



Comparative Analysis of the Effectiveness of Shared Book Experience, Repeated Book Reading and Directed Listening and Thinking Activity Instructional strategies on Reading Comprehension Abilities of Pupils in Uyo Metropolis, Akwa Ibom State

Esther Augustine Abiata, PhD
College of Education, Afaha Nsit
Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

Abstract

This study investigated the influence of shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity instructional strategies on reading comprehension performance of pupils in Uyo Metropolis, Akwa Ibom State. Two research questions and hypotheses guided the study. A quasi-experimental research design utilizing the pre-test and post-test non-randomized control group was used for the study. The population for the study consisted of five thousand and ninety-four (5094) primary school pupils in public primary schools Uyo Metropolis, Akwa Ibom State. A sample size of 200 pupils was arrived at using Simple random sampling technique. Four classes from two schools were randomly sampled and the four classes were further sampled into control and experimental groups. A researcher-made instrument titled "Reading Comprehension Achievement Test (RCAT)" developed from the reading comprehension passage titled "The Computer" was used for data collection. The instrument was validated by five experts. A trial test was carried out on 30 respondents who were not part of the study but were drawn from the population under study. Cronbach alpha was used to compute the coefficient, which gave a value of .79. Data obtained from research questions were answered using means and standard deviations while the null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Findings reveals that pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity) performed better in their ability to answer questions and comprehend sentences from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. It was recommended that teachers should encourage student learning and comprehension by varying the instructional strategy to meet the needs of the learners and inspire learning among the pupils.

Keywords: Reading, Comprehension Abilities, Instructional Strategies, critical evaluation of passages, question and answering in passages

Introduction

Reading comprehension is the ability to process text, understand its meaning, and to integrate with what the reader already knows (William, 2009). Comprehension, or extracting meaning from what is being read, is the ultimate goal of reading. The process of comprehension



is both interactive and strategic (Honig, et al, 2013). That is why teachers apply different reading strategies to help student develop comprehension skills. To be able to make sense of written material, pupils more often than not, try to make connections between what they read and what they already know. This is then followed by thinking deeply about what they have read. It should be noted that comprehension goes beyond just the ability to answer questions on a spoken or written passage correctly. This is because it is possible for a test-wise student to detect where the answer to a question is in a passage and just write same down with a little modification and score a fair point. During a reading comprehension exercise, the reader is actively involved in a sort of meaning negotiation with the writer. The greater the number of the constituent words in the passage that the reader finds familiar, the wider the scope of comprehension (Olatunji,2011).

Fundamental skills required in efficient reading comprehension are knowing meaning of words, ability to understand meaning of a word from discourse context, ability to follow organization of passage and to identify antecedents and references in it, ability to draw inferences from a passage about its contents, ability to identify the main thought of a passage, ability to answer questions answered in a passage, ability to recognize the literary devices or propositional structures used in a passage and determine its tone, to understand the situational mood (agents, objects, temporal and spatial reference points, casual and intentional inflections, etc.) conveyed for assertions, questioning, commanding, refraining etc. and finally ability to determine writer's purpose, intent and point of view, and draw inferences about the writer (discourse-semantics)(Committee on Learning Sciences, 2012). There are many reading strategies to improve reading comprehension and inferences. Each of these strategies could be adopted by the teacher as an instructional strategy. Research studies on reading and comprehension have shown that highly proficient teachers utilize a number of different strategies to comprehend various types of texts, strategies that are beneficial to students in order to improve their comprehension. This study considers ability to evaluate a story or passage critically and question and answer technique.

The child's ability to evaluate a story or passage critically is another component of reading comprehension. Critically evaluation has to do with the pupil's ability to talk about the characters in a story, evaluate the authenticity of a story and pass judgment to ascertain whether the character behaved well or acted well in the circumstance. It requires an individual to give a verdict to assess whether a character is good or bad as portrayed in a story or passage (Adam, 2004). The ability to evaluate critically what is read requires the reader's ability to distinguish between good or bad, love or hatred depending on the circumstances. The child should be able to note what is real or fictions in order to be able to note the up-to-date information presented. Pupils can do this starting from the early childhood and primary level of education provided there is the use of good teaching strategies.

