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#### Abstract

The study entitled, "Identification of Students Learning difficulties in English related to Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary and Comprehension at Grade Eight". Objectives of the study were to determine the reading difficulties in English language learning at Grade and to identify reading difficulties in English language learning in at Elementary Level. The study was survey and descriptive in nature. The quantitative research method was adopted. Population of the study comprised of head teachers, teachers and students at Grade Eight. The simple random sampling technique was adopted. The questionnaire was developed as a research tool and pilot tested to make it valid and reliable. The researcher personally visited the selected schools and collected data. The collected data was analyzed through SPSS 24 using relevant statistical formulas as; percentages, frequency, mean score and standard deviation. Findings of the study were $58 \%$ of respondents opined that most of learners recognized English letters. Mean score 4.25 and SD . 622 supported. $58 \%$ of respondents agreed that they were not familiar with English phonemes. Mean score 3.25 and SD .965 supported the statement. $75 \%$ of respondents agreed that students faced challenge of consonant sounds. Majority of respondents agreed that students faced challenge of consonant sounds. Mean score 3.25 and SD .965 supported the statement. $50 \%$ of respondents agreed that they struggled with vowel sounds. As a whole majority of respondents agreed that they struggled with vowel sounds. Mean score 3.75 and SD 1.215 supported the statement. The study concluded that majority of teachers agreed that students would recognize English letters. Majority of respondents recognized English letters. It was concluded that majority of respondents agreed to know English phonemes. Majority of respondents knew about English phonemes. The study recommended that reading comprehension must be promoted even though vocabulary signifies both conceptual and linguistic information; conceptual information is wider than vocabulary information. Especially, vocabulary and comprehension, neglected in elementary education, still come into view to be neglected in classrooms. Teacher has to spend conscious efforts by a reader to better understand or remember what is being read.
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## Introduction

The learning brings up to changes in behaviour.

A learner gains knowledge of different disciplines with the help of experience or
practice. Learning is an endless process. It is a process in which a learner gets his knowledge and skills through learning. The purpose of learning is not only to take the learner to heights of glory but also permits the learner later to serve the nation in the future (DomingoMaglinao, 2021). The learner is successful then it assists as indication to successful learning. It reserves from birth till death an individual must acquire learning (Zou, Huang, \& Xie, 2021). The learning a language is very important for a new learner at a time of birth. The mind of child is empty like a total censure which is occupied in by own experiences.
Humans are always engaged in learning activities. In educational process learning is at the core of this system. Most people learn how to learn outside of school (Cheng, 2020). For a thoughtful understanding, thousands of years ago thinkers and psychologists can comprehend the nature of learning. Therefore, learning can be done from one individual to another. The learning has different meanings depending on the person, so it may be used differently depending on the theory (Bower, 2019). Learning is the removal of changes that occur in an individual's mind/behaviour. Change contribution in current actions with other people to change the identity of individuals within the group (Turquet, 2019). The learning doesn't just somewhere take us. It would also let us to move on more without problems (Baker, 2019).

The rich go to private schools, where education standards are standardized by them. Unfortunately, it's also worth noting the idea that poor people who can't afford high school tuition are just rushing to public schools, where they get free education up to primary school, so the value of free education is lost. increase. Nursing students have different backgrounds, most of whom have little English skills (Hyseni Duraku \& Hoxha, 2018). Therefore, English learning difficulties on daily basis lead to advances in specialized research in the subject of English as an English teacher. The human progress and advancement of any country of the world can be examined through the quantity
and quality of the text books and people have habit of reading and writing books (Tabroni, Irpani, Ahmadiah, Agusta, \& Girivirya, 2022). The reading and writing habit enhance the people thinking style, strident their intelligence, conversion their sensitivity and way of living style.
Reading and writing contribute new ideas to the learner (Hamroyev, Qoldoshev, \& Hasanova, 2021). Reading and the consequence of reading, knowledge is flourishing among, personal, generations, and social enhancement be governed by on reading competencies (Seidenberg, Cooper Borkenhagen, \& Kearns, 2020) stated that if children have reading and writing capabilities, they accomplish sound in any conditions. Reading and writing are important to all learners since reading upturn their writing strength and give new path to their judgments in writings charms (Smith, 2019). Reading and writing habit can updated their vital information which they gain through reading and writing. Informative success means students learning and concert in the organization. Effective reading and writing is like a beneficial deterrent in the hands of English learning students (Diamond, Lee, Senften, Lam, \& Abbott, 2019). Learners come from different parts of the areas so; their reading and writing habits and educational successes are very different.

