish the test. After scores were tabulated, 7 students who got the highest marks on the diagnostic test, as well as 7 who got the lowest, were interviewed in order to collect extensive explanation and perception on their experiences and difficulties on the subject matter. Each of the 14 students participated for at least one 15-minute interview session.

Finally, the English teachers, likewise, were interviewed for thirty minutes each, about their perceived difficulties from the students and language teaching strategies they employ.

Data Analyses

The researchers analysed three datasets for the study, namely, the results of the survey questionnaire, diagnostic test scores, and interview data.

For the survey questionnaire, the researchers tabulated the questionnaire responses using Microsoft Excel which computed the percentages and frequencies of student replies. After which, the data were exported to a Comma Separated Values (CSV) file so that SPSS could compute for the items’ Cronbach’s alpha, mean, and frequency distribution. Consequently, the researchers made a table of frequencies and percentages in order to easily identify the categories the skills in writing and reading which the students perceived to be the most difficult.
To analyse the results of the diagnostic test, item analysis partnered with simple error analysis was done. Further, Microsoft Excel was utilized to compute the items in which the students made the most errors, and to as well identify items that may be categorized as easy, average, and difficult items following the students’ responses.

Finally, content analysis was performed in the replies of the teachers and students in the interviews after transcription. Emerging themes and patterns from the transcriptions were noted and utilized for analysis against the processed quantitative data.

Results

Results of the triangulation approach using a survey questionnaire, teacher and students-interview, and document analysis are summarized under three parts. The first section summarizes the quantitative results of the NA with regard to the perceived difficulties of students in reading and in writing and their preferred teaching and learning strategies generated from the survey questionnaire. The second section, on the other hand, presents the qualitative results of the NA, specifically the themes generated from the interviews among selected students and teachers. Finally, the last section details the results of item analysis and frequency of errors in writing and reading from results of the diagnostic test.

Survey results of the Needs Analysis

Reading Difficulties of Senior High School Students

Part 1 summarizes the results on the perceived difficulty of senior high school students when reading texts. They are categorized into Content schema, Textual schema, Linguistic schema, and Literacy in first language (L1).

Table 1

| STATEMENTS                                                                 | SD | D | A | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|------|-------------|------|
| I can easily understand texts written in the context (setting) of other countries. | 2  | 2%| 48| 49 | 1    | 1%         | 2.49 | Disagree       | 4  |
| I can formulate questions about things I read from texts.                 | 3  | 3%| 39| 45 | 13   | 13%        | 2.68 | Agree          | 12 |
Table 1 reveals that half of the students (50%) have difficulty understanding texts written in the context (setting) of other countries. The reason for this may be explained by the result regarding the importance of background knowledge in understanding texts. Seventy four percent of the students agreed that their background knowledge assists them in reading texts. If they do not have background knowledge of texts from other countries, learners would find them difficult to read and comprehend. Moreover, 58% of the students can formulate questions about things they read from texts, while 63% are familiar with strategies to assess the value of claims within texts. Also, 70% of the students find it easy to discuss things that they have read from texts. In general, students did not report reading difficulties concerning content schema.

Table 2

Reading difficulties of senior high school students concerning linguistic schema

| STATEMENTS                                                                 | SD | D  | A  | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|-------------|------|
| It is easy for me to comprehend even long sentence structures in a text     | 11 | 47 | 37 | 5  | 2.36 | Disagree    | 1    |
| I have no difficulties following the grammatical structure within texts.    | 7  | 59 | 21 | 13 | 2.40 | Disagree    | 2    |
| I can infer the meaning of words I don't know.                             | 9  | 41 | 37 | 13 | 2.54 | Agree       | 6    |
Concerning difficulties on linguistic schema when reading texts, Table 2 shows that 58% of the students struggle to comprehend long sentence structures in texts. This result implies that the longer the text, the little the focus, attention span, and comprehension of the students. It is the first perceived difficulty of the students when reading texts. The second concerns grammatical structure wherein 66% of the students disagreed that they do not have any problems in grammar. Likewise, only 51% can understand the meaning of a sentence even if they do not understand the grammar rules. It is also noticeable that only about 50% of the participants can guess the meaning of unfamiliar words.

