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# ABSTRACT

*This study investigated the effects of Interactive Approach on Reading Comprehension and Attitudes of Senior Secondary School Students in Zaria Local Government Area of Kaduna State. The study aimed at evaluating the effects of Interactive Approach in determining students’ predictive responses to passage; in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions, in enhancing students’ ability to summarize comprehension passage, as well as examined the effect of the approach on students attitudes in the study area toward learning of comprehension. Methodologically, quasi experimental design was used, in which a pre-test and post-test design was employed. The study area has three thousand and eight (3008) students. The study sampled SS one students from two public Secondary schools in Zaria local government which were divided into two groups each. The sample schools have six hundred students (600) and one hundred and twenty students (120) students from SS one were sample based on 20 percent. The study adopted social constructivism theory as the theoretical basis. The instruments of the study comprised of comprehension passage extract from Chinua Achebe Prose’s “A Man of the people” AMOP; questions from the same passage and questionnaire which was used for testing students’ attitudes. Four research questions and research hypotheses were set. Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data at two different levels, viz: descriptive and inferential level. Mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentages were used for descriptive analysis and t-test for inferential analysis all the analysis for inferences were done based on alpha (α) value of 0.05. The study rejected the four research hypotheses. The study found and concluded that interactive approach increases students’ performance in prediction of answers to comprehension passages; in establishing questioning strategies for answering comprehension questions; in summarizing idea of the passages. For the students’ attitude, Likert rating scale was employed to test the hypothesis and the result revealed that students’ attitude in reading comprehension passages was positive due to the use of interactive teaching method. Based on the findings, the study recommended that there is need for teachers of English language to employ interactive teaching method while teaching. It is also recommended that teachers should be available to students, answer their questions, ask them questions and create an interactive learning atmosphere in the classroom which will not just focused on improving achievement and learning skills, but also helps them to grow mentally.*
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**OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS**

**Attitude**: Students interest, feeling and mode of thinking towards learning comprehension passages.

**Interactive Approach:** It is the kind of teaching that encourages the rubbing of minds of teacher and students inform of questioning, storytelling, role playing, group discussion etc during teaching and learning processes.

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL: English as a Foreign Language JSS: Junior Secondary School

SSS: Senior Secondary School

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching ICT: Interactive Communicative Teaching L1: First Language

L2: Second language

SPSS: Statistical Packages for Social Sciences

GIST: Generating Interaction between Schemata and Text

# CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

* 1. **Background to the Study**

Reading is one of the four basic skills in language learning. Reading provides learners with a source of comprehensible input and serves to facilitate communicative fluency in other language skills. Reading is about understanding of a text. It is a complex activity that involves both perception and thought of a reader. Reading simply means attainment of language, sharing of information, communicating and comprehending it the right way. Reading is an individual activity and has to be done alone for better comprehension. It consists of two related processes: word recognition and comprehension (Daura, 2014).Furthermore, reading ability has always been viewed as critical to academic success. According to Chastain (1980) Reading is a receptive and decoding skill in which the reader receives the writer’s message and tries to recreate the writer’s message to the extent possible. The reading goal is to read for meaning or to recreate the writer’s meaning. By definition, reading involves comprehension. When readers do not comprehend, they have not read (ibid, p. 217).

Scholars of reading believe that reading is a dynamic process which varied from reader to reader and from text to text and that the key factor in understanding this process is the interaction between readers and text variables( Farzaneh & Nejadansari, 2014).According to Alderson (2000),reader’s knowledge constitutes one highly significant reader variable in reading process. The nature of the knowledge brought to the reading process by the reader affects the way the text is processed and understood. Moreover, the reader’s linguistic knowledge, especially, vocabulary size and metalingustics knowledge are important factors. Schema theory has been developed in order to determine to what extend readers’ knowledge affects what they

understand. In addition, according to Bernhardt and Kamil (1995), the transfer of reading ability from L1 to L2 must be considered in this regard. The reader’s motivation for reading constitutes another significant reader variable. When it comes to text variables, the major one is known to be the language of the text. Many aspects of text, including text content, text type, text organization, and sentence structures might help facilitate or complicate the reading process.

Reading is an interactive process, it is important to understand those interactive factors that contribute to learners’ development of effective reading, strategies and desire to read. In other words, it is important to understand the context in which reading occurs. While we recognize the difficulty of considering in isolation factors that exist as part of a broad context.

Farzaneh and Nejadansari (2014), conceive that theories of reading have undergone dramatic change in recent years. And that reading is no longer seen as primarily a receptive process of text to reader. Instead, it is regarded as an interactive process between the reader and text. To bring about effective reading comprehension therefore, Farzaneh and Nejadansari (2014) explain that a taxonomy of different type of reading comprehension is developed based on the ideas of Pearson and Comperelt (1994) and Nuttal (1996). This taxonomy includes six different types of comprehensions which are thought to help students to become interactive readers. They are literal comprehension, recognition, inference, prediction, question or evaluation and response.

Investigation into the English Language curriculum have shown that reading comprehension is expected to be thought in such a way that it emphasized what learners can do with the language rather than using the forms of the language. Thus

reading appears as a component of general second language proficiency, but only in the perspective of the whole picture of interactive language teaching.

In secondary school, the teacher of English language must help students to develop the skills of reading, writing and comprehension to the stage where they can make effective use of them in working life or in their further education.

Moreover, a student needs the ability to comprehend effectively to be able to give correct response to whatever question he/she is asked. Reading comprehension and understandings are interconnected. Even though, reading can be done for different purposes, it is generally believed that the main aim of reading is to comprehend ideas in the texts being given either in English Language or other subjects (Raghad, 2009). Petty (2004) explains that we learn by doing, and research shows that active learning is much better recalled, enjoyed and understood and reading is viewed as combination of bottom up and top-down processing, which start from the reader to the text and interactive approach provides that a reader has a varieties of knowledge sources he can use in comprehending the message of a texts, it is therefore important to teach those interactive strategies that will develop comprehension abilities of the students.

According to Brown (2001), researchers have found that competent readers are those who actively and interactively construct meaning through an integrated process, in which they interact with words, integrating new information with pre- existing knowledge structure. They are self-motivated and self-directed; they use Meta -cognitive process to monitor their comprehension by questioning, reviewing, revising, predicting and re-reading. On this note, the study examines the effect of Interactive Approach in teaching reading comprehension in terms of three levels of comprehension (Predicting, questioning, and summarizing) among students in some senior secondary schools in Zaria Local Government Area.

# Statement of the Problem

In Nigeria, English language is one of the core subjects in the primary and Secondary School Curriculum. According to the syllabus for English Language Curriculum Development Council CDC, (1999), teaching of four core skills: Listening, reading, speaking and writing; is necessary in each key stage. It is however points out by Oyetunde (2009) in Yusuf (2014),that most teacher-training institutions in Nigeria are not adequately equipped and oriented to prepare teachers meaningfully for reading instruction at the primary and secondary level. English language teachers use different methods to teach reading comprehension.

Researchers commonly recognize that lack of reading strategy knowledge accounts, to a large extent, for secondary schools poor reading ability and the instruction to train the students to be aware of and effectively use reading strategies rarely happens during English reading classes in most secondary schools. It seems that secondary school teachers assume that their students know reading strategies and thus use them to read English text effectively. Therefore, the teachers just assign the reading materials; have the students read them and asses their reading comprehension performance. The poor reading teaching like this can lead to students’ failure in reading comprehension. As stated by Ekwall and Shanker (1998), more than ninety percent of learners’ reading failure could be blamed on poor teaching. This is in line with the observational studies by Durkin (1978-79) Pressley and Wharton-McDonald (1997) which found that teachers regularly assigned reading tasks to their students and then tested their reading comprehension, but rarely taught the reading strategies needed by their students. To address this problem, they suggest that an effective reading strategy instruction must be urgently carried out to promote learners ‘reading ability.

As noted by Pressley (2000), some teachers were of the opinion that ‘Read, read, read’ approach helps students to comprehend text without any major difficulty; however, their approach does not assist students in constructing meaning from text while some teachers realize that instructional practices may enhance students’ reading achievement and so they teach reading strategies in lessons. Pressley (2000) further explains that, it is disappointing that some students are not able learn the strategies or do not know how to apply appropriate strategies when they read. Besides given a lot of reading activities and comprehension instructional frame work available, it is challenging to choose an appropriate one that will suits students’ needs.

Aspatore (2005) contends that a lot of students are failing examinations due to their inability to comprehend effectively the instruction, questions as well as the contents of whatever material they are using in learning.

Reading comprehension is a difficult task that cuts across all language skills. According to Ekwall & Shanker (1998), most students find it difficult to comprehend effectively the instruction, questions and materials, especially the transitional students; that is, students moving from the lower level to the upper level of secondary school which may be one of the factors contributing to the mass failure of students in English Language especially at WASSCE and SSCE examination. Yusuf (2014) states that poor teaching methodology has been identified as the main cause of students’ reading failure. Yusuf(204) reveals that investigation of the curriculum in teacher training colleges in Nigeria have shown that reading methodology is either ignored completely or poorly taught. Even though the cognitive views of reading emphasized the interactive nature of reading and constructive nature of comprehension (Druner, 1993; Binkley & Linnakyla, 1997) in Daura (2014). Also Lasley and Ornstein (2000), explain that there seems to be a move towards allowing

students to be more actively involved in the teaching and learning of reading comprehension and the only way to make learners a shareholder in their learning is for teacher to become more of a facilitator of the process of learning, providing guidance for learners.