## Research objectives

Objectives of the study were:

- To comprehend modern paradigms of students learning in English
- To identify students learning difficulties in English at elementary level


## Research questions

Research questions of the study were:

- What are the modern paradigms of students learning in English?
- What are students learning difficulties in English at elementary level?


## Research Methodology

The study was descriptive and quantitative in nature. Population of the study comprised of head teachers, English teachers and students of Grade Eight in district Rahim Yar Khan. The simple random sampling techniques was adopted. Sample of the study comprised of 48 schools of Tehsil Sadiqabad. Forty eight (48) head teachers and Math teachers from each school was selected. The learning difficulties in English reading were assessed through conducting test of Grade Eight from three hundred and eighty four (384) students. The researcher personally visited and collected data from the respondents. The quantitative data collected through questionnaire and test was
analyzed through using relevant statistical formulas as frequency, percentage, standard deviation and mean score. The English reading difficulties in elementary schools were studied due to limited time and resources. The study was delimited to elementary schools in district Rahim Yar Khan, elementary school teachers of English and $8^{\text {th }}$ class students of English.

## Data Analysis

The collected data through the questionnaire was entered into SPSS-23 data sheet. The data was analyzed by suing relevant statistical formulas like frequency, percentage, standard deviation and mean score. Results of the study were as follows;

Table 1: Factor-1 Phonemic Awareness

| Themes | Stat. | SDA | DA | UD | A | SA | Total | SD | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Letters recognized | F | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 16 | 48 | . 62 | 4.25 |
|  | \% | 0 | 0 | 8 | 58 | 33 | 100 |  |  |
| Unfamiliar with phonemes | F | 0 | 16 | 4 | 28 | 0 | 48 | . 96 | 3.25 |
|  | \% | 0 | 33 | 8 | 58 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Consonants sound | F | 0 | 12 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 48 | . 96 | 3.25 |
|  | \% | 0 | 25 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Vowels sound | F | 4 | 4 | 4 | 24 | 12 | 48 | 1.21 | 3.75 |
|  | \% | 8 | 8 | 8 | 50 | 25 | 100 |  |  |
| Short vowels | F | 8 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 12 | 48 | 1.50 | 3.42 |
|  | \% | 17 | 17 | 0 | 42 | 25 | 100 |  |  |
| Distinguishes word | F | 8 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 24 | 1.30 | 3.17 | 8 |
|  | \% | 0 | 33 | 25 | 33 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Rhyme words | F | 0 | 8 | 4 | 28 | 8 | 48 | . 96 | 3.75 |
|  | \% | 0 | 17 | 8 | 58 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Rhyme intonation | F | 16 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 48 | 1.69 | 2.83 |
|  | \% | 33 | 17 | 8 | 16 | 25 | 100 |  |  |
| Overall | F | 36 | 62 | 28 | 174 | 84 | 384 | 1.14 | 3.45 |
|  | \% | 7 | 19 | 8 | 49 | 17 | 100 |  |  |

Table 1: Factor-1 represents phonemic awareness among students at elementary level. Data analysis showed that $49 \%$ of respondents agreed that they knew about phonemic awareness, while $19 \%$ disagreed whereas $17 \%$
of respondents strongly agreed, $8 \%$ undecided and $7 \%$ strongly disagreed. As a whole, majority of respondents agreed that they knew about phonemic awareness. Mean score 3.45 and SD 1.14 supported the statement.