There arose three issues on linguistic schema: difficulties in reading longer texts, grammar usage, and unfamiliar words. When solved, it could lead not only to enhanced reading skills but also writing. When it comes to actual reading, it is still worth noting that 73% of the participants can read sentences and paragraphs quickly.
### Table 3

**Reading Difficulties of Senior High School Students on Textual Schema**

| STATEMENT                                                                 | SD | D  | A  | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-------|-------------|------|
| I can recognize different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description, narration, etc.) in texts. | 7  | 7% | 48 | 48%| 38    | 38%         | 7    | 7% | 2.45 | Disagree | 3    |
| I can evaluate the coherence, organization, grammar and mechanics of a text I read. | 6  | 6% | 45 | 45%| 41    | 41%         | 8    | 8% | 2.51 | Agree    | 5    |
| I can easily identify techniques in selecting and organizing information (e.g. brainstorming list, graphic organizer, topic outline, sentence outline). | 5  | 5% | 45 | 45%| 38    | 38%         | 12   | 12%| 2.57 | Agree    | 7    |
| I recognize the author’s attitude and purpose for writing when I read.    | 3  | 3% | 42 | 42%| 42    | 42%         | 13   | 13%| 2.65 | Agree    | 9    |
| I can identify main ideas and supporting details in texts.               | 6  | 6% | 34 | 34%| 47    | 47%         | 13   | 13%| 2.67 | Agree    | 11   |
I can effectively use paragraph headings/subtitles when reading texts. | 4 | 4% | 34 | 34% | 51 | 51% | 11 | 11% | 2.69 | Agree | 13
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
My familiarity with transitional markers (e.g. then, now, so, therefore, in addition) assist my reading. | 6 | 6% | 32 | 32% | 47 | 47% | 15 | 15% | 2.71 | Agree | 15

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

Table 3 presents the results on difficulties concerning textual schema. Results revealed that 55% of the students disagreed that they can recognize different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description, narration, etc.) in texts; 49% can somehow evaluate the coherence, organization, grammar, and mechanics of a text; and half of the respondents agreed that they can easily identify strategies in selecting and organizing information (e.g. brainstorming list, graphic organizer, topic outline, sentence outline), which is, perhaps, why it is also difficult for them to recognize the author’s attitude and purpose for writing the text material upon reading. These issues concerning textual schema have been experienced by almost half of the participants.

Meanwhile, despite these struggles, at least more than half of them can identify main ideas and supporting details in texts and are familiar with transitional markers (e.g. then, now, so, therefore, in addition), which is why 70% can effectively use paragraph headings/subtitles when reading texts.

Table 4

| STATEMENTS                                                                 | SD | D | A | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|------|-------------|------|
| I can effectively use my L1 (e.g. Tagalog) to comprehend English texts.   | 4  | 4%| 31| 31%| 47   | 47%         | 18   | 18% | 2.79 | Agree | 16 |

As Table 4 demonstrates, 65% of the students can effectively use their L1 to comprehend English texts. Thus, L1 literacy cannot be considered as a hindrance in understanding English texts.
Writing Difficulties of Senior High School Students

Part 2 summarizes the results for the perceived difficulty of SHS students when writing texts. These difficulties are categorized into Writing experience, Topic knowledge, Linguistic knowledge (discourse, grammar, genre conventions, spelling, and vocabulary), and Writing strategies.

Table 5

Writing Difficulties of Senior High School Students Concerning Their Writing Experiences

| STATEMENT                                                                 | SD | D  | A  | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|-------------|------|
| I have prior writing experience of academic texts.                        | 13 | 46 | 35 | 6  | 2.34 | Disagree    | 3    |
| I am familiar with the conventions (formal writing) of academic texts.    | 4  | 51 | 36 | 9  | 2.50 | Agree       | 9.5  |

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

Table 5 shows that 59% claimed they lack ample writing experience on academic texts. In addition, only half of the respondents are familiar with the conventions (formal writing) of academic texts. This result was backed up by students’ interview during which they attested to their unfamiliarity with the conventions of academic texts and their lack of ample writing experience.