In another development, researchers like Oyetunde (2009), Yusuf (2013) have equally shown that providing opportunities for students to interact during reading comprehension lesson can promote comprehension. It is on this note that this study is sets to assess the Effects of the Interactive Approach on Reading Comprehension and Attitudes of students in the Senior Secondary School.

# Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study is to assess the effects of the Interactive Approach in enhancing the level of students in reading comprehension. The specific objectives are to:

* + 1. Find out the effect of Interactive Approach in determining students’ predictive responses to passage in reading comprehension.
    2. Determine the effect of Interactive Approach in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions.
    3. To elucidate the effect of Interactive Approach toward enhancing students’ ability to summarize ideas in a comprehension passage.
    4. To examine the effect of Interactive Approach on the Attitude of students in senior secondary.

# Research Questions

This study presents and answers the following questions:

* + 1. What is the role of Interactive Approach in determining students’ predictive responses to passages?
    2. What is the role of Interactive Approach in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions?
    3. How does Interactive Approach help in enhancing students’ ability to summarize ideas in a comprehension passage?
    4. What is the effect of Interactive Approach on the attitude of students in senior secondary when thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach?

# Research Hypotheses

To conduct an unbiased study of the problem, the following null hypotheses were used for the study and tested at P≤ 0.05.

H01: There is no significant difference in the predictive response of students taught reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those taught using non Interactive Approach.

H02: There is no significant effect of Interactive Approach in enhancing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions by students taught using Interactive Approach and those taught using non Interactive Approach.

H03: There is no significant difference in the summary ability of students taught reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those taught using non Interactive Approach.

H04: There is no significant effect of Interactive Approach on the attitudes of students taught reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those taught using non Interactive Approach.

# Significance of the Study

The study may equip teachers on varieties of interactive teaching activities that can be used in teaching reading comprehension and which may help in enhancing the students’ comprehension competence, thereby helping in reducing the problem of mass failure of students in examinations, especially at WASSCE and SSCE examination.

To the curriculum planner at the school and board level who plan the syllabus and schemes, it may serve as a road map on the right method and approaches of teaching Reading Compression to be included in their curriculum when planning, thereby bring about the effective teaching and learning of comprehension.

To students, the use of Interactive Approach in teaching and learning, especially in reading comprehension, which is relevant not only in English language but also in other subjects, may make learning purposeful and more interesting due to the interaction at various levels.

The study may enables teachers to extend their range of group and interactive teaching techniques to support their learners’ comprehension skill, to develop a plan for interactive activities when planning the lesson, to create idea for Interactive group activities and effective questioning techniques to be used in teaching reading comprehension.

This study may be of help to book writers by giving them insight on the different types of interactive comprehension activities to be included in their books. It may also help them in using appropriate questioning techniques that will bring about effective teaching of comprehension that may help students to respond to the comprehension questions and used English in real communicative situation.

# Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that when Interactive Approach is used in teaching reading comprehension, it can help students to: predict answers to the comprehension questions; establish questioning strategies; enhance students’ ability to summarize passage as well as bring about their positive attitude towards learning of English language in general and reading comprehension in particular in senior secondary.

# Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study is limited to the effect of Interactive Approach on Attitude and Reading Comprehension of SS1 students in public schools in Zaria local government only. This research is limited to only public secondary schools because information on private secondary schools is not assessable. Also the aspect of Interactive activities that the work is focusing on are predictive, questioning and summary.

# CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

* 1. **Introduction**

This chapter focuses on the review of related literature. The literature is reviewed under the following sub headings: theoretical framework, concept of reading, comprehension, reading comprehension, levels of reading comprehension, interactive approach, and effect of the interactive approach in teaching reading comprehension, attitude, social constructivism, and empirical review.

# Conceptual Framework

* + 1. **Interactive Approach**:

The accepted theory of reading has changed dramatically, from the bottom-up approach to top-down approach, and then to the interactive approach (Allright & Bailey, 1991). The Interactive Approach proposed that reading is not viewed as a passive process, but as an active process and in fact an interactive process. The Interactive Approach combines the bottom-up and top-down models and views the reading process as an interaction between the readers and the text. It assumes that students are simultaneously processing information from the materials they are reading (i.e. the bottom-up model) and information from their background knowledge (i.e. top-down model) and that recognition and comprehension of printed words and ideas result from using both types of information. The interactive model is greatly influenced by philosophy of epistemological pluralism which is of the view that knowledge is found or located in many places (Stonovich, 1980). The post structuralisms are of the opinion that knowledge is a social / cultural dimension in which the individual, event, idea, or text is seen as a product of socio/cultural influences (Olaofe and Masembe, 2006). Put in another way, knowledge does not exist outside the individual and community who know it (Cunningham and Fitzgerald,

1996). Furthermore, interactive approach is an integration of the strengths of both bottom-up and top-down approach. It is assumed that the process of understanding written text relies upon both bottom-up and top-down information.

The word “interaction” was first used by German sociologist Simmel in his book Sociology published in 1908, in which he wrote that our society came into being because of people’s interaction (Jiang, L & Lin M, 2006). According to the New Oxford Dictionary of English, “interaction” means “mutual or reciprocal action or influence (interaction)”. From the definition, we can infer the following nature of interaction:

* + - 1. The two-way relationship is emphasized,
      2. Equality and co-operation are valued,
      3. Individual contributions are stressed,
      4. Personal participation and experience are required.

These qualities such as cooperation, equality, individuality and interpersonal participation are what the educational sector expects advocates these days. This is why interactive teaching methods has spread rapidly in field of the ESL teaching and learning. Interaction involves not just expression of one’s own ideas but comprehension of those of others. One listens to others; one responds (directly or indirectly); others listen and respond. The participants work out interpretations of meaning through this interaction, which is always understood in a context, physical or experiential, with nonverbal cues adding aspects of meaning beyond the verbal. Whether in oral or graphic form, comprehension and expression of meaning are in constant interaction in real-life communication. According to Straight (1985) cited in Rivers (1987), “The best way to acquire a language is to acquire the skills needed to comprehend it fluently, and everything else will follow, if not automatically, at least far more easily and effectively.” Shu & Zhuang (2008) state that the interactive

analysis done by Waller (1969) is the beginning of studies of classroom interaction. And that in 1970s, British scholar Blacklynch (1970) defines classroom interaction as a process of applying strategies and negotiating meaning. Shu & Zhuang (2008) also explain that Brown is the main advocate of interactive language teaching. According to them, Brown language teaching theory of classroom interaction is one kind of face- to-face communication between teacher and students, whose features include providing answers to students’ questions, explaining students’ confusion or repeating points.

As to the reason interaction in classroom is so important, Rivers (1987) expound that students can enhance their knowledge of the language when they receive language information by reading and communicating with others, during which they listen to others, discuss with others, and also take part in some tasks, etc. In addition, during the interaction, they apply what they have learned or picked up in their lives to express their intentions, which is very significant. Rivers points out clearly here that interaction plays an important role for students to learn a language as well as in teaching and learning in general.

Some other researchers also elucidate the pedagogical importance of interaction. Malamah (2004) for example, identifies several important factors for interaction, which contains learners, mentors, learners’ affective or cognitive needs, and other variables such as the mentors and peers’ acts, the mentors teaching methodologies and teaching equipment, etc. Person-to-person interaction is the important part of a lesson. A lesson cannot happen without person-to-person interaction (Allwright, 1984). Swain (1995) holds the view that, interaction gives L2 learners opportunities to output, urging them to command the elements of the new language and apply them, which promotes the chances that students can use them

freely and unconsciously. Pica (1994) also explains that interaction creates the opportunity to negotiate, provide learners with increased chances for comprehension of the target language, and to acquire target discourse conventions and practice higher level academic communicative skills. Kasanga (1996) further claims that students would acquire more English through more interaction in English in English language class. So we get to know that interaction is an important work for language teachers. In another development, Brown (2001) gives a description of interaction in relation to communicative language teaching and explicates that in the area of communicative language teaching, interaction is, in fact, the heart of communication; it is what communication is all about. We send messages, we receive them; we interpret them in a context; we negotiate meanings; and we collaborate to accomplish certain purposes. (p.159)

Brown (2001) further explicates that, in a second-language situation, interaction has become essential for survival in the new language and culture, and students need help with styles of interaction. Meanwhile, classroom interaction has become the topic of classroom management research, educational psychology and second language acquisition research. The communicative approach emphasizes that the most important function of a language is communication. It stresses the need to teach what is needed and when it is needed to give learners the flexibility to learn in their own way, at their own pace that is to learn interactively, rather than to follow a pre-determined syllabus. The interactive approach and communicative approach have some similarities that cannot be denied. Both emphasize the learners’ personal participation and experience in language teaching and learning. That is, language learners acquire language by using and practicing it in contexts (Beale, 2002).In this regard, the teacher rarely engages in long, elaborate explanations, but rather

concentrates on a specific need as it arises. The opportunities for learners to use language for communicative purposes are adequately provided so that language can be acquired easily through verbal communication. Comparing CLT to interactive approach, Brown (2001) points out that one of the primary characteristics of CLT is that like interactive approach, the target linguistic system is learned best through the process of interaction. These approaches contribute greatly to language teaching, and they have been adopted widely in some countries and language schools.

