United International Journal for Research & Technology
Volume 06, Issue 11, 2025 | Open Access | ISSN: 2582-6832

The Effect of Video-based Supplementary Learning Materials in Teaching Literature

Jessa May Reyes Alonzo
Capiz State University- Pontevedra Campus, Tangalan National High School

***Abstract*—** This quasi-experimental research using a non-equivalent control group design was conducted to identify the effect of video-based supplementary learning materials in teaching literature among Grade 11 TVL–HE students of Tangalan National High School, S.Y. 2023-2024. Before the intervention, both the control and experimental groups exhibited "good" comprehension levels in literal and inference levels, while their evaluative level comprehension was rated as "fair". Post-intervention, significant improvements were observed in both groups, with the control group achieving "very good" comprehension in the literal level and "good" in inference and evaluative levels. Similarly, the experimental group displayed "very good" comprehension in literal and inference levels, and "good" in the evaluative level after the intervention. The researcher-made Video-Based Supplementary Learning Materials were well-received, with the Quality Assurance Team rating their acceptability as "very satisfactory." Furthermore, significant improvements in reading comprehension were noted within both groups across all levels of post-intervention compared to pre-intervention levels. However, there was no significant difference in reading comprehension between the control and experimental groups before the intervention. After the intervention, while significant differences were observed between the groups in literal and inference levels, no significant difference was found in the evaluative level comprehension. These findings highlight the effectiveness of the intervention in enhancing reading comprehension among Grade 11 students, particularly in the literal and inference levels.

***Keywords*—** Supplementary Materials in Teaching Literature, Video-based Teaching.

I. INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension, especially in the English subject, is prevalent in most schools and considered a worldwide challenge (Chaka, 2015). Indeed, it is a great concern of the learners in public schools. According to the 2018 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) Report, which was released in 2019, high school students in the Philippines got lower scores in reading comprehension than most of those surveyed in other nations. Results showed that 19% of the 15-year-olds tested scored below a level 2 (of 6), indicating they had difficulty with tasks such as locating explicitly stated information, recognizing main ideas, and making low-level inferences in a familiar topic (Gultiano, 2022). Consequently, in the said study, the Philippines ranked last among 79 countries. This holds true in a local setting, wherein the researcher observed that some students are experiencing struggles in comprehension, which is vital in understanding their lessons in literature. This is based on the recent pre-test in Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) Group Screening Test (GST) District consolidated report for school year 2023-2024 wherein only 5% of the Grade 11 students in the school scored more than or equal to 18 (passing score) and 95% of the Grade 11 students in the school scored below 18 who did not make it to the passing score. According to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001, the K-12 education program aims to establish innovative and creative best practices through digitized instructional materials to help learners accomplish specified learning goals. However, one of the challenges the Filipino teachers face is the availability of appropriate and digitized instructional materials (Andres, Rollo, & Cagang, 2022). The use of multimedia instruction can be a part of a learning system because it has a lot of pedagogical benefits to offer. Using videos in teaching is not new. They date back to prehistoric times when cave instructors used 16mm projectors to show cave students examples of insurance company marketing commercials in business courses (Berk, 2009). Video as a change instrument in the classroom has undertaken a unique cycle of adoption over time.

Video-based materials boost student creativity and cooperation. Access to video can help motivate students and create a distinctive context for their learning experience. Thus, it is in this context that the study was conducted to identify the effect of video-based supplementary learning materials in teaching literature and identify the significant difference in the level of reading comprehension before and after intervention among Grade 11 TVL–HE students of Tangalan National High School, S.Y. 2023-2024.

This study was conducted to identify the effect of video-based supplementary learning materials in teaching literature among Grade 11 TVL – HE students of Tangalan National High

School, S.Y. 2023-2024. It sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of reading comprehension of Grade 11 students in the control and experimental groups before and after the intervention?
2. What is the level of acceptability of the developed video-based supplementary learning material for intervention in terms of:
    a. quality
    b. instructional quality
    c. technical quality
    d. other findings
3. Is there a significant difference in the reading comprehension of Grade 11 students in the control and experimental groups before the intervention?
4. Is there a significant difference in the reading comprehension of Grade 11 students in the control group before and after the intervention?
5. Is there a significant difference in the reading comprehension of Grade 11 students in the experimental group before and after the intervention?
6. Is there a significant difference in the reading comprehension of Grade 11 students in the control and experimental groups after the intervention?

II. METHODOLOGY

Quasi-experimental design was used in the study, specifically the pretest-posttest nonequivalent groups design. Fraenkel and Wallen (1990) state that experimental research is one of the most powerful research methodologies to establish caused and effect relationships between variables. Non-equivalent control group design is structured like a pretest-posttest randomized experiment, but it lacks the key feature of the randomized designs – random assignment. It uses intact groups that are similar as the treatment and control groups. In the pretest-posttest nonequivalent groups design, there is a treatment group that is given a pretest, receives a treatment, and then is given a posttest. But at the same time, there is a non-equivalent comparison group that is given a pretest, does not receive the treatment, and then is given a posttest. The question, then, is not simply whether participants who receive the treatment improve, but whether they change more than participants who do not receive the treatment (Yang, 2023). Thus, this was the most appropriate method in conducting the study because it aims to identify the effect of video-based supplementary learning materials in teaching literature, whether there is a significant difference in the level of reading comprehension before and after intervention.