Table 6

Writing Difficulties of Senior High School Students Concerning their Topic Knowledge

| STATEMENT                                                                 | SD | D  | A  | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|-------------|------|
| I have topic-relevant (e.g. business, arts, humanities, sciences) background knowledge to assist my writing. | 11 | 37 | 45 | 7  | 2.48 | Disagree    | 7    |

Table 5 shows that 59% claimed they lack ample writing experience on academic texts. In addition, only half of the respondents are familiar with the conventions (formal writing) of academic texts. This result was backed up by students’ interview during which they attested to their unfamiliarity with the conventions of academic texts and their lack of ample writing experience.
I can easily write topic-specific papers from texts I have read.



| Statement                                                                 | SD | D | A | SA | Mean | Description | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|-------|-------------|------|
| I am familiar with the different citation styles (e.g. APA, MLA, etc.).    | 18 | 62| 19| 1  | 2.03  | Disagree    | 1    |
| I can use grammatically correct sentences without thinking carefully about the rules. | 7  | 59| 27| 7  | 2.34  | Disagree    | 3    |
| I can use the correct vocabulary when I write.                            | 10 | 53| 30| 7  | 2.34  | Disagree    | 3    |
| I can use different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description, narration, etc.) when writing. | 10 | 50| 31| 9  | 2.39  | Disagree    | 5    |
| I can write texts with proper citations.                                  | 8  | 54| 28| 10 | 2.40  | Disagree    | 6    |
| I can effectively use transitional markers                                | 10 | 41| 38| 11 | 2.50  | Agree       | 9.5  |

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

Table 6 shows how the SHS students lack topic-relevant background knowledge which results in difficulty in writing topic-specific papers from texts they have read. In support of the study of Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000), this finding explains their difficulty in writing without enough knowledge on texts read. They stated that (1) since they facilitate each other, reading and writing skills intersect functionally, (2) reading and writing are reciprocal skills with fundamental common process and knowledge, and (3) reading and writing are both communicative acts.

Table 7

Writing Difficulties of Senior High School Students Concerning their Linguistic Knowledge
I am familiar with strategies to search for reliable references when writing. | 3 | 3% | 50 | 50% | 38 | 38% | 9 | 9% | 2.53 | Agree | 11

I can organize information in a paragraph. | 7 | 7% | 39 | 39% | 45 | 45% | 9 | 9% | 2.56 | Agree | 12.5

I can efficiently paraphrase texts that I have read. | 4 | 4% | 48 | 48% | 36 | 36% | 12 | 12% | 2.56 | Agree | 12.5

I can write sentences and paragraphs quickly. | 4 | 4% | 43 | 43% | 45 | 45% | 8 | 8% | 2.57 | Agree | 14

I can evaluate relevant ideas/concepts when writing. | 1 | 1% | 47 | 47% | 41 | 41% | 11 | 11% | 2.62 | Agree | 15.5

I can write summaries of texts I read. | 9 | 9% | 28 | 28% | 48 | 48% | 15 | 15% | 2.69 | Agree | 18

I can describe my ideas clearly when writing. | 8 | 8% | 26 | 26% | 51 | 51% | 15 | 15% | 2.73 | Agree | 19

I can support my ideas with clear details and examples. | 10 | 10% | 22 | 22% | 51 | 51% | 17 | 17% | 2.75 | Agree | 20

Table 7 shows that only 20% of the tested students are familiar with the different citation styles (e.g. APA, MLA, etc.), which implies limited exposure to research and report writing. Sixty six percent expressed their disagreement that they can use grammatically correct sentences without thinking carefully about the rules. This is followed by 63% who cannot use the correct vocabulary when writing, and another 60% who cannot use different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description, narration, etc.) when writing. All of these are necessary to be able to write effective academic texts, particularly research papers, and these are where the writing difficulties lie upon.

On a lighter note, almost half of the students can effectively use transitional markers (e.g. now, so, therefore) and are familiar with strategies to search for reliable references. Moreover, these are some of the writing skills they possess: information organization (54%),
paraphrasing (48%), writing sentences and paragraphs quickly (53%), evaluating relevant ideas (52%), summarizing (63%), describing ideas clearly (66%), and detailing (68%).

Table 8

Writing Difficulties of Senior High School Students Concerning Their Writing Strategies

| STATEMENT                                                                 | SD | D | A | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|------|-------------|------|
| It is easy for me to plan whenever I have a text to write.              | 8  | 31| 52| 9  | 2.62 | Agree       | 13.5 |
| I can easily revise the texts I write.                                  | 2  | 43| 44| 11 | 2.64 | Agree       | 16   |

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

As observed in Table 8, Many students are equipped with planning and writing strategies. Sixty one percent find it easier to plan first before writing a text and 55% can easily revise their own write-ups, although there is still a need to follow through on pre-writing, writing, and post-writing strategies for 39% and 45% of the population.