Brown (2001) further points out that, interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings, or ideas between two or more people resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other. It is the heart of communication; it is what communication is all about. Theories of communicative competence emphasize the importance of interaction as human beings use language in various contexts to “negotiate” meaning, or simply states, to get one idea out of your head and into the head of another person or vice-versa.

The interactive approach stresses not only learners’ personal participation and the cooperation between language learners in the process of learning language, but also individual learners’ unique devotion to language acquisition and learners’ mutual influence.

From another angle, but still on the pedagogical importance of interaction, Grabe (1985), in Jin (1993) explains that the reading process is not a matter of extracting information from the text rather, it is ‘one in which the reading activates a range of knowledge in the reader’s mind that he/she uses, and that, in turn, may be refined and extended by the new information supplied by the text’. According to this approach, during reading, the reader constructs a personal interpretation of a text; there is an interaction between the reader and the text. The reader also tries to get at

the author’s original intention; there is an interaction between the reader and the author. And there is also a constant interaction between the lower-level bottom-up strategies and the higher-level top- down strategies the readers employed.

Yusuf (2014) states that the objective of interactive approach is to teach students the strategies that will help them develop into independent readers who can monitor their own thinking while reading and link prior knowledge to the new material in their text. Consequently, reading becomes a highly individualized process as each reader’s schemata and the ability to use them are personal and unique. The more prior knowledge that a reader possesses, the more likely he or she is to construct meaning from the printed text. Students assume an increasingly important role in interactive approach activities. At this level, students no longer observe teacher, explains the information in the text, instead, they are actively involved in reading and comprehending. They support their classmates by sharing ideas and responsibilities of comprehension. And their teacher only provides assistance when needed. To buttress the statement above, Yan (2011) also asserts that, interactive approach helps to improve students’ reading ability and encourages them to read extensively and critically and therefore, think independently. Yan,(2011)stresses further that, this assertion possesses challenges to teachers to create an immense opportunity and awareness of the interactive approach to reading as well as encourage students to read extensively using both bottom-up and top-down strategies to function interactively as this will go a long way in developing the students’ critical reading and independent thinking. He thereafter suggests that during the reading process, the focus should be put on decoding the meaning of the text and on activating the systemic and schematic knowledge, with the bottom-up and the top-down strategies functioning interactively

to improve the students’ reading ability and cultivate critical reading and thinking in them.

Furtherer more, Yan (2011) explains that the ability to read at a reasonable rate with good comprehension is as important as other skills. Teacher in English language education should therefore, be concerned with approaches that can improve the reading comprehension of students. The interactive approach to reading is of great value in this aspect. And adds that, in order to help students to become efficient readers, it is necessary for teachers to cultivate the awareness of interactive approach to reading in students and teach them certain reading strategies as well as encourage them to read interactively by employing both bottom-up lower level strategies and top-down higher level strategies. This is to help students become efficient and critical readers both by reading intensively in class and by a large amount of reading after class.

In addition, and to emphasize the importance of interaction in the language acquisition process, Cunningham and Fitzgerald (1996) and Krashen, (1987 ) show that several studies document such as that of Arreaga-Mayer & Perdomo-Rivera (1996), Ramirez, (1992), Barrera (1983), Goldenberge, (1989), Heibert (1983), Knapp & Shields (1990) and a host of others show the paucity of interaction in ELL classrooms and/or the tendency to weight ELL instruction toward lower level skills lessons and factually oriented lessons. Such findings, as well the emergence of newer studies like that of Palinscar & Brown (1985), Tharp & Gallimore (1988) documenting the potential value of interactive instruction served to stimulate and justify increasing interest in interactive approaches (Dalton, 2006; Tharp, 1997) and the promise of programs specifically for ELLs that utilized both direct instruction and

interactive approaches (August & Hakuta, 1998; Calderón, Hertz-Lazarowitz, & Slavin, 1998; García, 1992; Gersten, 1996, Goldenberg, 1996; Saunders, 1999).

In conclusion, interactive approach according to Olaofe & Masembe (2006), is similar to bottom-up and top-down approaches in a couple of ways. First, like bottom- up model, the reader depends on the information in the text for comprehension to take place that is reading is viewed as text-driven, Second, interactive approach is similar to top-down model n that it is a reader driven. A reader’ knowledge and experience are needed for comprehension to take place since the reader has to make guesses about the meaning of the text. However, interactive approach differs from the two approaches in one basic way. While bottom-up and top-down are serial models, interactive is cyclical. Reading is perceived to involve parallel and continuous processing of all source of information. The basis for this is that in interactive approach, there is interaction between the written text and the reader. In this interaction the reader’s knowledge and experience from all sources combine together simultaneously to facilitate comprehension

There remains an urgent need to continue conceptualizing and studying instructional approaches that assist EFLs in acquiring knowledge, skills, and higher level concepts, both in their primary language and in English language (OLA; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2001, 2003).

# Concept of Attitude

Attitude is a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favour or disfavour (Wanke, 2002). It is a predisposition or a tendency to respond positively or negatively towards certain idea, object, person, or situation. Attitude influences an individual's choice of action, and responses to challenges, incentives, and rewards (Business Dictionary). Zelley,

Marianne and Elaine (2005) postulate that attitudes are generally positive or negative views about a person, place thing or event which are often referred to as the attitude object. Mei (2005) quotes Allport's definition of attitude as a mental and neural state of readiness organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related. Implicit in the various definitions is that attitude is a psychological orientation developed as a result of one's experiences, which influences how a person views situations, objects or people, and how he/ she appropriately responds to them. The response may be positive or negative; favorable or unfavorable; neutral or ambivalent.

Hannula (2002) looks at attitude from the cognitive-emotional perspective and states in his research that while a student is engaged in a mathematical activity, there is a continuous unconscious evaluation of the situation with respect to personal goals. And that when students are evaluated, there are four areas examined. The first is simply situational and no prior experience of the entity being evaluated. The second depends entirely on previous experience and is the kind that is typically seen on questionnaires. The third evaluation is when the situation is familiar to a degree, but the individual has no personal experience. The fourth is when an individual looks at ones whole life and the value of different goals in it. Hannula,(2002) then concludes that "these four evaluations produce attitude".

According to Bohner (2002), attitude is a central part of human identity. Every day, people love, hate, like, dislike, favor, oppose, agree, disagree, argue, persuade etc. All these are evaluative responses to an object. Hence attitudes can be defined as a summary evaluation of an object or thought. Lionel, (2005) defines attitude as inclinations and predispositions that guide an individual's behavior which can develop

and change with time. While Bob,(2004) sees attitude as an action that can be evaluated as either positive or negative.

The concept of attitude, therefore, arises from attempt to account for observed regularities in the behavior of persons. In another development, McGure (1981) defines attitude as predispositions to classify sets of objects or events and a reaction to them with some degree of evaluative consistency. He further describes attitude as hypothetical constructs (i.e they are inferred but not objectively observable), which are manifested in conscious experience, verbal reports, gross behaviors and physiological symptoms. McGure, (1981) also explains that opinion expressing people’s likes and dislikes towards object, event or subject is conveyed through one’s attitude. Psychologist and sociologist define attitude as a term relating to relation between attitude and behaviour. To psychologist, if behaviour is to change, attitude change must manifest.

Sociologists, on the other hand, mentioned that attitudes can be measured and used to predict behaviour (Albalawi, 2014).Generally an attitude comprises three main components: affective, cognitive and behaviour. The three components are closely related. Emphasizing this, Fazior and Olson (2003) posit that attitude can be based on either cognitive, affective or behaviour and the existence of an evaluation based on one of the elements need not imply existence of the other two elements. Attitude comes in different strengths and like most things that are learned or influenced through experience, they can be measured and can be changed. Regarding these three components, Hogg and Vaaughan (2005) state that an attitude is a relatively enduring organization of beliefs, feelings and behavioral tendencies towards socially significant objects, groups, events or symbols. To explain the different components, Hogg and Vaaughan (2005), further define attitude as enduring systems

of belief that can be examined in three different levels that is, cognitive(how we think or reason through an attitude),emotion(how we feel regarding an attitude), and behavioural (how we act on an attitude).

Attitudes to learning and the perceptions and beliefs which determine them, have a profound influence on learning and on learning outcomes (Cotteral,1995). Successful learners develop insightful, beliefs about language learning processes, their own learning abilities and the use of effective learning strategies, which in total have facilitative effects on learning. These students tend to develop a more active and autonomous attitude that allows them to take charge of their learning. An attitude that expresses a predisposition reaction of individuals against any subject around them has been a case that causes bias in decision-making process and shapes the behavior of individuals towards such subject. If the attitude developed against a subject, object or event is positive, then the possibility of the decision related to them will be positive. For this reason, attitude had a qualification decision related to the future (Ulgen, 1995; Tavsancil, 2002).Teachers, therefore, need to acknowledge and respect students’ attitude, beliefs, expectation and help them overcome any harmful perceptions towards them (Mantle-Bronely, 1995).