Table 2: Factor-2 Phonics

| Themes | Stat. | SDA | DA | UD | A | SA | Total | SD | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Phonetics | F | 4 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 1.15 | 1.17 |


|  | \% | 8 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 42 | 100 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Homograph | F | 0 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 48 | . 853 | 3.00 |
|  | \% | 0 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Homophone | F | 0 | 32 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 48 | . 905 | 2.50 |
|  | \% | 0 | 67 | 26 | 0 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Decoding | F | 4 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 24 | 48 | 1.24 | 3.92 |
|  | \% | 8 | 8 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 100 |  |  |
| Phonics chart | F | 12 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 48 | 1.50 | 2.58 |
|  | \% | 25 | 42 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Compound words | F | 0 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 48 | . 937 | 3.83 |
|  | \% | 0 | 17 | 0 | 67 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Drilling and repetition | F | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 8 | 48 | . 739 | 4.00 |
|  | \% | 0 | 8 | 0 | 75 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Silent letter | F | 0 | 16 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 48 | 1.08 | 3.42 |
|  | \% | 0 | 33 | 0 | 58 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Overall | F | 20 | 100 | 28 | 160 | 76 | 384 | 1.05 | 3.05 |
|  | \% | 5 | 26 | 7 | 42 | 20 | 100 |  |  |

Table 2: Factor-2 represents Phonics among students at elementary level. Data analysis showed that $42 \%$ of respondents agreed that they knew about Phonics, while $26 \%$ disagreed whereas $20 \%$ of respondents strongly agreed,
$7 \%$ undecided and 5\% strongly disagreed. As a whole, majority of respondents agreed that they knew about Phonics. Mean score 3.05 and SD 1.05 supported the statement.

Table 3: Factor-3 Vocabulary

| Themes | Stat. | SDA | DA | UD | A | SA | Total | SD | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Antonyms | F | 0 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 48 | 1.03 | 3.33 |
|  | \% | 0 | 25 | 33 | 25 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Dictionary | F | 0 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 48 | . 93 | 3.83 |
|  | \% | 0 | 17 | 0 | 67 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Identify words | F | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36 | 8 | 48 | . 73 | 4.00 |
|  | \% | 0 | 8 | 0 | 75 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Guess the meaning | F | 0 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 48 | . 93 | 3.83 |
|  | \% | 0 | 17 | 0 | 67 | 17 | 100 |  |  |
| Difficult in dictionaries | F | 0 | 12 | 4 | 28 | 4 | 48 | 1.00 | 3.50 |
|  | \% | 0 | 25 | 8 | 58 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Overall | F | 0 | 44 | 20 | 140 | 36 | 240 | . 93 | 3.69 |
|  | \% | 0 | 18 | 9 | 58 | 15 | 100 |  |  |

Table 3: Factor-3 represents Vocabulary among students at elementary level. Data analysis showed that $58 \%$ of students agreed that they knew about vocabulary, while $18 \%$ strongly disagreed whereas $15 \%$ of students were
strongly agreed, $9 \%$ respondents were undecided. As a whole, majority of students agreed that they knew about vocabulary. Mean score 3.69 and SD .93 supported the statement.

Table 4: Factor-4 Comprehension

| Themes | Stat. | SDA | DA | UD | A | SA | Total | SD | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summarizes text | F | 4 | 4 | 28 | 12 | 0 | 48 | . 85 | 3.00 |
|  | \% | 8 | 8 | 58 | 25 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Understands text | F | 0 | 32 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 48 | . 90 | 2.58 |
|  | \% | 0 | 67 | 8 | 25 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Summarizes text | F | 0 | 40 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 48 | . 38 | 2.17 |
|  | \% | 0 | 83 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Studied the text | F | 4 | 20 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 48 | 1.19 | 2.83 |
|  | \% | 8 | 42 | 17 | 25 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Find out text | F | 0 | 16 | 12 | 20 | 0 | 48 | . 90 | 3.08 |
|  | \% | 0 | 33 | 25 | 42 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Learning grammar | F | 0 | 24 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 48 | . 99 | 2.92 |
|  | \% | 0 | 50 | 8 | 42 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Identify word | F | 0 | 20 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 48 | 1.04 | 3.00 |
|  | \% | 0 | 42 | 25 | 25 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Guess of meaning | F | 0 | 16 | 8 | 24 | 0 | 48 | . 93 | 3.17 |
|  | \% | 0 | 33 | 17 | 50 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Understand the context | F | 8 | 28 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 48 | 1.07 | 2.33 |
|  | \% | 17 | 58 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Answer a question | F | 24 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 48 | 1.62 | 2.42 |
|  | \% | 50 | 8 | 0 | 33.3 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Aware reading | F | 24 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 48 | 1.62 | 2.42 |
|  | \% | 50 | 8 | 0 | 33.3 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Organize the sentence | F | 0 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 0 | 48 | . 83 | 3.17 |
|  | \% | 0 | 25 | 33.3 | 41.7 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Overall | F | 64 | 220 | 100 | 176 | 16 | 576 | . 98 | 2.75 |
|  | \% | 11 | 38 | 17 | 31 | 3 | 100 |  |  |