It is also worthy of note that, reading comprehension is the ability to develop skill in reading to answer questions. Proficiency in finding the answer to a question can be helpful in a variety of reading situation. It is important at times to choose the main idea, to predict outcomes, to follow directions and to perform other activities connected with reading. Answers are relatively easy to find when the questions are partly couched in the exact words of the writer,



with the immature reader or the one who has difficulty in reading to find the answer to a question, this type of question may be used at first. If the writer says: “Susan’s father gave her a kitten for her birthday”, the reader may ask: “What did Susan’s father give her for her birthday?”. In asking questions to young readers, words like what, why, if used in the formulation of questions at this level can encourage or discourage critical thinking in a child. Not only will the pupils gain skills in finding answers to questions that are stated by others, but will avoid overdependence on the teachers. Finding answers to questions in a story or a passage read will also help the pupils to develop the ability to formulate significant questions for themselves as purposes for reading. Some practices that can be of value in developing skills in answering questions by pupils include among other, reading to answer questions stated by the teacher, reading to answer questions stated at the end of a selected reading passage and reading to answer questions brought out by watching a film or listening to stories. The ability to answer questions correctly from a story or passage is an indication that the individual understands what he has read.

Statement of the Problem

Reading is the foundation for effective learning and communication. It forms the bedrock for learning in other disciplines and making constructive ideas not just in classroom but in life generally. However, a progressive decline in the reading culture has reflected not just in poor grades in English language, but in students lacking confidence in expressing their ideas, themselves and even in understanding teachers as well as others. The problem of poor reading culture among younger Nigerians is a national menace that requires urgent action and sustained attention. The search for solutions in the classroom is the application of varying instructional strategies by the teachers to arouse student attention and maintain their motivation to reading and learning in general. However, some teachers are struggling to find the right teaching methods to assist in instruction and are also failing in the making the right choice in application of a particular instructional strategy that fits a particular unit of subject in reading comprehension. That is, not one instructional strategy should be used to teach all topics in reading comprehension. Teachers who fail to apply different and appropriate instructional strategies for each unit of instruction will not make the most of instruction. This in effect, will affect negatively instruction, which by extension, will also impact negatively on student performance. This study thus, intends to compare three different instructional strategies on different reading and comprehension topics to help the teacher make the right choice in choosing which is best for each topic.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity instructional strategies on the comprehension achievement of pupils in Uyo Metropolis, Akwa Ibom State. Specifically, the study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. To determine pupils’ performance in critical evaluation when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity instructional strategies.



2. To ascertain pupils' performance in question answering when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity instructional strategies.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study.

1. What is the difference in the performance of pupils' in critical evaluation when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity?
2. What is the difference in the performance of pupils' in question answering when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity?

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses guided the study

1. There is no significant difference in the performance of pupils' in critical evaluation when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity.
2. There is no significant difference in the performance of pupils' in question answering when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity.

Methodology

A quasi-experimental research design of pre-test and post-test non-equivalent control group was used for the study. The population for the study consisted of five thousand and ninety-four (5094) (1034 males and 1360 females) primary school pupils in public primary schools in Uyo Metropolis, Akwa Ibom State. Simple Random Sampling Technique was used to select four (4) public primary schools of intact classes of fifty (50) in the study area. Purposively, four intact classes from the selected schools were used for the selection, giving a total number of 200 (comprising 93 males and 107 females). A researcher-made instrument titled "Reading Comprehension Achievement Test (RCAT)" developed from the reading comprehension passage titled "The Computer" was used for data collection. The instrument contained 20 items, measuring pupils' ability to answer questions and ability to critically evaluate passages. Face and content validity was carried on the instrument by five experts, two from the Department of Early Childhood Education, two in the Department of English and one from Test and Measurement in the Department of Educational Foundation, College of Education, Afaha Nsit, Akwa Ibom State. To determine the reliability of the instrument, a trial test was carried out on 30 respondents who were not part of the study but were drawn from the population under study. A reliability coefficient of .79 was obtained signifying that the instrument was reliable. The instrument was administered to the subjects (pupils) as pre-test and post-test as achievement test. Data obtained from research questions were answered using means and standard deviations while



the null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). When the p value is less than 0.05 (P0.05) level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Results

Research Question 1: What is the difference in the performance of pupils' in critical evaluation when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity?