In addition, Mantle-Browley,(1995),Peacock,(1998) reveal that teachers should also enhance students’ awareness of their personal weaknesses and strengths and their task/strategic knowledge, since beliefs differing from those of the teacher can lead to great frustration, dissatisfaction with subjects, unwillingness to perform communicative activities, and lack of confidence in the teacher. Ojo,(1993)explains that the major causes of students’ poor performance in English and other school subjects is their inability to read effectively, which in turn, is largely due to the attitude of learners towards reading.

As explain by Farzaneh & Nejdansari, (2014) researchers constantly maintain that reading instruction that emphasize learners’ active participation like interactive approach proves to be effective and can therefore bring what positive attitude of learners. It is for this reason that this work is set to examine the effect of interactive approach on the attitude of senior secondary students towards reading comprehension.

# Reading

Reading is very fundamental to an individual’s success in school and in society. It is one of the basic language skills. Others are listening, speaking and writing. Out of these skills, reading is at the centre of every academic success and acquisition of general literacy. This is why Kolawole (2005) asserts that the success of any further education depends entirely on the intensive and extensive reading a child is able to do. Similarly, Shoebottom (2003), postulates that educational researchers have found a strong correlation between reading and academic processes as well as between reading and vocabulary knowledge. Hedge (2003) defines reading as an “interactive” process between a reader and a text which leads to reading fluency. In this process, the reader interacts dynamically with the text as he/she tries to elicit the meaning and where various kinds of knowledge are being used: linguistic or systematic knowledge (through bottom-up processing) as well as schematic acknowledge (through top-down processing). To show the importance of teaching reading, Hedge, (2003) states that any reading component of an English language course may include a set of learning goals for the ability to read a wide range of texts in English. This is the long-range goal most teachers seek to develop through independent readers outside English as Foreign Language/ English as Second Language classroom. Other goals include:

1. Building a knowledge of language which will facilitate reading ability
2. Building schematic knowledge.
3. The ability to adapt the reading style according to reading purpose (i.e. skimming, scanning).
4. Developing an awareness of the structure of written texts in English
5. Taking a critical stance to the contents of the texts

Adigun and Oyelude (2003) stress that reading is a lifelong activity. And that those who enjoy reading derive pleasure and satisfaction from it. They also observe that skill in reading will not only assist students in organizing their thoughts and jotting down important facts while reading, but also equip them to comprehend entire texts.

Adewole (2001) asserts that the aim of any reading program is to lay a strong foundation that can benefit pupils throughout their lives in academic pursuits. Oyetunde and Unoh (2009) list impediments to positive reading habits and attitude. These includes lack of materials, poor preparation of teachers, lack of interest, poor libraries or none at all, home background, and lack of adult readers as models.

Grabe (1991), on the other hand, proposes six component skills necessary in reading, which include automatic recognition skills, content background knowledge, etc. These component skills contain both lower-level identification skills and higher- level comprehension and interpretation skills—which all together make possible fluent, effective reading.

Carell (1998) asserts that “reading is a receptive language process in that it starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which the reader constructs”. Such a cognitive view of reading puts both the text and the reader at the heart of the reading process. To Bramford and Day,(2004) an accurate, successful word-decoding upgrades readers to the stage of connecting

information with prior knowledge, so as to reach textual meanings/comprehension eventually.

In another development, Kern, (2000) defines reading as a dynamic, interactive process which produced meanings and derived discourse from text. Fielding & Pearson (1994) view reading is an active, constructive, and meaning- making process. Therefore, reading comprehension is generally associated with the ability to read, and to construct meanings as well. Iser (1980) also explains the cognitive view of reading as reader-response theory. According to him, in reading process, readers stand at the center of reading as readers’ prior knowledge and textual content interact. Meanings are thus eventually incited in this way. There is a dynamic relationship between the reader and a text, in which reading is a creative process rather than a textual decoding only. The reader is therefore granted an authorial role. From another perspective Duffy (1993) expounds that in other to bring about effective teaching and learning of reading comprehension, there is need to apply relevant reading strategies. Reading strategies are ‘plans for solving problems encountered in constructing meaning’.

Reading strategies are specific abilities that enable the reader to read the written form as meaningful language, to read anything written with comprehension, fluency, and to mentally interact with the message the writer conveys. Different reading strategies are used in order to achieve different purposes. Some let the reader figure out new words, predict the new words, phrase or sentence quickly for speed recognition; some help the readers to see the relationship of ideas and use these in reading with meaning and fluency; while some help the reader use knowledge of the words to interpret the text. Strategies help students process the text actively, monitors

their comprehension, and to connect what they are reading to their own knowledge and to other parts of the text (Duffy, 1993).

# Comprehension

Comprehension is the process of deriving meaning from connected text. It involves word knowledge as well as thinking and reasoning. Comprehension is not a passive process but an active one. The reader actively engages with the text to construct meaning. This active engagement includes making use of prior knowledge. It involves drawing inferences from the words and expressions that a writer uses to communicate information, ideas and viewpoints (Daura, 2014).

Comprehension is the process of making sense of words, sentences and connected text. Readers have to make use of background knowledge, vocabulary, grammatical knowledge experience with text and other strategies to understand written texts (Adams, 1998). In addition, comprehension is defined as intentional thinking during which meaning is constructed through interactions between text and reader (Harris and Hodges,1995, cited in National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2002).

Comprehension is the goal of both reading and listening. Successful comprehension enables readers \listeners to acquire information, to experience and be aware of other worlds (including fictional ones) to communicate successfully, and to achieve academic success. Good reading comprehension involves reading the words on the page, accessing their meanings computing the sense of each sentence and much more activities. In other words comprehension simply means understanding therefore to understand text in a meaningful way, readers need to integrate the meanings of successive sentences and to establish local coherence (Daura, 2014). Readers also need to establish how the information fits together as a whole, that is, global

coherence. For both local and global coherence, readers need to incorporate background knowledge and ideas (retrieve from long-term memory) to make sense of details that are only implicit (Kamil, 2004).

# Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension is defined by Snow and Sweet (2003) “as the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning.’’ Within this definition the dual challenges of figuring out how print represents words and how to integrate new meanings with old information are acknowledged. Reading comprehension is a complex process that can be taught only through the effective process with deep thinking of connected and coherent text.

Furthermore, reading comprehension is the process of constructing meaning through dynamic interaction among reader’s existing knowledge, the information suggested by the written language and the context of the reading situation (Helene citedin Ahmed, 1998). In addition, it is the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. It consists of three elements: the reader, the text and the activity or purpose for reading. (RAND reading study group, 2002). Meaning is constructed as a transaction between reader, text and activity situated within a lager social/cultural context (Dalton, 2006).

Reading comprehension can be improved by expanding reader’s vocabularies and gaining greater control over complex syntactic structure. All texts share certain essential components. Readers must solve the words, recognize how text is organized (text structure), make sense of the sentences and paragraphs (language structure), understand what they are reading (Pearson and Camperelt, 1994). Pressley (2000), on the other hand, suggests that readers adjust their reading to give attention to different aspects of texts when they encounter different types of texts. To be a skillful

comprehender, therefore, readers need exposure to a wide variety of texts. Most researchers on reading now focus on the effective reading strategies that increase students’ comprehension.

Reading comprehension is the process of making meaning from text. The goal, therefore, is to gain an overall understanding of what is described in the text rather than to obtain meaning from isolated words or sentences. The ability to read, taking general comprehension requires the reader to draw information from the text and combine it with the information and expectations that the reader already has. This interaction of information is a common way to explain reading comprehension, though it does not reveal much about the specific of reading. All researchers recognize that the actual ability to comprehend texts come about through reading, and doing a great deal of it. (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

According to Guthrie and Humenick (2004), several aspects of intrinsic motivation support for reading .Their findings suggest that meaningful conceptual content in reading instruction increases motivation for reading and text comprehension. Orasanu (1986) however, argues that the knowledge a reader brings to a text is the principal determinant of how the text will be comprehended, and what may be learned and remembered .To attests to this, Ahmed (1998) views reading comprehension as the process of constructing meaning through the dynamic interaction among the reader’s existing knowledge (prior knowledge), the information suggested by the written language and the context of the reading situation. To enhance reading comprehension, therefore, Haller (2000) modeled a number of school- base post-reading activities through the use of: matching exercises, cloze exercises, cut-up sentences and comprehension questions.

# Levels of Comprehension

According to Iyiola (2013) there are basically four level of reading comprehension. They are reading for gist or general information (seeking for clarification), reading for required information (summarization), reading for inferential or implied meaning (prediction) and reading for projection (generating questioning). In addition, USA National Reading Pannel (2000) report on reading, reveals that five strategies should be thought to ensure good reading comprehension. These are prediction, questioning, clarifying and summarization.