Table 4: Factor-4 represents Comprehension among students at elementary level. Data analysis showed that $38.19 \%$ of students disagreed about comprehension, while $30.56 \%$ agreed whereas $17.36 \%$ of students were
undecided, $11.11 \%$ strongly disagreed and $2.78 \%$ strongly agreed. As a whole, majority of students disagreed about comprehension. Mean score 2.75 and SD .98 supported the statement.

Table 5: Factor-5 Fluency

| Themes | Stat. | SDA | DA | UD | A | SA | Total | SD | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fluently | F | 0 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 48 | . 66 | 2.42 |
|  | \% | 0 | 75 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Finish reading | F | 0 | 36 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 48 | . 90 | 2.50 |
|  | \% | 8 | 50 | 17 | 25 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Passage | F | 4 | 24 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 48 | 1.16 | 2.92 |
|  | \% | 8 | 33 | 25 | 25 | 8 | 100 |  |  |
| Questions in English | F | 4 | 16 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 48 | 1.16 | 2.92 |
|  | \% | 58 | 33 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Read the text | F | 28 | 16 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 48 | . 90 | 1.58 |
|  | \% | 25 | 42 | 8 | 25 | 0 | 100 |  |  |


| Additional materials | F | 12 | 20 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 48 | 1.15 | 2.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | 17 | 58 | 8 | 17 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Reading activities | F | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 48 | 1.11 | 2.83 |
|  | \% | 8 | 42 | 8 | 42 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Read charts | F | 8 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 48 | 1.21 | 2.75 |
|  | \% | 17 | 33 | 8 | 42 | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Overall | F | 60 | 180 | 44 | 96 | 4 | 384 | 1.05 | 2.45 |
|  | \% | 16 | 47 | 12 | 25 | 1 | 100 |  |  |

Table 5: Factor-5 represented Fluency amongst students of English at elementary level. Data study showed that $47 \%$ of students disagreed, while $25 \%$ agreed whereas $16 \%$ of students were strongly disagreed, $12 \%$ undecided and $1 \%$ strongly agreed. As a total, majority of students disagreed about comprehension. Mean score 2.45 and SD 1.05 supported the report.

## Findings

- $49 \%$ of respondents agreed that they knew about phonemic awareness, while $19 \%$ disagreed whereas $17 \%$ of respondents strongly agreed, $8 \%$ undecided and $7 \%$ strongly disagreed. As a whole, majority of respondents agreed that they knew about phonemic awareness. Mean score 3.45 and SD 1.14 supported the statement.
- $42 \%$ of respondents agreed that they knew about Phonics, while $26 \%$ disagreed whereas $20 \%$ of respondents strongly agreed, $.32 \%$ undecided and $5 \%$ strongly disagreed. As a whole, majority of respondents agreed that they knew about Phonics. Mean score 3.05 and SD 1.05 supported the statement.
- $59 \%$ of students agreed that they knew about vocabulary, while $18 \%$ strongly disagreed whereas $15 \%$ of students were strongly agreed, $8 \%$ respondents were undecided. As a whole, majority of students agreed that they knew about vocabulary. Mean score 3.69 and SD .93 supported the statement.
- $38 \%$ of students disagreed about comprehension, while $30 \%$ agreed
whereas $17.36 \%$ of students were undecided, $11 \%$ strongly disagreed and $3 \%$ strongly agreed. As a whole, majority of students disagreed about comprehension. Mean score 2.75 and SD .98 supported the statement.
- $47 \%$ of students disagreed, while $25 \%$ agreed whereas $16.2 \%$ of students were strongly disagreed, $12 \%$ undecided and $1 \%$ strongly agreed. As a total, majority of students disagreed about comprehension. Mean score 2.45 and SD 1.05 supported the report.