Table 1: Mean difference in pupils' ability to evaluate critically from a passage before and after exposure to three instructional strategies.

| Variables | Pretest | | Posttest | | Mean gain |
|---------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | \bar{X} | SD | \bar{X} | SD | |
| Experimental group | | | | | |
| Shared book experience | 3.62 | 1.46 | 8.80 | 0.60 | 5.18 |
| Repeated book reading | 4.11 | 0.95 | 9.87 | 0.37 | 5.76 |
| DLTA* | 3.91 | 1.14 | 9.36 | 0.49 | 5.45 |
| Control group | 4.12 | 1.38 | 6.44 | 0.95 | 2.32 |

*DLTA = Directed Listening and Thinking Activity

Analysis in Table 1 shows that the post-test mean scores of pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience: $x = 8.80$); repeated book reading ($x = 9.87$); and directed listening and thinking activity ($x = 9.36$) were greater than the post-test mean score of pupils in the control group ($x = 6.44$). These results showed that the pupils exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity) performed better in their ability to evaluate critically from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. The mean score for each instructional strategy was also higher than that of the control group. This confirmed that pupils' exposed to the three instructional strategies performed better in their ability to evaluate critically from a passage than those not exposed. Thus, the three instructional strategies could be used to teach students critical evaluation of passages.

Research Questions 2: What is the difference in the performance of pupils' in question answering when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity?

**Table 2:** Mean difference in pupils' ability to answer questions from a passage before and after exposure to three instructional strategies.

| Variables | Pretest | | Posttest | | Mean gain |
|---------------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | \bar{X} | SD | \bar{X} | SD | |
| Experimental group | | | | | |
| Shared book experience | 5.03 | 0.96 | 10.72 | 0.47 | 5.69 |
| Repeated book reading | 5.01 | 0.57 | 11.71 | 0.70 | 6.7 |
| DLTA* | 4.60 | 0.83 | 11.15 | 0.55 | 6.55 |
| Control group | 4.81 | 0.86 | 6.57 | 0.98 | 1.76 |

*DLTA = Directed Listening and Thinking Activity

Analysis in Table 2 shows that the post-test mean scores of pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience: $x = 10.72$); repeated book reading ($x = 11.15$); and directed listening and thinking activity ($x = 11.15$) were greater than the post-test mean score of pupils in the control group ($x = 6.57$). This implies that, pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity) performed better in their ability to answer questions from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. The mean score for each instructional strategy was also higher than that of the control group. This confirmed that pupils' exposed to the three instructional strategies performed better in their ability to answer questions from a passage than those not exposed.

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the performance of pupils' in critical evaluation when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity.

Table 3: Summary of Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) on difference in pupils ability to evaluate critically when exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | Compound F-ratio | p-value |
|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------------------|---------|
| Corrected model | 202.442 | 2 | 101.221 | 13.933 | .000* |
| Intercept | 15.322 | 1 | 15.322 | 2.109 | .005* |
| Pretest | 18.441 | 1 | 18.441 | 2.538 | .001* |
| Group | 111.141 | 2 | 55.571 | 7.649 | .000* |
| Error | 1431.212 | 197 | 7.265 | | |
| Total | 18314.64 | 200 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 1633.654 | 199 | | | |

* Significant at .05 alpha level.

Table 3 shows that the calculated F-value of 7.649 in respect of the between group treatment of the three instructional strategies was significant at .000 p-value. The p-value (.000) was significant because it was less than .05 alpha level at degrees of freedom of 2 and 200. This



result indicates that the pupils differ significantly in their ability to evaluate critically when exposed to the three instructional strategies. Hence, hypothesis six was rejected.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in the performance of pupils' in question answering when exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity.

Table 4: Summary of Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) on difference in pupils ability to answer questions when exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean square | Compound F-ratio | p-value |
|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------------------|---------|
| Corrected model | 217.036 | 2 | 108.518 | 10.200 | .000* |
| Intercept | 25.429 | 1 | 25.429 | 2.390 | .649 |
| Pretest | 22.445 | 1 | 22.445 | 2.109 | .001* |
| Group | 163.408 | 2 | 81.704 | 7.679 | .000* |
| Error | 2096.045 | 197 | 10.639 | | |
| Total | 2517.21 | 200 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 2313.081 | 199 | | | |

* Significant at .05 alpha level.

Table 4 shows that the calculated F-value of 7.679 in respect of the between group treatment of the three instructional strategies was significant at .000 p-value. The p-value (.000) was significant because it was less than .05 alpha level at degrees of freedom of 2 and 200. This result indicates that the pupils differ significantly in their ability to answer questions when exposed to the three instructional strategies. Hence, hypothesis three was rejected.