# Summarization

This involves the extraction of the main idea or theme of what is read (while putting aside the irrelevant details) and integrating the details into a coherent whole. Teaching students to summarize what they read is another way to improve their overall comprehension of text (U.S.A National Reading Panel, 2000). Dole, Duffy, Roehler, and Pearson (1991) explain that, summarizing is often confused with determining main idea but, summarizing is a broader, more synthetic activity for which determining main idea is necessary, but not sufficient, condition. The ability to summarize information requires readers to sift through large units of text, differentiate important from unimportant ideas, and then synthesize those ideas and create a new coherent text that stands for, by substantive criteria, the original. Indeed, most people with relevant experience will agree that summarizing is a difficult task for many students. Many students require instruction and practice in summarizing before they are able to produce good oral and written summaries of text. Interestingly, research suggests that instruction and practice in summarizing not only improves students’ ability to summarize text, but also their overall comprehension of text content. Thus, instruction in summarization can be considered to meet dual purposes: to improve students’ ability to summarize text and to improve their ability to comprehend text

and recall. There are at least two major approaches to the teaching of summarization. In rule-governed approaches, students are taught to follow a set of step-by-step procedures to develop summaries. For example, McNeil and Donant (1982) teach the following rules, which they draw from the work of Brown, (1981) and Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978):

Rule 1: Delete unnecessary material. Rule 2: Delete redundant material.

Rule 3: Compose a word to replace a list of items.

Rule 4: Compose a word to replace individual parts of an action. Rule 5: Select a topic sentence.

Rule 6: Invent a topic sentence if one is not available.

Through teacher modeling, group practice, and individual practice, students learn to apply these rules to create brief summaries of text. Other approaches to summarizing text are more holistic. One that has been the subject of research is the GIST (generating interactive between schemata and text) procedure (Cunningham, 1982). In GIST, students create summaries of 15 or fewer words for increasingly large amounts of text, beginning with single sentences and working incrementally to an entire paragraph. As Cunningham describes it, GIST is conducted first as a whole class, then in small groups, and finally on an individual basis.

Working with sixth-grade students, Bean and Steenwyk (1984) studied the effectiveness of McNeil and Donant’s set of rules procedure and Cunningham’s GIST procedure. They found that versions of both approaches were effective not only in improving students’ written summaries of text, but also in improving their comprehension of text as measured by a standardized test. Despite being markedly different, the two approaches were roughly equal in their effectiveness, and both were superior to a control technique that involved only practice in writing summaries based on the main ideas in text. Perhaps one of the reasons both McNeil and Donant’s and

Cunningham’s summary procedures are effective is that they are both consistent with an overall model of text processing that itself has stood the test of validation.

Kintsch and Van Dijk’s (1978) model of text comprehension posits that text is understood through a series of identifiable mental operations. These operations are necessary for understanding both the local and the more global meaning of text within the constraints of working memory, the reader’s goals, and the structure of the text. Although a thorough description of these operations is beyond the scope of this chapter, they essentially involve a series of deletions, inferences, and generalizations, much like those required by the summarizing procedures later used by McNeil and Dunant (Bean & Steenwyk, 1984).

# Prediction

Prediction means forecasting, that is, a statement that says what you think happens and the act of making such statement (Duru 2016). Duffy (2003) explains that when readers make predictions of what ideas they will encounter on a text, they increase the potential for effective reading comprehension to take place. Duru (2016) further explains that prediction often occurs in tandem with other strategies such as using background knowledge, generating questions, comprehension and monitoring. As readers move on to later parts of a text in a passage, they may also change what they predicted.

Furthermore, it could be argued that the ability to predict what a text entails is the first step to successful comprehension .A reader obtains the first clues to what a text is all about via the title. Together with the opening sentences, this can help the reader decide if the text is appropriate to their purpose (USA National Reading Pannel, 2000).

Irwin (1991) contends that predictions also depend upon the readers’ characteristics, their background knowledge, goals in reading a given text, and their attitude towards the ideas they learn from a passage which influence their knowledge about text structure. Prediction stimulates readers’ sense of monitoring and teaches them to pay close attention to identify important information. Irwin (1991) concludes that these strategic behaviours make the reading process active and constructive. As Duffy (2003) confirms that the strategy of making prediction is fundamental to reading comprehension of text. It can also be taught to learners at all levels. He therefore suggests that when students experience a situation where they are uncertain about what they are reading but still try to read without being able to make much sense, they should be guided to use predictions. It should be explained how this strategy is important in enhancing probing for meaning.

Basically, students can be taught to use the topic, textual cues, and picture to elicit predication. Duffy (2003) also asserts that an effective prediction is “a thoughtful hypothesis base on cues”. According to Duffy (2003) students can determine what they have predicted and how they make the prediction for example what cues or background knowledge they use, which will indicate that the instruction of the strategy is successful.

Afferbech’s study (1990) on “the influence of the prior knowledge and text genre on readers’ prediction strategies” concludes that students make more predictions on essays and stories with the more familiar contents and structures of the texts. In addition to thought making predictions, they also use cues available from their background knowledge to monitor and determine the effectiveness of their suppositions and comprehension. Because using background knowledge is an

important knowledge in reading strategy, it is important that readers have adequate and appropriate background knowledge as a reading tool.

# Generating Questions

Generating questions during reading helps students move themselves to a higher level of thinking. Duffy,(2003) explains that good readers generate question while reading without having to put much effort on it, but poor readers do not have this skill and tend to believe that they will understand the meaning of the text only when they can decode words. Duffy (2003) further asserts that by nature, since generating questions together with prediction and monitoring are cognitive activities that normally take place instantaneously and quite unconsciously and invisibly during reading, It is therefore necessary to teach these thinking processes only by giving explanations or by modeling. Students found it difficult to mimic the teachers’ modeling because the strategy itself requires background knowledge and normally each individual reader has different prior knowledge. Students cannot achieve this skill just by passively seeing the teacher performing it instead they have to actually practice it. Studies regarding reciprocal teaching provided evidence that training students to actually generate questions together with the other three strategies of summarizing, predicting and clarifying would help improve students’ comprehension because generating question alone will not be as effective as when all strategies are employed together (Brown & Palincsar 1985, Brown, 2001).Actively engaged readers can use self-questioning to monitor their reading comprehension and to help clarify points that they fail to understand. A successful comprehender knows how to generate pertinent questions and can fall back on their mental model of the text to know where to locate relevant information (U.S.A Reading Pannel, 2000).

Similarly, a review of various reading research studies concludes that students who were trained to use this strategy with well-structured guidance out performed those who did not receive training. In fact it was observed that students’ success in this strategy application seemed to have a connection with the type of instrument provided to them. The nature and intensity of the instruction may be critically important’ (Dole & Duffy, 2003; Duffy, Roehler & Pearson, 1991). In relation to this, from the instructional perspective, Duffy (2003) suggests that using guided and intensive practice, when students become comfortable with this cognitive behavior, teacher can ask them to report how they have used it and how they relate it with other strategies in their reading.

# Approaches to Reading Comprehension

Recent investigations of language understanding have spawned a number of models of the reading process. As explain by Kintsch,(1974),Kintsch & Bates(1977) that cognitive theorists like Cooper, (1972), Gough, (1972) Laberge & Samuel(1974) and Rumelhart & Smith (1971) show that, most durable component of the memorial code is the set of propositions which represents sentence meaning. That is in most cases, information about the surface structure is remerged less than semantic information.

Contrasting sharply with this line of thinking is the model of reading developed by Kolers and Ostry (1974), which holds that memorial representation of a sentence produced during reading consists of a record of pattern analyzing operations which were used to encode the sentence. Koler argues that instead of viewing reading as a process in which we retain the surface structure of sentence only long enough to extract meaning from it, we should view it as a process in which the procedures used to encode it are ‘part and parcel’ of the meaning representation (Kolers, 1975). From

this view point, what is stored in the memory are the procedures applied to the linguistic input at encoding rather than a propositional presentation of sentence meaning. Code durability is therefore contingent on the complexity elaboration of the encoding operations in this work, the different approaches to reading comprehension to be examined are: bottom-up approach, top-down approach, and interactive approach. The first two will be discussed so as to bring about a clear understanding of the third one, which is the main focus of this research.

# Bottom-Up Approach

The Bottom-up approach is promoted by educators who view reading as a set of sub skills that must be mastered by students and integrated to the extent that students use them automatically. The approach views that meaning resides in the graphic symbols the writer uses in encoding the message (Olaofe and Masembe 2006). It is a kind of approach that imposes a hierarchical organization on written text in that, step wise, readers first must learn to recognize letters, then words, and finally words in context. That is, readers are seen as processing the text from smallest unit to the highest unit of the text ( Olaofe and Masembe 2006).

They further indicate that bottom-up approach hold the view that meaning is present in the graphic symbols that writer uses in encoding the message. That is reading involves sensing print on the retina, analyzing letters features and letter cluster, detecting and combining letter into words, organizing words into phrases and sentences, associating meaning with these sentences and storing and reasoning with these meaning. Thus there is a hierarchical organization of written text in which the reader is seen as processing of text from its smallest to the highest unit and so readers read letters by letters serially from left to right.

Furthermore, this approach to reading has its ideology from behaviorism

/stimulus-response theories of learning which are described as reductionist because for them, the whole must be broken down into small separate elements if comprehension is to take place. The reason for the belief is that when the whole is reduced to various parts, comprehension becomes easier. In other words, if students are able to comprehend the letters, words and phrases they will automatically understand the whole text (Olaofe and Masembe, 2006).The bottom up approach emphasizes the ability to recode or put into sound what is seen in a text. It focuses on the knowledge of the target language more than the information on the reading. It is data-driven approach that requires the specific knowledge of language itself from the readers (Goodman, 1967).