An adapted questionnaire, which consists of thirty (30) multiple-choice items having 12-item questions under literal level, 10-item questions under Inference level, and 8-item questions under evaluative level with four options in each item covering the different literary texts in the modules for First Quarter, was utilized as a research instrument. It was validated by the three English teachers in the District teaching the same subject, “21st Century Literature from the Philippines and the World”. The reliability was tested using test-retest reliability, with Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.835, indicating good reliability. The adapted questionnaire was pre-tested on 40 Grade 11 GAS students of Tangalan National High School, S.Y. 2023-2024. Each item was given 1 point for every correct answer and zero or no point for every wrong answer. The maximum point that a student can attain is 30 points. A researcher-made video-based supplementary learning materials were also utilized as a research instrument, as it is the intervention being employed. The adopted DepEd Evaluation Rating Sheet for Non-Print Materials, which uses a 4-point Likert scale following the 2019 Guidelines and Processes for LRMDS Assessment & Evaluation, was used for the validity of the said materials.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Reading Comprehension of Grade 11 Students in the Control and Experimental Groups

The level of reading comprehension of the control group before the intervention under the literal level has good result while after the intervention it has very good result. This shows that the control group, which did not receive any intervention, exhibited a notable improvement in their literal reading comprehension from a "good" level to a "very good" level. This unexpected advancement may suggest intrinsic growth in comprehension skills over time, possibly influenced by factors such as continued exposure to reading materials, classroom instruction, or individual learning trajectories. The result of control group before the intervention under the literal level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has good result wherein learners can answer basic information and follow simple

instruction though not that high. Yet, the result is lower with the findings of Sari (2015) which has 70% of students had very good result. On the other hand, the result of control group after the intervention is consistent with the findings of Sari (2015) which has 70% of students had very good result but is higher with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has only good result wherein learners can answer basic information and follow simple instruction though not that high. Nevertheless, both the results of the control group before and after the intervention under the literal level negates the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which has poor result wherein students had difficulties in completing literal questions.

In terms of inference level of the control group, the level of reading comprehension before and after the intervention has good results. This shows consistent results, remaining at a "good" level both before and after the study. This suggests that without external interventions, students' ability to draw conclusions and make inferences from text remained stable over time. It implies a baseline level of proficiency in inference skills that was maintained throughout the study period, unaffected by external factors introduced by the intervention.

The results of control group before and after the intervention under the inference level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has good result wherein learners can apply and analyze cognitive processes though not that high. On the other hand, this negates the findings of Sari (2015) which found that students had low result in comprehension, more so with the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which has found that 74% of students had poor comprehension result.

In terms of evaluative level of the control group, the level of reading comprehension before the intervention has fair result while after the intervention it has good result. This shows that despite no intervention being introduced, improvement suggests a natural progression in their ability to critically assess and evaluate text over the study period, possibly influenced by factors such as ongoing instruction, practice, or individual development.

The result of control group before the intervention under the evaluative level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has fair result wherein students had the difficulty to make judgments as they read but negates the findings of Sari (2015) which found that 43% of students had failed result in the reading comprehension test. On the other hand, the result of control group after the intervention negates the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has fair result wherein students had the difficulty to make judgments as they read.

Meanwhile, the level of reading comprehension of the experimental group before the intervention under the literal level has good result while after the intervention it has very good result. It is the same with the result of the control group but with higher number. This improvement mirrors the pattern observed in the control group but with a higher score. This indicates that the intervention was particularly effective in enhancing literal reading comprehension skills, with the experimental group showing a more significant advancement compared to the control group.

The result of the experimental group before the intervention under the literal level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which found that learners can answer basic information and follow simple instruction. Both the results of the experimental group before and after intervention under the literal level negates the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which has found that students had difficulties in completing literal questions. In terms of inference level of the experimental group, the level of reading comprehension before the intervention has good result while after the intervention it has very good result. It is quite better than the result of the control group wherein it gives a consistent good result. It suggests that the intervention implemented in the experimental group was particularly effective in enhancing students' ability to draw conclusions and make inferences from the text, outperforming the natural progression seen in the control group.

The result of the experimental group before the intervention under inference level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has good result wherein learners can apply and analyze cognitive processes though not that high but negates the findings of Sari (2015) which has 57% of students had low result, more so with the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which has 74% of students had poor result. On the other hand, the result of the experimental group after the intervention under the

inference level is higher than the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has only good result wherein learners can apply and analyze cognitive processes though not that high and negates with the findings of Sari (2015) which has 57% of students had low result, more so with the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which has 74% of students had poor result. In terms of evaluative level of the experimental group, the level of reading comprehension before the intervention has fair result while after the intervention it has good result. It is the same with the result of the control group but with higher number. This improvement aligns with the trend observed in the control group. However, in the experimental group, these improvements were more pronounced, yielding higher scores compared to the control group. This suggests that the intervention was particularly effective in enhancing students' ability to critically assess and evaluate text, leading to significant advancements in comprehension skills. The result of experimental group before the intervention under the evaluative level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which found that students had the difficulty to evaluate and make inferences about what they read.

Level of Acceptability of the Developed Video-Based Supplementary Learning Materials

The acceptability of the researcher-made video-based supplementary learning materials in teaching literature followed the adopted DepEd Evaluation Rating Sheet for Non-Print Materials which uses 4-point Likert scale following the 2019 Guidelines and Processes for LRMDS Assessment & Evaluation. In content quality, it has a total point of 40 which passed the evaluation and has a rating of 4 or “very satisfactory”. This indicates that the content exceeds expectations by offering comprehensive, accurate, and engaging material that enhances understanding and supports learning goals.