Preferred teaching-learning strategies of senior high school students

Part 3 summarizes the results obtained from the questionnaire which aimed at identifying the preferred teaching-learning strategies of senior high school students when reading texts which are categorized into Text-based approach and Context variables (time, means, personal preferences/interests).

Table 9

Preference of Senior High School Students for Text-based Approach Instruction

| STATEMENTS                                                                 | SD | D | A | SA | MEAN | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|------|-------------|------|
| I like knowing about text structures through a critiquing of sample texts. | 5  | 53| 35| 7  | 2.44 | Disagree    | 2    |
I find incidental (during reading/amidst discussions) vocabulary discussions helpful.  | 3  | 3% | 43 | 43% | 46 | 46% | 8 | 8% | 2.59 | Agree | 6.5

I appreciate noting the organization of ideas through text samples. | 5 | 5% | 38 | 38% | 49 | 49% | 8 | 8% | 2.60 | Agree | 8

I like studying academic conventions through text samples. | 5 | 5% | 35 | 35% | 53 | 53% | 7 | 7% | 2.62 | Agree | 10

I find vocabulary learning meaningful when words are chosen from the texts we are reading/writing. | 1 | 1% | 30 | 30% | 43 | 43% | 26 | 26% | 2.94 | Agree | 14

I like to study grammar as they appear on the texts we are reading/writing. | 2 | 2% | 24 | 24% | 50 | 50% | 24 | 24% | 2.96 | Agree | 15

*SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree*

Table 9 depicts the students’ general agreement on most of the text-based approaches in teaching reading and writing in which providing learners with authentic and accurate text samples will greatly help in the learning process. Still, it also pointed out that 58% of them do not find having sample paper critiquing to be helpful as a way to know more about text structures. This is partly because they lack actual experience of it in classroom practices.
Table 10
Preference of senior high school students concerning contextual variables

| STATEMENT                                                                 | SD F | SD % | D F | D % | A F | A % | SA F | SA % | MEAN  | DESCRIPTION | RANK |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-------|-------------|------|
| I like reading and writing texts outside the class hours.                | 11   | 11%  | 48  | 48% | 34  | 34% | 7    | 7%   | 2.37  | Disagree    | 1    |
| I like reading and writing texts in the morning.                        | 7    | 7%   | 53  | 53% | 28  | 28% | 12   | 12%  | 2.45  | Disagree    | 3    |
| I like searching for texts inside libraries.                             | 15   | 15%  | 36  | 36% | 36  | 36% | 13   | 13%  | 2.47  | Disagree    | 4    |
| I like reading and writing texts in the afternoon.                      | 10   | 10%  | 42  | 42% | 37  | 37% | 11   | 11%  | 2.49  | Disagree    | 5    |
| I like reading and writing texts during class hours.                    | 7    | 7%   | 36  | 36% | 48  | 48% | 9    | 9%   | 2.59  | Agree       | 6.5  |
| I like studying professional correspondences (resume, application for college, etc.) through examples. | 8    | 8%   | 38  | 38% | 39  | 39% | 15   | 15%  | 2.61  | Agree       | 9    |
| I like writing in groups rather than writing by myself.                 | 8    | 8%   | 32  | 32% | 42  | 42% | 18   | 18%  | 2.70  | Agree       | 11   |
| I like to read texts in print.                                          | 4    | 4%   | 34  | 34% | 42  | 42% | 20   | 20%  | 2.78  | Agree       | 12   |
| I like to read texts virtually (using electronic gadgets).              | 4    | 4%   | 31  | 31% | 40  | 40% | 25   | 25%  | 2.86  | Agree       | 13   |
I like searching for texts online (using electronic gadgets).

|        | 5 | 5% | 13 | 13% | 50 | 50% | 32 | 32% | 3.09 | Agree | 16 |
|--------|---|----|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|------|-------|----|

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

Table 10 reveals the students’ preferences and disagreement toward using different contextual variables when teaching reading and writing. Majority of the students expressed their liking on searching for texts online, and 65% of the respondents expressed their agreement on reading virtually (both using electronic gadgets) in this digital age. However, there are 62% who like to read in print, while 60% would prefer writing in groups than writing by themselves. More than half of the respondents have expressed their interest in studying professional correspondences (resume, application for college, etc.) through examples. It is also notable that 58% want reading and writing texts only during class hours since 52% do not want to do it in the afternoon and 59% on not doing it outside class hours. These students go to school on a morning shift but only 40% would still want to do it in the morning. Lastly, more than half of the respondents are not interested in searching for texts inside libraries as everything is available on the internet nowadays.