When students combine a high level of accuracy with speed and proceed to read aloud with good expression, they are exhibiting automaticity (Samuels, 1994). Students therefore, should not be taught using a method that considers reading as though it were a single process. Instead, for instructional purposes, it is best to think of reading as a set of interrelated sub skills that must be practiced in the context of actual reading. Students can build automaticity only by spending considerable time reading, preferably with meaningful material that is easy and interesting. This part-to- whole model is involved in the basal reader approach, which has been the dominant method of reading instruction for many years.

The strengths of Bottom-up approach are: as a microscopic view of reading, the bootom-up approach helps the learners to improve semantic and syntactic knowledge about the target language. It enables the readers to pay particular attention on words. And by so doing be able to discover the writer’s intended meaning (Rivers, 1964). However, the weakness of the approach according to Eskey & Grabe, (1990) is

that simply knowing the meanings of some set number of words does not ensure that a reader will be able, while reading, to process those words both rapidly and accurately. Therefore, they suggest that teachers must help students develop identification skills (exercises for rapid recognition: word recognition and phrase identification extensive reading over time); Rate building: good readers read fast; they do not, like many EFL readers, try to read word by word, which destroys their chances of comprehending very much of the text. They therefore conclude that the major bottom-up skill that readers of second language must acquire is the skill of reading fast. To do this, (Paced and timed reading exercises: formal rate-building work should be limited to a few minutes per class). And then major increases in reading rate can only follow from extensive reading in the language over time.

Another weakness of the bottom- up approach according to Stonovic, (1990) is that the approach does not allow for the higher-level of processing stage to influence the lower-level processing during reading. Olaofe & Mesembe (2006) also explain that the operating principle of the approach that understanding written text is exclusively in the graphic symbols that is, meaning reside in the printed mark does not give room for consideration for meaning beyond the graphic symbol. Teaching under bottom- up approach has to do with teaching key vocabulary items, in the area of grammar, teaching various cohesive devices as well as laying emphasis on learning skills as a goal in itself.

As a result of this, controversy has developed regarding which set of skills to teach and in what order. And this leads to the rejection of the reductionist approaches by cognitive psychology (constructivists) who view learning as more than just sensory perception. The constructivist such as Readance, Bean and Baldwin, (1981) explain, that in order to comprehend, learners must take active part in reading process. This

ideology gave birth to the top-down theory which is the whole-to-part model that teaches students to recognize words by sight, without any analysis of letters or sounds.

# Top-Down Approach

The alternative approach to bottom- up approach is the psycholinguistic approach the top-down approach to reading. One of the representatives of this approach Goodman (1967) states that, ‘reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game

.And that efficient reading does not result from precise decoding, but from skill in selecting the fewest, most productive cues necessary to produce guesses that are right the first time’. Rather than decoding each symbol, the reader begins with a set of hypotheses or predictions about the meaning of the text he is about to read, and then selectively samples the text to determine whether his predictions are correct or not. If the predictions are not confirmed, the reader may revise his prediction by sampling the text again. Reading process is a process of reconstructing meaning rather than decoding form, and the reader only resorts to decoding if other means fails. Olaofe & Masembe (2006) show that in top-down approach, comprehension of written texts starts from the higher-level stage.

Cambourne (1979) also, provides the following illustration of top-down approach to reading: past experience, language institutions and experience. In top- down manner of reading, not only is the reader an active participant, making predictions and processing information, but also everything in reader’s background knowledge plays a significant role in reading. The top-down agrees that the reader rather than the text is the heart of reading process. And it emphasises the reader’s role in reading process and marginalizes the decoding process in reading.

The top- down approach focuses on what the readers bring to the process of reading. The readers get information from the text and contrast it with their world knowledge, helping to make sense of what is written. It is text-driven approach that the readers interact with the text. It emphasizes the critical role that the reader’s mind plays in comprehending the text. According to this theory, students use three cue systems: graph phonic, semantic, and syntactic and make educated guesses about the meaning of the reading passage. The advocates of this approach view reading as a holistic experience and believe that what the reader anticipates profoundly affects how he/she actually perceives the message in a text. Thus, the basis of top-down approach is that readers use their knowledge and experience in other to make prediction about the meaning of the text .This approach operates on the principle that comprehension of written text starts from the higher level stages of understanding down to the text being read. Advocates of top-down approach such as Goodman (1968), Bernett (1988), Dechant (1982), Smith (1988) and Dechant & Smith (1977) argue that the reading process is more of bringing meaning to than gaining it from the printed page. The top- down approach emphasizes readers bringing meaning to text based on their experiential background and interpreting text based on their prior knowledge (whole language). Top = higher order mental concepts such as the knowledge and expectations of the reader. Bottom = the physical text on the page. The readers sample the text for information and contrast it with their world knowledge, helping to make sense of what is written. The focus here is on the readers as they interact with the text.

The strengths of top- down approach are that, in using it to teach comprehension, it helps learners improve their reading skills and also to understand the general meaning of the whole reading; In order to understand written text, readers

use their knowledge of syntax and semantics to reduce their dependence on the print and phonics of text. The weaknesses of this approach are: the top-down approach does not account for situation in which a reader has little knowledge of a text topic, and therefore cannot form prediction (Stonovic,1980).Another weakness of this approach is that educators have argue that children need to learn word recognition skills for processing language to become independent readers.

The most salient difference between bottom-up and top-down approaches is the role of readers: the former views readers as passive decoders while the latter view them as active encoders. Speaking of interactive strategy, two modes of interaction are referred to here: the interaction between bottom-up and top-down, and the interaction between text and reader (Chin Ching, 2011). The two modes are actually inseparable when it comes to the meaning and understanding of interactive approach.

# Effects of Interactive Approach in Teaching Reading Comprehension.

In the early seventies, Goodman's psycholinguistic model of reading (later named the top-down or concept driven model) began to have an impact on views of second language reading. In this model the readers are active, make predictions, processes information, and reconstruct a message encoded by a writer (Internet). According to Goodman (1967), reading is a receptive language process and a psycholinguistic guessing game, which is an essential interaction between language and thought in reading, and the writer, encodes thought as language and the reader decodes language as thought. Based on this theory, the teaching approaches of reading were suggested by three categories: Top-down, Bottom-up approach which views teaching reading as a dichotomy, and Interactive approach which integrates these two approaches.

According to Grabe (1991), the term interactive approaches can refer to two different conceptions: First, the term ‘interactive approach’ refers to the general interaction which takes place between the reader and the text. The reader (re)constructs the text information based in part on the knowledge drawn from the text and in part from the prior knowledge available to them. Second, the term ‘interactive approach’ refers to the interaction of many component skills potentially in simultaneous operation; the interaction of the cognitive skills leads to fluent reading comprehension. This means reading involves both an array of lower-level rapid, automatic identification skills and an array of higher-level comprehension/ interpretation skills (Carrell 1988, 1989, Eskey 1986, Eskey and Grabe 1988, Rayner and Pollatsek 1989, Samuel and Kemil 1984). The two perspectives are complementary, though most cognitive psychologists and education psychologists stress the interaction-of-skills arrays; in contrast, most second language researchers stress the interaction between the reader and the text.

This teaching approach which provides time and question for students to think and discuss, and which cultivates a supportive classroom atmosphere to promote interactions between students and the teacher, and amongst peers was found to be crucial to promote learners’ intellectual engagement in class. This type of teaching approach is defined as ‘interactive approach’.

Interactive teaching is that type of teaching in which there are two ways communications between the teacher and students; students to students. And the teacher continuously monitors and responds to students thinking as he/she continues teaching by adjusting the flow and focus of the lesson in response to how students are thinking with the aim of allowing them to dig deeper into the reading text (Moles, 2003).

Teaching in interactive approach is about the notion of knowledge being constructed jointly rather than content being delivered to learners by teachers. Instead of the teacher giving answers and full information to students on how to solve reading questions he/she allows students to think deeply about how the giving problem can be solved. To allow learners dig deeper into meaning of reading text, the teacher structures classroom communication in such a way that each learner freely communicates without hindrance from teacher’s dominance. Learners communicate and sort information with confidence and assurance from the teacher that working together they shall deeply learn the author’s intended message. Students do have the understanding that the teacher is only there to support them and not to find out who is making mistakes or to spoon feed them nor is he/she there to give answers to questions. Learners have an assurance of openness to each other and their teacher; and with some amount of control of the learning process.

In this pedagogy ,the teacher does not only emphasize the enhancement of learner’s interest, participation, discussion during the comprehension lesson but also aims at developing students’ comprehension ability. The teacher ensures that learners are focused more on learning than merely interacting (Yan, 2011).

Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) outline the processes involved in this interactive process where both bottom-up and top-down processes occur simultaneously at all levels. The data that are needed to instantiate*,* or fill out the schemata become available through bottom-up processing; top-down processing facilitates their assimilation if they are anticipated by or consistent with the reader’s conceptual expectations. Bottom-up processing ensures that readers will be sensitive to information that is novel or that does not fit their ongoing hypotheses about the content or structure of the text; top-down processing helps the listeners/readers to

resolve ambiguities or to select between alternative possible interpretations of the incoming data. Therefore, readers can improve reading comprehension by expanding their vocabularies and gaining greater control over complex syntactic structures. Contemporary insights believe that grammar facilitates learning and its presentations to learners should be through contextualization of linguistic forms in situations of natural use.