In terms of instructional quality, it has a total point of 40, which passed the evaluation and has a rating of 4 or “very satisfactory”. This indicates that the instructional approach demonstrates excellence in clarity, organization, and effectiveness, engaging learners through various strategies.

In terms of technical quality, it has a total point of 52, which passed the evaluation and has a rating of 4 or “very satisfactory”. This indicates that the video showcases excellent technical quality with flawless audiovisual production and smooth transitions, enhancing the learning experience. Lastly, in other findings, it has a total point of 16 which passed the evaluation and has a rating of 4 or “very satisfactory”. This indicates that there is no conceptual errors, factual errors, grammatical and / or typographical errors, and other errors (i.e., computational errors, obsolete information, errors in the visuals, etc.). In overall, the material received a rating of 4 or “very satisfactory”. This indicates that the developed material demonstrates excellence across all evaluated criteria, earning a rating of "very satisfactory." Overall, the developed material sets a benchmark for excellence, serving as a model for effective and inclusive educational resources.

Video-based materials have become increasingly prevalent in educational settings to enhance students' reading comprehension. This study focuses on utilizing visual content to support learners' understanding and engagement with reading materials. By incorporating videos into reading instruction, educators can tap into students' visual processing abilities and provide a multi-modal learning experience (Lin, 2016). Moreover, it found out that video-based supplementary materials are beneficial in enhancing the learning process. These materials served as an alternative to traditional teaching methods, enhancing learning outcomes and student engagement. Researchers recognized the potential of these materials to align teaching practices with the evolving needs and preferences of today's digitally savvy learners, who relied on visual media for their education (Ferrer & Ancheta, 2022).

Differences in the Grade 11 Students’ Level of Reading Comprehension in the Control and Experimental Group Before the Intervention

The mean of the control group before the intervention under the literal level is 6.40 indicates “good”, and the mean of the experimental group before the intervention under the literal level is 6.90 which indicates “good” as well.

This exhibits a solid ability to understand and extract explicit information from the text. Readers at this level can accurately identify main ideas, key details, and supporting evidence presented directly in the text. They demonstrate proficiency in comprehending straightforward content and can do so with relative ease and accuracy.

It has a mean difference of -0.50. It also reveals a no significant difference in the literal level of both the

control and experimental groups before the intervention (t=1.125, p=0.260>α). This indicates that they had similar baseline comprehension abilities, reinforcing the validity of the study's findings regarding the intervention's impact.

The results of both the control and experimental groups before the intervention under literal level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has good result wherein learners can answer literal questions. Nevertheless, both the control and experimental groups before the intervention under the literal level negate the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which has poor results wherein students had difficulties in completing literal questions.

In terms of inference level, the mean of the control group before the intervention is 4.73 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.258, and the mean of the experimental group before the intervention under the inference level is 4.17 which indicates "good" as well with a standard deviation value of 1.487. Readers at this level can effectively infer implied meanings, identify cause-and-effect relationships, and understand characters' motivations or feelings with proficiency. They demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the text's deeper layers and can interpret implicit information with clarity and insight. It has a mean difference of 0.56. It also reveals a no significant difference in the inference level of both the control and experimental groups before the intervention (t=1.672, p=0.095>α). This indicates that they shared similar baseline skills in drawing conclusions from text, providing a stable foundation for evaluating the intervention's effects on inference abilities. The results of both the control and experimental groups before the intervention under the inference level is consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021) which has good results wherein learners can apply and analyze cognitive processes though not that high but negates the findings of Sulfasyah, Ernawati, Fatmawati (2023) which found that 74% of students had poor results in comprehending the text.

Lastly, in the evaluative level, the mean of the control group before the intervention is 3.07, which only indicates "fair" with a standard deviation value of 1.015, and the mean in the experimental group before the intervention under the evaluative level is 2.87 which means "fair" as well with a standard deviation value of 1.332. Readers at this level can recognize basic elements of the author's intent, evaluate arguments or evidence to some extent, and identify strengths and weaknesses in the text. However, their evaluations may be inconsistent or lack thoroughness, and they may overlook certain aspects of the text that could affect their judgment.

It has a mean difference of 0.20. It also reveals no significant difference in the evaluative level of both the control and experimental groups before the intervention (t=0.931, p=0.352>α). This indicates that they had comparable baseline skills in critically assessing and evaluating text, enhancing the credibility of the study's findings regarding The intervention's impact on evaluative abilities. The results of both the control and experimental groups before the intervention under evaluative level are consistent with the findings of Manggasang & Belasoto (2021), which has a fair result wherein students had difficulty making judgments as they read.

Table 1. *Differences in the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Comprehension in the Control and Experimental Group Before the Intervention*

Level of Reading Comprehension Mean (Pre-Test)	Comprehension Mean	SD	Interpretation
Literal			
Control Group	6.40	1.653	Good
Experimental Group	6.90	1.788	Good
Inference			
Control Group	4.73	1.258	Good
Experimental Group	4.17	1.487	Good
Evaluative			
Control Group	3.07	1.015	Fair
Experimental Group	2.87	1.332	Fair

Differences in the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Comprehension in the Control Group Before and After Intervention

The mean of the control group before the intervention under the literal level is 6.40 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.653. Readers at this level can accurately identify main ideas, key details, and supporting evidence presented directly in the text. They demonstrate proficiency in comprehending straightforward content and can do so with relative ease and accuracy.