**Interview results of the NA**

The interview phase was conducted among three English teachers as well as 14 students, 7 of whom got the lowest scores in the diagnostic test and 7 got the highest scores. In-depth interview was done in order to enrich the discussion on the data collection for the needs analysis and the development of Reading and Writing Syllabus.

As regards the results of the interview with the students, it is regrettably surprising that only four of them are familiar with academic texts specifically book reviews, article critiques, literature reviews, research reports, project proposals, position papers, and other professional correspondences like the letter of application for college admissions and employment. Most of them have not been exposed to academic texts like these nor have been given rich opportunities to write academic texts during their junior high school years.

Regarding their perceived difficulty when reading texts, the teachers asserted that the difficulty of students lies in their lack of utilization of various reading strategies in order to get used in quick and articulate reading as well as extract relevant information from the text material (See excerpt 1 below). Meanwhile, the students all agreed that their difficulties are their inability to comprehend texts because of unfamiliar words.

**Excerpt 1:**

Teacher A: “For my Senior High School students, I am expecting that they are more likely using skimming, scanning and using key words/points in reading. This will help them finish the examinations (especially Reading Comprehension exams) in a shorter period of time. Unfortunately, only few students are religiously using the skills mentioned.”

As regards writing, the teacher respondents claimed that students’ difficulties are caused by their low mastery on proper writing mechanics such as capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and most especially grammar (See excerpt 2 below). All students declared grammar usage as their number one difficulty. They also struggle in translating their ideas and thoughts into words because of limited vocabulary and organizing their ideas (See excerpts 3-5).
Excerpt 2:
Teacher B: “There are many issues that even my Senior High School students encounter when writing texts. Using of capital and lowercase letters, using space, using punctuation marks properly, spelling, word choice, organization of ideas, grammar and more.

Excerpt 3:
Student 2: “The most difficult part of writing texts in English for me is when I cannot express my ideas smoothly because I cannot find the right words to use.

Excerpt 4:
Student 3: “I’m not good in grammar.”

Excerpt 5:
Student 4: “I want to write so many things. My thoughts get mixed up and it’s difficult.”

Furthermore, teachers prefer utilizing inquiry-based instruction on sample text material, text-based approach in teaching reading and writing to help facilitate active learning, and employ higher-order thinking skills as well as peer tutoring (See excerpt 6). As for the students, for them to enhance their literacy skills, they are aware of the importance of reading a lot of books, novels, and articles while immediately consulting the dictionary to arrive the meaning of unfamiliar words. They also prefer to watch online tutorials and practice pre-writing activities. These findings did reflect on the results of the survey questionnaire.

Excerpt 6:
Teacher A: Remedial classes. But definitely, establishing a good reading habit with students can cure the problems. The program Readster of the Schools Division Office of Malabon City is indeed helpful to most students that I have talked to. They had a chance to hold and finish a novel. Then some became interested in reading more novels. Being exposed with good and quality reading materials will help the students easily acquire the necessary skills in reading and writing, then later on speaking L2.

Lastly, one of the teachers argued that among the competencies, still the most important is the attitude of the learner which is reflected in their willingness to learn. “Giving interesting and engaging activities/tasks will help the students overcome their Second Language/Foreign Language Anxiety. No matter how hard you try to teach a student new words and/or concepts using L2, you will never see an improvement if he or she is not willing to learn the language,” she added.

Item analysis results from the diagnostic test

In the last phase of the triangulation approach, the researchers administered a 60-item teacher-made diagnostic test which covers the application of reading and writing content lessons and competencies stated in the Department of Education Reading and Writing Curriculum Guide: Reading and Thinking Strategies across Text Types, Text and Context Connections (Critical Reading), and Purposeful Writing in the Disciplines and Professions.