Cook (1997) suggests that language learners be taught to alternate between top- down and bottom-up processing to check and restructure their comprehension of the content as they read. Correct predictions would seem to require little bottom-up processing, while the need to correct previous predictions might require a more careful attention to specific linguistic elements of the reading. For learners of English, two primary hurdles must be cleared in order to become efficient readers. First, they need to be able to master fundamental bottom-up strategies for processing separate letters, words, and phrases, as well as top-down, conceptually driven strategies for comprehension. Secondly as a part of that top-down approach, second language readers must develop appropriate content and formal schemata background information and cultural experience to carry out those interpretations effectively (Brown, 2004). The two models of reading frequently regarded in connection with each other are: bottom-up and top-down models; also referred to as text-driven and concept-driven respectively (Day and Bamford, 1998).

They both rely on the idea that every piece of reading consists of a number of hierarchical items which are successively processed. Barnett (1985) distinguished these items: letters and characters, the phonological component (letter and sound correspondences), individual words, the lexicon or vocabulary (words carrying meaning), semantics (meaningful groups of words) syntax or grammar (words

functioning in relation to each other) structure of sentences, paragraphs and the whole text.

In bottom-up reading model the reader arrives at understanding, first, by combining different text elements, that is: letters and words until a chunk of data is created (this stage is called decoding). Only then do students deploy a stage of comprehension which is transforming previous phonological data into meaning. Bottom-up model of reading is characterized by a linear process of joining lower-level text items and gradually adding them together until a meaningful chunk of data is created. This kind of text processing is believed to be typical of weaker second language readers and texts beyond their comprehension skills. In such cases, readers adhere to bottom-up decoding process as they cannot immediately draw meaning from the text.

A top-down reading model is almost a complete contradiction of a bottom-up model. Goodman (1964) presents it as "an interaction between reader and written language, through which the reader attempts to reconstruct a message from the writer." He also calls the model "a psycholinguistic guessing game". The last expression is quite exact as in top down reading the reader does not instantly concentrate on the elements of text, but produces predictions about the meaning based on his/her knowledge of syntax and semantics (Ibid).

In many cases an efficient reader appears to use what are called Top-Down and Bottom-Up strategies. This means that the reader will not just try to decipher the meaning of individual lexical items but will also have clear ideas about the overall rhetorical organization of the text. The essential features of the bottom-up approach are that the reader tries to decode each individual letter encountered by matching it to the minimal units of meaning in the sound system (the phoneme) to arrive at a

meaning of the text, whereas with the top-down approach, the interaction process between the reader and the text involves the reader in activating knowledge of the world, plus past experiences, expectations and intuitions, to arrive at a meaning of the text. In other words, the top-down process interacts with the bottom-up process in order to aid comprehension, which is the basis of the ideology of interactive approach. Many studies have adopted an interactive teaching approach and found that it promotes students’ participation in the learning process, and it beneficial to the students’ performance. For example, Angelo (1993) in her study, encourage an active interactive process because its brings about understanding of learning, helps to improve teaching performance as well as enhance students’ learning (p.3).In support of this, Chang (2002) explains that interactive teaching approach promotes interaction and learning engagement, including concentration, thinking and discussion, develops

learners’ perspective, interest, enjoyment as well as satisfaction with learning.

Gonzalez (2008) refers to interactive teaching as ‘learning by doing’ and shows that the teaching method is effective in that its develops in students the ability to work in teams, as well as preparing them better for work after graduation. This opinion shows the effectiveness of interactive approach beyond school and classroom level.

He however concludes that, no assessment method is perfect, and the one under discussion is not an exception. Furthermore, the use of interactive approach in teaching ‘complex multi-sensor measuring technology’ has helped students gain experience in the use of measuring devices and encourages the process of understanding measurement machines and their characteristics. The academic education will also benefit from the increasing quality by combining theoretical lesson with practical interactive training (Barge, 1993).This explanation above has

revealed the relevance of interactive approach in both practical and theoretical application.

To lend support to the relevance of interactive teaching method in practical teaching, Barraket (2005) asserts that the shift toward student- centeredness through the use of interactive small group activities have significantly enhanced students’ learning. She further asserts that, using this approach, the classroom experience was characterized by high leveled of dialogue and interaction, strong engagement of students with subject matter and positive students’ feedback. The strength of interactive approach is that, it allows students to build common experiential ground, which provided a shared base for technical base for engaging with more technical aspects of subject matter.

Sangoma (2008) explicates, that interactive approach is associated with positive learning outcomes of deep understanding of meanings concepts by learners; learners develop confidence and are motivated in learning by doing as well as helps in the development of higher thinking in learners and resilient attitude required in solving problems especially in reading comprehensions. Collis &Lacey,(1996) make it clear that Interactive mode of teaching has many roles in teaching and learning of English language, especially in reading comprehension. Being process based, it tends to enhances learning more than the transmission mode of teaching would do. This is achieve because the quality of teaching and learning process is the main objective for it successful implementation. This means that interactive mode of teaching does not only emphasis and focused on learners finding correct answers to comprehension passages, but also on the nature and the quality of interactions taking place as a process through which learners go in order to find answers to comprehension questions. Sangoma (2008) also justifies that interactive mode of teaching is the

process that if conducted properly would enhances deep learning of reading comprehension.

The interactive model has also been applied to teaching of latest instructional technologies by some researchers like Turel and Johnson (2012).They come up with the word ‘interactive white board’ to them interactive white board (IWB) has enhanced the functionality of existing ICT such as computers and projectors by adding interactively to these media that make it distinctive from PowerPoint presentation. In addition, the use of Interactive white board (IWB) has enhanced social interaction between teacher and students, between students and learning environment, draw learner’s attention, facilitate learning and using visual media etc.

This model starts with the hypotheses and predictions then attempts to verify them by working down to the printed stimuli. This view of reading was called the psycholinguistic guessing game. According to Goodman (1967) readers employ five processes in reading:

1-Recognition-initiation 2-Prediction

3-Confirmation 4-Correction

5-Termination

Hence, the interactive model (Rumelhart, 1977) stresses both what is on the reading and what a reader brings to it using both top-down and bottom-up skills**.** Efficient and effective reading and comprehension require top-down and bottom-up strategies operating interactively, interactive model. So, top-down and bottom-up processes, function interactively, are necessary for an adequate understanding of second language reading and comprehension (Carrell, 1988).

For the effective comprehension of reading, two approaches are integrated and involved in a reading process together. The readers continually shifts from one focus to another, which is adopting a top-down one to predict probable meaning, and then moving to the bottom-up one to check whether that is really what the writer says. Since it requires all knowledge system activated by the readers, which are linguistic knowledge on a meaning of words or syntax, but also the cognitive knowledge about the contents of the reading, it helps the learners to make their reading more effective to understand the main ideas and improve the language skills as well. Reading is views as the interaction between reader and text. The overreliance on either mode of processing to the neglect of the other mode has been found to cause reading and comprehension difficulties for EFL students (Carrell, 1983).The interactive models of reading assume that skills at all levels are interactively available to process and interpret the text (Grabe 1991).

If a text contains too many difficult words, no strategy (top down or bottom up) can make such a text accessible to the reader. However, second language readers do of course encounter some unknown words in most texts. This is the best means of increasing their control of English vocabulary. EFL students, however, are frequently panicked by unknown words, so they stop reading to look them up in dictionaries, thereby interrupting the normal reading process.

In response to this problem, many EFL texts recommend various strategies for guessing the meaning of unknown words from context, by using semantic and syntactic clues or even morphological analysis. In order to develop good reading habits, the best strategy for dealing with an unknown word may well be to keep reading until the meaning of that word begins to make itself plain in relation to the

larger context provided central to all these bottom-up concerns is the concept of automaticity.

Good reader’s process language in the written form of written text without thinking consciously about it, and good EFL readers must learn to do so. It is only this kind of automatic processing which allows the good reader to think instead about the larger meaning of the discourse, which allows for global reading with true comprehension.

The review above explains the focus of this study which is to evaluate the effect of interactive approach on reading comprehension and attitudes of students in Senior Secondary Students.

# Previous Study on Interactive Approaches

Yusuf (2014) carries out a study on Interactive activities and its impact on students’ performance in reading comprehension. The study made use of pre-test and post-test quasi experimental design and T-test was used to analized the result. The population of the study comprised of senior secondary schools in Kaduna state, out of which eighty (80) students from two schools were selected for the sample. Two reading comprehension tests were used for collection of data. The result of the study revealed that interactive activities had significant impact on the students’ performance in reading comprehension and thereby suggested that interactive activities are helpful in understanding and comprehending written. It helps teacher to see how students’ individual thought processes from texts. Teachers are also encouraged to use interactive activities to facilitate students’ reading comprehension; curriculum planners are also encouraged to include interactive activities in the reading component of the English language curriculum for senior secondary schools.

The study reviewed is similar to the present study in the sense that they both research on senior secondary school students of the same level in the same state. The quasi experimental research design used in the review study analysis will be adopted in the present study. However, the effects of interactive approach on attitude of students was not examined in the reviewed study. It only examined the impact of interactive activities as a determinant of students’ performance. In the reviewed study, the schools used are only day schools while the present study examined both day and boarding schools. The exact population of the reviewed study was not stated and the theoretical framework upon which the reviewed work was base was not specified.