On the other hand, the mean of the control group after the intervention under the literal level is 7.73 which now indicates "very good" with a standard deviation value of 1.780. Readers at this level exhibits a strong capacity to extract explicit information from the text with precision and clarity.

They can accurately identify main ideas, key details, and supporting evidence, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the text's content. They consistently grasp straightforward content and may also recognize subtle nuances or implicit information.

It has a mean difference of -1.33. It also reveals a significant difference in the literal level of the control group before and after the intervention (t=-6.759, p=0.00<α). This demonstrates improvement despite no intervention being administered.

The result of control group before the intervention under the literal level is consistent with the findings of Bilbao et al. (2016) which has moderate result with a mean of 56.77 and is supported by the study of Huila (2003) with a mean of 2.84 which falls on moderate result as well. On the other hand, the result of the control group after the intervention negates the findings of Kamagi (2020) which has only good result wherein the students' ability in identifying the literal comprehension of English reading texts is 81.47%. In terms of inference level of the control group, the mean before the intervention is 4.73 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.258. On the other hand, the mean of the control group after the intervention under the inference level is 4.70 which still indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.557. Readers at this level can effectively infer implied meanings, identify cause-andeffect relationships, and understand characters' motivations or feelings with proficiency. They demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the text's deeper layers and can interpret implicit information with clarity and insight.

It has a mean difference of 0.03. It also reveals a significant difference in the inference level of the control group before and after intervention (t=-6.662, p=0.00<α). This shows that despite initially scoring higher on the pretest, it suggests the potential for substantial growth in inference skills over time, even without intervention.

The results of control group before and after the intervention under the inference level is consistent with the findings of Bilbao et al (2016) which has moderate result with a mean of 56.05 and is supported by the study of Huila (2003) with a mean of 3.01. On the other hand, this negates the findings of Kamagi (2020) which has only enough result wherein the students' ability in identifying inferential comprehension of English reading texts is only 63.58%.

Lastly, in the evaluative level, the mean of the control group before the intervention is 3.07 which only indicates "fair" with a standard deviation value of 1.015. Readers at this level can recognize basic elements of the author's intent, evaluate arguments, or evidence to some extent, and identify strengths and weaknesses in the text. However, their evaluations may be inconsistent or lack thoroughness, and they may overlook certain aspects of the text that could affect their judgment.

On the other hand, the mean of the control group after the intervention under the evaluative level is 4.10 which now indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.213. Readers at this level can discern the author's intent, critically evaluate arguments, or evidence, and identify strengths and weaknesses in the text with proficiency. They demonstrate a balanced and insightful approach to evaluating the text and can articulate their assessments clearly and convincingly.

It has a mean difference of -1.03. It also reveals a significant difference in the evaluative level of the control group before and after intervention (t=-6.586, p=0.00<α). This demonstrates improvement despite no intervention being administered. The result of control group before the intervention under evaluative level negates the findings of Huila (2003) which found a high result in terms of evaluative level among students.

Table 2. *Differences in the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Comprehension in the Control Group Before and After Intervention*

Level of Reading Comprehension (Pre-Test)	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Literal Pre-Test	6.40	1.653	Good
Post-Test	7.73	1.780	Very Good
Inference Pre-Test	4.73	1.258	Good
Post-Test	4.70	1.557	Good
Evaluative Pre-Test	3.07	1.015	Fair
Post-Test	4.10	1.213	Good

Differences in the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Intervention Comprehension in the Experimental Group Before and After

The mean of the experimental group before the intervention under the literal level is 6.90 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.788. Readers at this level can accurately identify main ideas, key details, and supporting evidence presented directly in the text. They demonstrate proficiency in comprehending straightforward content and can do so with relative ease and accuracy. On the other hand, the mean of the experimental group after the intervention under the literal level is 8.97 which now indicates "very good" with a standard deviation value of 1.474. Readers at this level exhibits a strong capacity to extract explicit information from the text with precision and clarity. They can accurately identify main ideas, key details, and supporting evidence, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the text's content. They consistently grasp straightforward content and may also recognize subtle nuances or implicit information.

It has a mean difference of -2.07. It also reveals a significant difference in the literal level of the experimental group before and after intervention ($t=-6.759$, $p=0.00<\alpha$). This suggests a notable improvement in their comprehension of explicit information within the text. This positive outcome indicates that the intervention effectively enhanced the experimental group's literal reading comprehension skills.

The result of experimental group before the intervention under the literal level is consistent with the findings of Kamagi (2020) which has good result wherein the students' ability in identifying the literal comprehension of English reading texts is 81.47%. On the other hand, the result of experimental group after the intervention negates the findings of Bilbao et al (2016) which has only moderate result with a mean of 56.77 and is supported by the study of Huila (2003) with a mean of 2.84 which falls on moderate result as well.

In terms of inference level, the mean of the experimental group before the intervention is 4.17 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.487. On the other hand, the mean after the intervention under the inference level is 6.27 which now indicates "very good" with a standard deviation value of 1.202. It has a mean difference of -2.1. It also reveals a significant difference in the inference level of the experimental group before and after intervention ($t=6.771$, $p=0.00<\alpha$). This suggests a noteworthy improvement in their ability to draw conclusions and make inferences from the text. This positive outcome indicates that the intervention effectively enhanced the experimental group's inference skills.