The result of the frequency of errors shows in Table 11 shows the evident mistakes committed in the following lessons and competencies (arranged by ranks):
(1) Text and Context Connections (Critical Reading): Using Determining textual evidence to validate assertions and counterclaims made about a text read (EN11/12RWS-IVac-10)—Evaluating statement as an opinion or fact

(2) Reading and Thinking Strategies across Text Types: Distinguishes between and among patterns of development in writing across disciplines (EN11/12RWS-IIIbf-3)—Determining cause and effect in a given situation

(3) Purposeful Writing in the Disciplines and Professions: Identifies the unique features and requirements in composing texts that are useful across disciplines (EN11/12RWS-IVdg-12.2)—Writing a research report with proper citation

(4) Reading and Thinking Strategies across Text Types: Distinguishes between and among patterns of development in writing across disciplines (EN11/12RWS-IIIbf-3.7)—Determining problem and solution in a given situation

(5) Reading and Thinking Strategies across Text Types: Distinguishes between and among patterns of development in writing across disciplines (EN11/12RWS-IIIbf-3.3)—Identifying definition as a pattern of development in a given situation

Based on the data presented, learners have difficulty in the three content lessons and or modules for the Reading and Writing course. The top five mistakes in the diagnostic test mostly fall under the competency that intends to hone students’ ability to present idea by identifying the patterns of paragraph development across different disciplines.