Discussion of Findings

Pupils' ability to evaluate critically when exposed to the three instructional strategies (Shared Book Experience, Repeated Book Reading and Directed Listening and Thinking Activity)

The results in Table 6 showed that the pupils exposed to shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity performed better in their ability to evaluate critically from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. The mean score for each instructional strategy was also higher than that of the control group. This further confirmed that pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies perform better in their ability to evaluate critically from a passage than those not exposed. To evaluate critically, the pupils must demonstrate ability to talk about the characters in a story, evaluate that authenticity of a story and pass judgment to ascertain whether the character behaved well or acted well in the circumstance. It requires an individual to give a verdict to assess whether a character is good or bad as portrayed in a story or passage (Adam 2004). The ability to evaluate critically what is read requires the reader's ability to distinguish between good or bad generosity



or greed, love or hatred depending on the circumstances. The child should be able to note what is real or fictitious in order to be able to note the up-to-date information presented. Adam (2004) stated further that pupils can learn to evaluate critically the early childhood and primary level of education, provided they are exposed to good teaching strategies.

The present study further found that there was significant difference in pupils' ability to evaluate critically when exposed to the three instructional strategies. The difference was observed from the post-test mean scores of pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience (\bar{X} = 8.80); repeated book reading (\bar{X} = 9.87) and directed listening and thinking activity (\bar{X} = 9.36). From the mean scores, it was evident that pupils in the repeated book reading group and those in the directed listening and thinking activity group performed better than those in the shared book experience group.

Pupils' ability to answer questions when exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity)

The result of data analysis in Table 3 revealed that the pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies performed better in their ability to answer questions from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. Further analysis with ANCOVA indicated that there was significant difference in pupils' ability to answer questions when exposed to the three instructional strategies. The difference occurred because the post-test mean scores for repeated reading (\bar{X} = 11.71) and directed listening and thinking activity (x = 11.15) were higher than post-test mean score of shared book experience (\bar{X} = 10.72). This result occurred as a surprise because majority of the teachers believed that the pupils should be able to answer questions from a reading comprehension passage irrespective of method used in the teaching. The ability to answer questions correctly from a story or passage is an indication that the individual understands what he has read. Repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity tend to have characteristics that make lessons clearer and understandable to the pupils. However, bitter, O'day, Gubbin and Socias (2011) stated that answers are relatively easy to find when the questions are partly couched in the exact words of the writer.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the conclusion reached were that pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies (shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity) performed better in their ability to answer questions and comprehend sentences from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. The pupils exposed to the three instructional strategies also performed better in their ability to make evaluate critically and follow direction from a passage than those not exposed to any of the instructional strategies. There was significant difference on pupils' ability to find main answer questions, evaluate critically and follow direction when exposed to the three instructional strategies.



Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions reached in this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Primary school teachers should apply shared book experience, repeated book reading and directed listening and thinking activity instructional strategies in teaching their pupils reading comprehension.
2. The local school authorities should prioritize training and retraining of teachers particular in classroom management and instructional systems delivery to ensure that modern methods of instructional management are imbibed by the teacher.
3. The teachers should encourage student learning and comprehension by varying the instructional strategy to meet the needs of the learners and inspire learning among the pupils.

References

- Adam, M. M. (2004). *Beginning to read: Thanking and learning about print*. Cambridge: Mass MLT press.
- Babalola, H.A.L. (1999). Comprehension and summary writing. In S.O. Oluga, C.O. Adewusi, H.A.Babalola, B.A. Oyediran (Eds.) *Essentials of Use of English. A Pragmatic and Comprehensive Approach*. Ede: BOA Educational Publishers.
- Committee on Learning Sciences (2012). *Foundations and applications to adolescent and adult literacy; Division of behavioral and social sciences and education*. National Research Council. National Academies Press.
- Honig, B., Diamond, L. & Gutlohn, L. (2013). *Teaching reading sourcebook, 2nd ed*. Novato, CA: Arena Press.
- Olatunji, S. O. (2011). Reading Comprehension and Summary Skills. In I. Oloosun, E. Olanrewaju, and O. Odekunle (Eds). *English language and communication skills for tertiary education (1-19)*. Joytal Educational Services, Ibadan.
- William, G. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