The result of experimental group before the intervention under inference level is consistent with the findings of Bilbao et al. (2016) which found that students have moderate performance in the three levels of reading comprehension. On the other hand, the result of experimental group after the intervention negates the findings of Kamagi (2020) which has only enough result wherein the students' ability in identifying inferential comprehension of English reading texts.

Lastly, in the evaluative level, the mean of the experimental group before the intervention is 2.87 which only indicates "fair" with a standard deviation value of 1.332. On the other hand, the mean after the intervention under the evaluative level is 4.37 which now indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 0.890. It has a mean difference of -1.5. It also reveals a significant difference in the evaluative level of the experimental group before and after intervention ($t=-6.580$, $p=0.00<\alpha$). This suggests a notable improvement in their ability to critically assess and evaluate text. This positive outcome indicates that the intervention

effectively enhanced the experimental group's evaluative comprehension skills. The result of experimental group before the intervention under evaluative level negates the findings of Basaraba et al. (2012) which has only very low result wherein evaluative items are most challenging compared to inference and literal items.

Table 3. *Differences in the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Comprehension in the Experimental Group Before and After Intervention*

Level of Reading Comprehension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Literal Pre-Test	6.90	1.788	Good
Post-Test	8.97	1.474	Very Good
Inference Pre-Test	4.17	1.487	Good
Post-Test	6.27	1.202	Very Good
Evaluative Pre-Test	2.87	1.332	Fair
Post-Test	4.37	0.890	Good

Differences in the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Comprehension in the Control and Experimental Group After the Intervention

The mean of the control group after the intervention under the literal level is 7.73 which indicates "very good" with a standard deviation value of 1.780, and the mean of the experimental group after the intervention under the literal level is 8.97 which indicates "very good" as well with a standard deviation value of 1.474. Readers at this level exhibit a strong capacity to extract explicit information from the text with precision and clarity. They can accurately identify main ideas, key details, and supporting evidence, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the text's content. They consistently grasp straightforward content and may also recognize subtle nuances or implicit information.

It has a mean difference of -1.24. It also reveals a significant difference in the literal Level of both the control and experimental groups after the intervention ($t=2.590$, $p=0.010<\alpha$). The improvement in the literal level of both the control and experimental groups after the intervention suggests a significant enhancement in their comprehension abilities. Despite the control group not receiving any intervention, both groups showed notable improvement in literal level of reading comprehension, with the experimental group displaying particularly noticeable progress.

The results of both the control and experimental groups after the intervention under the literal level negates the findings of Basaraba et al. (2012) which found that students found literal items to be the least challenging compared to inference and evaluative items, as well as the findings of Alonzo (2009) which has also an average result in the different levels of reading comprehension.

In terms of inference level, the mean of the control group after the intervention is 4.70 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.557. Readers at this level can effectively infer implied meanings, identify cause-and-effect relationships, and understand characters' motivations or feelings with proficiency. They demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the text's deeper layers and can interpret implicit information with clarity and insight. On the other hand, the mean of the experimental group after the intervention under the inference level is 6.27 which indicates "very good" with a standard deviation value of 1.202. Readers at this level exhibit a strong capacity to make sophisticated logical connections and draw insightful conclusions based on implicit information in the text. They can infer complex implied meanings, discern subtle cause-and-effect relationships, and understand characters' motivations or feelings with precision. They demonstrate a deep understanding of the text's underlying themes and can interpret implicit information with depth and sophistication.

It has a mean difference of -1.57. It also reveals a significant difference in the inference level of both the control and experimental group after the intervention ($t=3.947$, $p=0.000<\alpha$).

The improvement in the inference level of both the control and experimental groups after the intervention indicates a significant enhancement in their ability to draw conclusions and make inferences from the text. While both groups demonstrated improvement, the experimental group showed a more prominent enhancement, suggesting that the intervention had a greater impact on their inference skills.

The result of control group after the intervention under the inference level is consistent with the findings of Bilbao (2016) which found that students scored average in answering literal, inference, and evaluative questions.

Lastly, in the evaluative level, the mean of the control group after the intervention is 4.10 which indicates "good" with a standard deviation value of 1.213, and the mean of the experimental group after the intervention under the evaluative level is 4.37 which indicates "good" as well with a standard deviation value of 0.890. Readers at this level can discern the author's intent, critically evaluate arguments, or evidence, and identify strengths and weaknesses in the text with proficiency. They demonstrate a balanced and insightful approach to evaluating the text and can articulate their assessments clearly and convincingly. It has a mean difference of -0.27. It also reveals a no significant difference in the evaluative level of both the control and experimental group before the intervention ($t=1.672$, $p=0.095>\alpha$). The improvement in the evaluative level of both the control and experimental groups after the intervention suggests progress in their ability to critically assess and evaluate text. However, the lack of a significant difference between the control and experimental groups after the intervention indicates that the intervention used in the experimental group may have had limited impact, as evidenced by its similarity to the control group, which did not receive intervention.

The results of both the control and experimental groups after the intervention under evaluative level are consistent with the findings of Bilbao et al. (2016) which found that students scored average in evaluative level. On the other hand, this negates the findings of Basaraba et al. (2012) which has only very low result wherein evaluative items are most challenging compared to inference and literal items.