Table 11

**Reading and Writing Diagnostic Test**

| Item | Sections | Frequency | Percentage | ERROR RANKING |
|------|----------|-----------|------------|---------------|
|      | A | B | C | D | CR | E | CR | E |     |
| 1    | 14 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 40 | 25.93% | 74.07% | 16 |
| 2    | 6  | 8  | 32 | 8  | 32 | 22 | 59.26% | 40.74% | 49 |
| 3    | 5  | 15 | 4  | 30 | 30 | 24 | 55.56% | 44.44% | 60 |
| 4    | 15 | 17 | 5  | 13 | 17 | 37 | 31.48% | 68.52% | 22 |
| 5    | 9  | 7  | 25 | 13 | 25 | 29 | 46.30% | 53.70% | 39 |
| 6    | 10 | 1  | 24 | 19 | 19 | 35 | 35.19% | 64.81% | 25 |
| 7    | 35 | 4  | 14 | 1  | 35 | 19 | 64.81% | 35.19% | 53 |
| 8    | 33 | 8  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 46 | 14.81% | 85.19% | 4  |
| 9    | 16 | 24 | 5  | 9  | 9  | 45 | 16.67% | 83.33% | 5  |
| 10   | 6  | 2  | 45 | 1  | 45 | 9  | 83.33% | 16.67% | 59 |
| 11   | 11 | 3  | 2  | 38 | 38 | 16 | 70.37% | 29.63% | 56 |
| 12   | 1  | 6  | 40 | 7  | 40 | 14 | 74.07% | 25.93% | 57 |
| 13   | 8  | 12 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 37 | 31.48% | 68.52% | 23 |
| 14   | 25 | 17 | 9  | 3  | 25 | 29 | 46.30% | 53.70% | 40 |
| 15   | 12 | 13 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 41 | 24.07% | 75.93% | 15 |
| 16   | 10 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 16 | 38 | 29.63% | 70.37% | 21 |
| 17   | 6  | 36 | 7  | 5  | 36 | 18 | 66.67% | 33.33% | 54 |
| 18   | 13 | 8  | 22 | 11 | 22 | 32 | 40.74% | 59.26% | 33 |
| 19   | 2  | 6  | 26 | 20 | 26 | 28 | 48.15% | 51.85% | 41 |
| CR | E |
|----|---|
| 20 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 36 | 11 | 43 | 20.37% | 79.63% | 8 |
| 21 | 12 | 10 | 24 | 8 | 24 | 30 | 44.44% | 55.56% | 37 |
| 22 | 10 | 36 | 6 | 2 | 36 | 18 | 66.67% | 33.33% | 55 |
| 23 | 18 | 4 | 19 | 13 | 19 | 35 | 35.19% | 64.81% | 26 |
| 24 | 29 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 29 | 25 | 53.70% | 46.30% | 44 |
| 25 | 13 | 25 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 45 | 16.67% | 83.33% | 6 |
| 26 | 14 | 20 | 14 | 6 | 20 | 34 | 37.04% | 62.96% | 29 |
| 27 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 34 | 34 | 20 | 62.96% | 37.04% | 51 |
| 28 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 31 | 31 | 23 | 57.41% | 42.59% | 48 |
| 29 | 20 | 12 | 2 | 20 | 20 | 34 | 37.04% | 62.96% | 30 |
| 30 | 28 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 43 | 20.37% | 79.63% | 9 |
| 31 | 10 | 26 | 14 | 4 | 26 | 28 | 48.15% | 51.85% | 42 |
| 32 | 6 | 17 | 24 | 7 | 24 | 30 | 44.44% | 55.56% | 38 |
| 33 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 48 | 11.11% | 88.89% | 1 |
| 34 | 2 | 29 | 21 | 2 | 29 | 25 | 53.70% | 46.30% | 45 |
| 35 | 22 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 42 | 22.22% | 77.78% | 12 |
| 36 | 6 | 28 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 48 | 11.11% | 88.89% | 2 |
| 37 | 12 | 4 | 26 | 12 | 12 | 42 | 22.22% | 77.78% | 13 |
| 38 | 12 | 32 | 3 | 7 | 32 | 22 | 59.26% | 40.74% | 50 |
| 39 | 2 | 43 | 6 | 3 | 43 | 11 | 79.63% | 20.37% | 58 |
| 40 | 10 | 20 | 13 | 11 | 20 | 34 | 37.04% | 62.96% | 31 |
| 41 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 17 | 37 | 31.48% | 68.52% | 24 |
| 42 | 14 | 9 | 20 | 11 | 20 | 34 | 37.04% | 62.96% | 32 |
| 43 | 23 | 3 | 9 | 19 | 23 | 31 | 42.59% | 57.41% | 34 |
| 44 | 19 | 14 | 11 | 20 | 11 | 43 | 20.37% | 79.63% | 10 |
| 45 | 9 | 30 | 7 | 8 | 30 | 24 | 55.56% | 44.44% | 47 |
| 46 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 35 | 35.19% | 64.81% | 27 |
| 47 | 19 | 8 | 10 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 35.19% | 64.81% | 28 |
| 48 | 12 | 7 | 27 | 8 | 27 | 27 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 43 |
| 49 | 7 | 14 | 30 | 3 | 14 | 40 | 25.93% | 74.07% | 17 |
| 50 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 40 | 25.93% | 74.07% | 18 |
| 51 | 23 | 14 | 7 | 10 | 23 | 31 | 42.59% | 57.41% | 35 |
| 52 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 6 | 15 | 39 | 27.78% | 72.22% | 19 |
| 53 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 44 | 18.52% | 81.48% | 7 |
| 54 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 15 | 39 | 27.78% | 72.22% | 20 |
| 55 | 14 | 7 | 24 | 9 | 7 | 47 | 12.96% | 87.04% | 3 |
| 56 | 2 | 34 | 10 | 8 | 34 | 20 | 62.96% | 37.04% | 52 |
| 57 | 10 | 23 | 12 | 23 | 31 | 42.59% | 57.41% | 36 |
| 58 | 17 | 17 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 42 | 22.22% | 77.78% | 14 |
| 59 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 29 | 29 | 25 | 53.70% | 46.30% | 46 |
| 60 | 19 | 8 | 16 | 11 | 11 | 43 | 20.37% | 79.63% | 11 |

CR = Correct Response; E = Error
Discussion and Conclusions

The triangulation approach across three instruments of the study identified the difficulties of the SHS students when reading and writing texts and their preferred teaching-learning strategies. While the findings of the present study cannot be generalized due to the nature of the study and limited sample size, still the present study can draw out tentative conclusions that could be transferred to other contexts. The researchers concluded that the participants in this present study are not well-versed in the conventions and process of writing academic texts, specifically research reports, position paper, project proposal, and correspondence letters which they need in order to pursue higher education and employment. This is caused by their poor skills on two macro skills: reading and writing.

For reading skills, researchers identified the main problems or difficulties of the SHS students in the study: (1) recognizing different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description, narration, etc.) in texts; (2) evaluating the coherence, organization, grammar, and mechanics of a text, having poor vocabulary knowledge; and (3) distinguishing techniques in selecting and organizing information (e.g. graphic organizer, brainstorming list, topic outline, and sentence outline). These findings explain why they are reluctant to read long texts, especially those that were written in the context of foreign countries since they cannot understand and make any connections from it. Simply put, students fail to grasp important concepts when reading because they lack these skills. It follows then that possession of these skills will help the learners organize and select information in a written text to achieve a specific purpose. Also, when learners are able to organize and select information, it aids them in reading comprehension and it deepens content knowledge and ideas needed in writing academic texts. Knowledge of text structures and linguistic schema leads to an understanding of the concepts and eventually purposeful writing.