## Conclusion

This research study was designed to assess the difficulty of reading comprehension of students in elementary schools. This study categorized according to their purpose and research questions. The conclusion is based on the following findings;
Factor one of the study was phoneme recognition. It was concluded that majority of teachers agreed that students would recognize English letters while some teachers strongly agreed with the statement whereas few were undecided. Majority of teachers recognized English letters. It was concluded that majority of teachers were agreed to know English phonemes while some did not whereas few were undecided. Majority of respondents agreed to know English phonemes.
Factor second of the study was phonics. It was examined that the majority of respondents agreed that there was a problem with pronunciation in English, and some did not. Majority of respondents agreed that it was difficult to copy by voice in English. One third
of teachers agreed to know English homographs (spelled but pronounced differently), one third of respondents disagreed, and three thirds of respondents.
Factor three of the study was vocabulary. It was concluded that majority of respondents were undecided to recognize the meaning of the word but some respondents agreed and few disagreed with this statement. Majority of questions who recognized meaning of the word were undecided. It was shown that while majority of respondents agreed to search for synonyms in the text, some respondents did not. Overall, majority of respondents agreed that they were looking for synonyms in the text. It was investigated that the majority of respondents agreed to get help from teachers in the sense of the word, but only a few respondents disagreed. Majority of the respondents agreed to receive help from teachers in the sense of the word.
Factor four of this study was about understanding. It was concluded that majority of respondents were undecided about understanding and reading the text, some respondents agreed, and a few respondents disagreed. Majority of respondents did not agree that they understood the text better than other students, but some respondents indicated they did. Majority of respondents did not agree that they understood the text better than other students. It was concluded that majority of respondents did not agree with the text summary, but only a few were undecided. Majority of respondents did not agree to summarize the text.
Factor five of the study was the quest for fluency. Majority of respondents did not agree to read English texts fluently, but some respondents were investigated to agree. Majority of respondents did not agree to read English texts fluently. Majority of respondents did not agree to try to finish reading in English on time, but some respondents concluded that they did. Majority of the respondents objected, so they tried to finish reading in English on time. Majority of respondents did not agree to read many sentences in English, but some respondents indicated they did. Majority of
respondents did not agree to read most of the text in English.

## Recommendation:

In the light of findings and conclusions following recommendations were made;

- Reading instruction must be provided to all students for right use of English, particularly those who have reading difficulties should be on top priority. Instructor should be emphasized in promoting phonemic awareness because it is one of important factor of learning English.
- Mindful awareness of sounds in lexis should be promoted among students. Being conscious that she/he has two sounds and understanding of which letters stand for the sounds that are essential for the awareness among students of phonological achievement.
- English teacher must be emphasized on teaching of English grammar and use story books to learning English grammar. This enables the students to improve their language.
- Lack of grammatical knowledge is another factor in reading English. When students lacking grammatical knowledge, they do not understand the text properly.
- Fluency of reading is very vital problem in our students. A slow reader cannot keep rapidity with the contemporary times. It is suggested that, the text for slow reader must be recommended easy and packed with in order; the speed is to be improved.
- The next recommendation described on elementary school level is to promote reading activities neither for students, nor in school but outside the school. The extra practice of reading has to accelerate development of reading.
- Teachers give students books for reading at the right level. They should recognize the main theme of the book.

Students should focus on the overall meaning of the story. Teachers must give them picture books for reading.

- To improve the fluency of reading, students should read the passage quickly and smoothly, so they will become more fluent.
- If students are struggling with reading comprehension, they have to need more help from teachers. In this regards teacher help students with building their vocabulary or practice phonetic skills.
- For the building their vocabulary students should consult dictionary and talk to their teachers. Teacher should ask questions about the topic in English and students should the answer in English as well as. If students do feel difficulty in this matter, then teachers would give courage.
- Teacher must use different techniques to improve reading skills among students at elementary level. For example, use of computer and modern methods of teaching, use audio visual methods.
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