Table 4. *Differences on the Grade 11 Students' Level of Reading Comprehension in the Control and Experimental Group After the Intervention*

Level of Reading Comprehension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Literal Control Group	7.73	1.780	Very Good
Experimental Group	8.97	1.474	Very Good
Inference Control Group	4.70	1.557	Good
Experimental Group	6.27	1.202	Very Good
Evaluative Control Group	4.10	1.213	Good
Experimental Group	4.37	0.890	Good

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

Despite not receiving any specific intervention, the Grade 11 students in the control group demonstrated an improvement in their reading comprehension levels over time especially in the literal and evaluative level. This improvement suggests potential factors such as exposure to reading materials, individual growth, or other environmental influences contributing to their enhanced comprehension abilities.

On the other hand, it can be concluded that the intervention applied to the video-based supplementary learning material group of Grade 11 students has led to a significant improvement in their reading comprehension levels across literal, inference, and evaluative levels. This suggests that the intervention was effective in enhancing the students' overall reading comprehension abilities, particularly in the literal and inference levels, while also contributing to improvement in the evaluative level. Comparatively, the control group, which did not receive the intervention, did not show the same level of improvement although both groups show significant difference in their pre-test and post-test results. Therefore, the intervention appears to have played a significant role in enhancing the reading comprehension skills of the Grade 11 students in the video-based supplementary learning material group.

The "very satisfactory" rating in the researcher-made video-based supplementary learning materials suggests that the materials have been effective in supporting the teaching of literature. This positive result indicates that the materials have likely played a helpful role in enhancing the learning experience and understanding of the subject matter.

Subsequently, in comparing control and video-based supplementary learning material group, prior to the

intervention, Grade 11 students in both the control and videobased supplementary learning material groups had similar levels of reading comprehension across literal, inference, and evaluative levels. This suggests that any differences observed in their comprehension levels after the intervention are less likely to be influenced by pre-existing disparities between the groups.

After the intervention, a significant difference in reading comprehension levels was observed between the control and video-based supplementary learning material groups under literal and inference levels. This indicates that the intervention had a notable impact on improving reading comprehension in these areas compared to the control group.

However, there was no significant difference in reading comprehension levels between the control and video-based supplementary learning material groups under the evaluative level after the intervention. This suggests that the intervention may not have had a substantial impact on improving reading comprehension in this particular area.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of foregoing findings and conclusions, the following are recommended:

To enhance students' reading comprehension and foster enjoyment in the English literature class, incorporating video-based supplementary learning materials is highly recommended. These materials have been found to effectively support the teaching of literature and can contribute significantly to student's understanding and enjoyment of the subject matter. Integrating multimedia resources such as videos that relate to the literature being studied can provide students with visual and auditory reinforcement, making abstract concepts more tangible and engaging. Additionally, these materials can cater to various learning styles, accommodating students who may learn better through visual or auditory means.

1. Teachers must continue utilizing the effective intervention applied to the video-based supplementary learning material group, which significantly improved reading comprehension levels across literal and inference levels and contributed to improvement in the evaluative level. For both groups, emphasis should be placed on fostering an environment that promotes exposure to diverse reading materials and supports individual growth, as these factors may have contributed to the observed improvements in reading comprehension abilities over time.
2. Parents can play a significant role in supporting their children's reading comprehension skills by incorporating video-based supplementary learning materials into their literature education. Research suggests that this approach effectively enhances comprehension levels, particularly in literal and inference aspects, contributing to a deeper understanding and enjoyment of literary texts. By actively encouraging and facilitating the use of these resources at home, parents can create a more dynamic learning environment that complements traditional reading materials, ultimately fostering their children's academic success and lifelong love for literature.
3. The school administrators could make use of the study's findings to provide a valuable opportunity to enhance English teaching. By incorporating video-based supplementary learning materials into the curriculum, students' engagement and comprehension levels can be enriched. To support this initiative, a proposed inservice trainings and seminars for teachers focusing on the design and integration of these materials into lesson plans could be done. This proactive approach will ensure the effective utilization of multimedia resources, ultimately elevating the quality of education and fostering a dynamic learning environment for the students.

Further research could explore modifications to the intervention to better address evaluative comprehension skills and investigate potential factors influencing its effectiveness. Conducting longitudinal studies is also suggested to track the long-term impact of video-based materials on students' reading comprehension. This can reveal whether the limitations observed in this study persist over time or change.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmadi, M. (2013). The importance of metacognitive reading strategy awareness in reading comprehension. English Language Teaching.

[2] Akhondi, M., Malayeri, F., Samad, A. (2011). How to teach expository text structure to facilitate reading comprehension. International Literacy Organization Hub.

[3] Alexander, R. (2020) A dialogic teaching companion. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge

[4] Alonzo, J. (2009). An empirical look at the nuances of measuring reading comprehension. Hammill Institute on Disabilities.

[5] Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. International Journal of Teaching and Education. III. 21-34. 10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002.

[6] Andres, E., Rollo, C., & Cagang, A. (2022). Effectiveness of supplementary materials in developing vocabulary competence utilizing video lessons among grade 5 learners. Global Scientific Journals, 10(9), 353–360. https://doi.org/ISSN 2320-9186

[7] Basaraba D. et.al. (2012). Examining the structure of reading comprehension: Do literal, inferential, and evaluative comprehension truly exist?. Reading and Writing.