As regards writing skills, the main challenges the learners experience in writing are the following: (1) lack of topic-relevant background knowledge (due to poor reading comprehension); (2) insufficient knowledge and practice on writing with proper citation, incorrect grammar, shallow vocabulary, and insufficient knowledge and skills in writing different patterns of development (comparison and contrast, definition, description narration, etc.). These skills are vital in composing effective written texts which are important in various fields.

In summary, learners lack writing experience on academic texts due to the limited topic and linguistic knowledge and lack of writing strategies. The reading and writing courses in senior high school must address these needs because even though the ability to read and write no longer solely define literacy skills, they still have bidirectional development paths along the way. Reading and writing are two aspects of literacy abilities that support each other in a mutual manner (Grabe & Zhang, 2016). Not only that, reading and writing allow students to gain a richer cognizance of the world, especially now in this digital age. Students need to be equipped with various reading and writing competencies because SHS is a transition period for students, and they need to be prepared for college-level academic rigor and future employment.

Finally, the needs analysis concluded the learners’ preference in teaching strategies for reading and writing. Students want authentic academic text samples to learn conventions, mechanics, structure, organization, grammar, and vocabulary. This result is in line with the students’ preference on context variables—studying and familiarization of professional correspondences (resume, application for college, etc.) through examples. Additionally, learners prefer writing in groups with the availability of online resources during morning class hours.
Researchers recommend explicit instruction using the textual approach in the teaching of reading, writing, and comprehension strategies since it involves teaching one strategy at a time. This allows students to practice and apply it while teachers provide clear feedback and reviews. This will then lead to independent practice. An example of explicit instruction is describing and clarifying a skill, strategy, or process in a direct and systematic way. Another is teaching it in a meaningful way through the use of context CPDD, 2010 as cited in singteach.edu).

On top of this, utilization of the text-based approach as the tool in explicit instruction allows the learners to recognize relevant information within texts, patterns of development, and evaluate the conventions and mechanisms of a text. Reading more text samples broadens their topic knowledge across disciplines. In addition, identifying vocabulary words in the given text material as well as incidental grammar teaching as they examine academic texts will increase their confidence in the process of actual writing. More so, students will be exposed to various academic texts and eventually learn proper citations and functional knowledge that will guide them on their academic journey as they are expected to compose texts, write reviews and research reports, present arguments, give judgments, formulate critical essays, and write office correspondences.

One of the strongest recommendations of this paper is on the creation of a syllabus for the subject Reading and Writing. The syllabus for this subject must be eclectic in approach to cater students’ various learning styles and different language situations which allow the learners to know more and use the language. The syllabus must be outcomes-based to assess how much students have learned. And if an effective syllabus is created, teachers and textbook writers may use that syllabus as a basis for writing modules or worktexts which will aid in the learning of the senior high school students.

This paper also calls for further studies that explore the emerging needs of students in the SHS in terms of language learning. This call to action is deemed important to gather information on how teachers and other stakeholders can help in the development and enhancement of students’ 21st century skills. Further studies on the needs of the SHS students will provide a clearer pathway on what should be done in their classes and what innovations can be introduced to improve the reading and learning process.

Finally, the outcomes-based approach may be used to ensure focused teaching and learning. Educators should give topics, activities, and assessment tasks aligned to the learning outcomes of developing learners’ reading, thinking, critical reading, and purposeful writing in order to address the gaps between their current literacy level and the expected 21st-century skills. This outcomes-based approach must be integrated with the paradigms of authentic and collaborative task-based teaching and learning which have been established in research as having positive effects in students' learning. Task-based activities facilitate collaboration and social interaction which lend support to the development of target life-long learning skills that are needed by the learners beyond the walls of the classroom into real-world contexts. In addition, outcomes-based collaborative tasks are, by design, student-centered, giving students rich opportunities to practice and own the language while addressing authentic goals and objectives inside or outside the classroom (Blancaflor, Mauleon, and Purpura, 2021).
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