[8] Beare, K. (2008). Choosing props for the esl/efl classroom, props in class. esl.about.com/od/eslefl teachingtechnique/a/t_props_2. htm

[9] Berk, R. A. (2009). Multimedia teaching with video clips: Tv, movies, YouTube, and MTVs in the college classroom. International Journal of Technology in Teaching & Learning, 5, 1-21.

[10] Bernhardt, E. B. (1991) Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, empirical, and classroom perspectives. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

[11] Bevan, B. (2020). "I see students differently": Following the lead of maker educators in defining what counts as learning. Frontiers in Education.

[12] Bilbao, M. E. (2016). Level of reading comprehension of the education students. International Journal of Liberal Arts, Education, Social Sciences and Philosophical Studies.

[13] Brandon, D. (2021). The importance of reading comprehension. Alabama Cooperative Extension System.

[14] Butler-Pascoe, M.E., & Wiburg, K. (2002). Technology and teaching English language learners.

[15] Cabral, A., & Tavares, J. (2002). Practicing college reading strategies. The Reading Matrix: an International Online Journal, 2.

[16] Cadacio, R. et. al. (2020).21st century literature from the Philippines and the world modules. Department of Education.

[17] Carmen, P. (2021). My research is my story: A methodological framework of inquiry told through storytelling by a Doctor of Philosophy student. SAGE Journal.

[18] Chaka, C. (2015). The structures and features of the SMS language used in the written work of communication English I students at the university of South Africa: original research. Sabinet African Journal.

[19] Choi, H. J., & Johnson, S. D. (2005). The effect of contextbased video instruction on learning and motivation in online courses. American Journal of Distance Education, 19(4), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15389286ajde1904_3

[20] Connor, C. & Al Otaiba, S. (2008). Encyclopedia of infant and early childhood development. ScienceDirect.

[21] Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha?: An examination of theory and applications. Journal of Applied Psychology.78, 98-104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98

[22] Cottingham, C. D. (1986). Limited edition: Small community colleges adapt to new technologies. New Directions for Community Colleges, 59-64.

[23] De-la-Peña, C., Luque-Rojas, M. (2021). Levels of reading comprehension in higher education: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Frontiers in Psychology.

[24] Dikilitas, K. (2009). Using popular movies in teaching oral skills. World Conference on Educational Sciences.

[25] Fairbairn, G. & Winch, C. (1996). Reading, writing, and reasoning: A guide for students. Open University Press, Buckingham.

[26] Ferrer, C., & Ancheta, Q. (2022). Utilization of English video lessons and their significance to the Philippine language curriculum: A literature review. SSRN: Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4222378

[27] Fraenkel, J. & Wallen, N. (1990). How to design and evaluate research in education. McGraw-Hill Education.

[28] Ghenaiet, A. (2023). Inferential comprehension questions guide (with examples). INK. https://inkforall.com/aiwriting-tools/engaging-questions-tool/inferentialcomprehension-questions/

[29] Gitlina, G. (2010). The cognition of grammatical structures. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2(2), 4147-4151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.655

[30] Grabe, W.P., & Stoller, F.L. (2011). Teaching and researching: Reading (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833743

[31] Grisso, L. (2018). The relationship between English language proficiency and academic achievement for English language learner. Doctoral Dissertations and Projects.

[32] Gultiano, S. (2022). Reading comprehension in the English subject among grade 4 students in the Carmen Elementary School. International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education.

[33] Han, H. P. (1994). Implementing the video-based instruction in the college-level ESL classroom based on second language acquisition and communication competence theories. USA: North Carolina State University.

[34] Harmer, J. (2001). Teaching with video in a Pearson education limited. Practice of English Language Teaching. England: Editorial logman.

[35] Houston, C. (2000). Video usage and active learning strategies among community college faculty members. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25 (5), 341- 357.

[36] Hu, M. & Nation, P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. Open Access Te Herenga WakaVictoria University of Wellington. Journal contribution. https://doi.org/10.26686/wgtn.12560354.v1

[37] John, A., Barasa, P., & Omulando, C. (2017). The use of textbook illustrations in the teaching of reading comprehension: a study of secondary schools in Kathiani District-Kenya. International Journal of Research in Social Sciences, 7(8), 101-121. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20378

[38] Jude, W.I., & Ajayi, O.B. (2012). Literal level of student's comprehension in Nigeria: A means for growing a new generation african scholars. Journal of Education and Practice, 3, 120-129.

[39] Kamagi, S. (2020). A study on students' ability in literal and inferential comprehension of English texts. Journal on International Conference Proceedings.

[40] Kendeou, P. (2015). Predicting reading comprehension in early elementary school: The independent contributions of oral language and decoding skills. Journal of Educational Psychology.

[41] Lah, Y.C., & Hashim, N.H. (2014). The acquisition of comprehension skills among high and low achievers of year 4 to 6 students in primary school. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 114, 667-672.

[42] Lastiri, L. (2022). How does implementing different strategies to incorporate modern foreign languages (MFL) into a KS1 classroom affect the children's retention of the specific language taught?. York St John University School of Education, Language and Psychology.

[43] Lee, A. (2014). 6 Essential skills for reading comprehension. Understood for All Inc.

[44] Lin, L.-F. (2016). The impact of video-based materials on Chinese-speaking learners' English text comprehension. English Language Teaching, 9(10), 1. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n10p1

[45] Linde, S. & Fredrickson, A. (2020). Essential reading comprehension skills. https://study.com/academy/lesson/essentialreadingcomprehension-skills.html

[46] Liu, C.-C., Guo, Y., Hwang, G.-J., Tu, Y.-F., & Wang, Z. (2023). Effects of an article-structure strategy-based spherical video-based virtual reality approach on EFL learners' English reading comprehension and learning conceptions. Interactive Learning Environments, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2155840

[47] Manggasang, J. & Belasoto, M. (2021). Level of reading comprehension among grade 11 learner's basis for instructional material development. International Journal of Social Science and Human Research, 04(09). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v4-i9-09

[48] Martinez, A. (2002). Authentic materials: An overview. http://www3.telos.net/linguisticissues/authenticmaterials.html.

[49] Mayer, R. E. (2009). Multimedia learning (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511811678

[50] Mekheimer, A. (2011). The impact of using videos on whole language learning in EFL context. Arab World English Journal. 2, 5-39. 10.21608/jfe.2016.235209.

[51] Miller, L. (2003). developing listening skills with authentic materials. http://www.elthillside.com/up/files/article4.doc.

[52] Moore, J. et.al. (2016). The simplicity and complexity of reading comprehension. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 7(6).

[53] Nordquist, R. (2019). The art of communicating and how to use it effectively. Thought.Co.

[54] Oakhill, J., Cain, K., & Elbro, C. (2014). Understanding and teaching reading comprehension: A handbook (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315756042

[55] Oguntade, F. M. (2021). content analysis of levels and aspects of comprehension in west African senior secondary school examination. Reading & Writing, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v12i1.293

[56] Okueso, A. (2021). Social media as technological device in teaching reading comprehension: Benefits to teachers of English. Psychology And Education 58(2): 3826-3834 ISSN: 00333077.

[57] Oyetunde, T. (2002). Second-language reading: Insights from Nigerian primary schools. The Reading Teacher. 55. 748755.

[58] Oyinloye, G.O., & Adeleye, I. (2010). Impact of the media on the senior secondary school student's performance in speech work in English language. Academic Leadership: The Online Journal.

[59] Paris, D. (2011). Language across difference: Ethnicity, communication, and youth identities in changing urban schools. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[60] Powell-Smith, K. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on student reading development. The Elementary School Journal, 123, 583 - 598.

[61] Qizi, S. (2021). Pedagogical mechanisms of the formation of the social outlook of future teachers in the context of the informatization of education. The American Journal of Applied Sciences. 03. 203-207. 10.37547/tajas/Volume03Issue04-28.

[62] Rammal, S. (2006). Using video in the EFL classroom. http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/using%20video

[63] Rutzler, S. 2020. Importance of reading comprehension. http://www.mathgenie.com/blog/importance-of-reading-comprehension.

[64] Samiei, F., & Ebadi, S. (2021). Exploring EFL learners' inferential reading comprehension skills through a flipped classroom. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 16(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s4. 1039-021-00157-9

[65] Sari, F. (2015). Exploring English learners' engagement and their roles in the online language course. Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics.

[66] Smeltzer, D. K. (1988). Media utilization and the studentcontent teaching inventory: A correlation study of community college instructors. International Journal of Instructional Media (15), 222-223.

[67] Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. Psychological Assessment, 8, 350-353 https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.8.4.350

[68] Sparling, E (2016). Why we need to watch out for reading without comprehension. Hummingbird Learning Centre.

[69] Stoller, F. (1988). Films and videotapes in the ESL/EFL classroom. Institute of Education Science.

[70] Sulfasya, S., Ernawati, E., & Fatmawati, F. (2021). Investigating literal and inferential comprehension achievement of grade six students. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 39, 127-133. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v39i1.8057

[71] Stoffelsma, L. & Spooren, W. (2019). The relationship between English reading proficiency and academic achievement of first-year science and mathematics students in a multilingual context. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education 17, 905-922. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-018-9905-z

[72] Thyab, R. A. (2016). Mother-tongue interference in the acquisition of English article by L1 Arabic students. Journal of Education and Practice.

[73] Tomkins, G., Campbell, R., & Green, D. (2012). Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach. French Forest, NSW, Australia: Pearson Australia.

[74] Trochim, P. W. M. K. (2023). Nonequivalent groups design. Nonequivalent Groups Design - Research Methods Knowledge Base. https://conjointly.com/kb/nonequivalent-groupsdesign/?fbclid=IwAR3CrXBxUV9g8Aawavy9JVLW5pI7ROqB8RjSLIF0HLdf4yXo_keo8fwgnY

[75] Van Duzer, C. (1998). Improving ESL learners´ listening skills: At the workplace and beyond.http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/digests/LISTENQA.html

[76] William, R. T., & Lutes, P. (2000). Using video in the ESL classroom. http://www.Takamatsuu.ac.jp/library/06_gaku

[77] Wood, E., Motz, M., & Willoughby, T. (1998). Examining students' retrospective memories of strategy. Journal of Educational Psychology, 90(4), 698-704. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.90.4.698

[78] Yang L. (2023). Common quasi-experimental design. LibreText Statistics.

[79] Zhang, L. (2001). Chinese senior high school EFL students' metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy Use. Reading in a Foreign Language. 21.