Katrina (2010) carried out a research on promoting the reading comprehension of freshmen engineering students through an interactive approach to content based materials. The study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of a content based interactive reading pedagogy to enable first year engineering students develop significant levels of reading comprehension of science text and compensatory strategies; to help in improving their attitude and motivation towards reading. The study used both quasi – experimental and survey research design.

The population of the study consists of first year engineering students of university of Santontomas, Manila Philippines. For the quasi – experimental, a total of number of eighty (80) first year students were sampled and divided into two groups one serving as control group and another as experimental group. For the survey research, the study employed questionnaires in forms of 5 point likert rating scale as the instruments. The analyses were done in two parts, for the first part result t-test was used to analyzed pre and post test result and the result shows that Interactive Approach to reading content-based materials is effective in improving the freshmen engineering students’ reading comprehension skills because of the appropriate

emphasis on bottom-up and top-down processing skills. This interaction gave the students in the experimental group the opportunity to address difficulties in content processing and language processing due to lack of knowledge in skill and subject matter of the text. Also, the Interactive Approach helped the experimental group acquire compensatory skills which assisted them in overcoming reading difficulties arising from lack of knowledge about the content or the subject matter of the text. Hence, he concluded that interactive process provided the students skills and strategies in compensating their own weaknesses with their own background knowledge. Furthermore, the Interactive Approach as treatment was successful because the experimental group found the lessons informative, relevant to their area of specialization and dynamic as it encouraged exchange of ideas and feedback in the classroom.

The similarity of the review of Katrina (2010) research and this present study is in the area of methodology and instrument. The study of Katrina (2010) employed both quasi experimental and survey methods. The two works examined the impact of interactive approach on performance and attitude of students in reading comprehension. The difference between the two researches was on the level of the students. The former focused on university students while this present one shall be focusing on secondary school students. Theoretical differences also exist, in the Katrina (2010) the study is built on ternate of different theories and interview to two teachers while the present study is based on social constructivism and no room for interviews for teachers, only student’s questionnaire.

In another development, Connel (2012) studied impact of traditional vs interactive instruction on students who have moderate to severe cognitive disabilities, the study aimed at ascertaining if the comprehension of students who have moderate

to severe cognitive disabilities would benefit from interactive or traditional teaching methods. The population comprises of students and teachers of St. John Fisher Honeycomb Central School District of Western New York. Two teachers and two students of the schools were sampled for the study. Interview of teachers, students’ field notes and work samples were the instruments used to collect data for the study. The findings of the research revealed that: both direct and interactive instructions can benefit students reading comprehension; it is important to have an arsenal strategies to tackle different challenges because challenges related to comprehension varies, lastly, using interactive teaching method to hold the attention of students is a strategy that may not actually aids students comprehension but it may be of benefit provided it reinforce rather than distracts their attention from text being read.

Connel (2012) research was quite informative. The steps taking in the analysis were explained. The review of the research differed from the present research on area of population and sample. The population of the reviewed only comprised of two teachers and two students of the special schools in the area. While the present study will be examining one hundred and twenty (120) students from regular secondary schools in Nigeria; the theoretical background of Connel (2012) and the present study also differs. Also the principle behind the reviewed study was not totally followed. In the principle, it is believed that literacy is influence by interaction of people, materials, technologies of the time which promotes literacy practice (Freebody and Lukes, 1990) was not followed in the course of data collection. In Connel (2012) students were not allowed to interact with themselves only with materials and their teachers. Furthermore, the reviewed work only examined the theory and practice related to “direct instruction” and failed to examine the “interactive instruction” perhaps that was why the result was not totally positive toward interactive method.

Raghad (2009) on the other hand, carried out research on “The effect of interactive approach vs cognitive approach on students’ reading comprehension”. The study dealt with testing of the contribution of interactive approach and cognitive approach on enhancing students’ level of reading comprehension. Based on pre-test, two homogeneous classes from the College of Basic Education were chosen as the subjects of the study based on three hundred and fifty four (354) populations. To verify the effectiveness of either approach on promoting students’ reading comprehension one group (experimental) was taught by interactive approach and the other group was taught (control) by cognitive approach. After ten sessions of class work, the subjects were participated in a post-test. From the data analysis carried out via a t-test calculation, it became clear that the first group (experimental group) outperformed the second one (control group). The Raghad (2009) study cogently concluded that interactive approach was more effective than cognitive approach. The reviewed study is related to the present study in the area of objectives, however the work under review is on the investigation of the effectiveness of cognitive and interactive approaches to teaching reading comprehension. the present study is on the investigation of the Interactive Approach and Attitude. The method of analysis also differ in nature, because Raghad (2009) work had to test effectiveness of the two approaches despite this the choice of instrument is inappropriate due the fact that multiple choice and short answers test used is a poor measures of students’ achievements particularly of the ability to understand, compose, create and use complex ideas or materials (Olaofe, 2013) which are the skills required in comprehension activity. On this note, the present study will be using the kind of comprehension test that will test all the comprehension skills mentioned above.

Rahman (2014) conducted a research on Reading Comprehension through group work activities in an EFL classroom. The aim of the study is to: quest for way of solving the problems and assessing the feasibility of group work in classrooms; to identify effect of group work activities in classroom activity as well as to identify techniques that promote better reading comprehension. The population involved in this study was EFL 8th grade students of a secondary school in Dakar. There were 18 students of 12-13 years chosen as the sample of the study. The study adopted quantitative and qualitative research design in gathering data of strategic changes. Pretest and post-test were conducted. The pre-test aimed at identifying the existence cognizance of the student in Languages uses and the post-test was conducted for gathering the date on the implications of applying the group work in the real classroom. The findings showed that group work has a good impact on comprehension skills, understanding and generating ideas. The work is very informative. However, the author should have administered a test on attitudes of the students so as to ascertain the students’ attitudes toward the method. In addition the use of different test for pre and posttest groups is inappropriate because it questioned the reliability and validity of the test.

Uredi (2013) conducted a study on ‘the Effect of Classroom teachers’ Attitude toward the Constructive Approach (which is the theory behind interactive approach teaching model) on their level of establishing a constructivist learning environment: ‘case study of Mersin. The sample comprises of five hundred and four teachers (504) in thirty-two(32) elementary education schools in the province of Mersin Akdeniz, Yenisehir, Toroslar and Mezitli Central District Turkey .’ Constructivism Approach Attitude Scale’ developed by Evrekli , Kesercioglu, Balım and Inel Evrek (2009) on 5-point likert was used to determine the teachers’ attitude towards constructivism

approach. The finding showed that classroom teachers have positive attitude towards this approach; majority of the teachers have established a constructivist learning environment and there has been a significant positive effect of interactive approach on their attitude.

The similarity between Uredi (2013) and the present work is in the investigation of constructivist approach which is the theoretical framework of the present study also the work covered large area thus making it to be elaborate. Nevertheless, Uredi (2013) work would have focused on the effect of the theory on the attitude of the students as well, for it is believed that the students are the benefactors of the end product of the research not teachers so it would have been the students’ attitude that would have determined the effectiveness of the approach.

In another development, Barraket (2005) conducted study on “Teaching Research Method Using a Student-Centred Approach. The methodology employed in this analysis is a reflective case study approach loosely based on an action research methodology. One hundred and sixty eight (168) students in masters-level social research were sampled. The study revealed that the shift toward student-centeredness through the use of interactive small group activities based on primary resources appears to have significantly enhanced students’ learning in this case. Also the study revealed that classroom experience was characterized by a high level of dialogue and interaction, the assessment results suggest overall students’ strong engagement with the subject matter, and student feedback was very positive.

One of the key strengths of this approach was that it allowed students to build common experiential ground, which provided a shared base for engaging with more technical aspects of the subject matter. This is increasingly important in higher education contexts where flexible learning pathways are producing diverse student

cohorts with no, or highly limited, common learning experiences. At the same time, students feedback on the more didactic features of the curriculum was equally positive. This study suggested that a holistic teaching approach at the individual subject level is as important as particular teaching techniques that emphasize student- centeredness. It was however revealed that, students continued to place value on more formal teaching methods therefore, the value of student-centered techniques in this case would rested in the way which they were integrated with didactic teaching practice.

The similarity of Barraket (2005) and this study is that they both examine the effect of interactive approach on students’ performance. Even though the reviewed work was based on cognitive constructivism, the present study is based on social constructivism but both study are built on the premises of placing value on students centered learning. However the areas of divergent of the reviewed study and the present one are the reviewed was based on research method using a Student-Centred Approach while the present study is on reading comprehension; the population and location differs in level. The reviewed work sampled masters’ student while the present study will be sampling secondary school students. Also the present study will be examining students’ attitude but the reviewed failed to do so.

Farzaneh & Najadansari (2014) conducted study on “Students’ Attitude towards Using Cooperative Learning in Teaching Reading Comprehension” The aim of the study was to investigate students’ attitude towards using cooperative language learning techniques in reading instruction. The study employed survey questionnaire which was distributed among the participants in order to determine their views about employing cooperative techniques in instructing reading comprehension. The uni- dimensional questionnaire used in the study was developed by McLeish (2009) and

had 12 items. The respondents were allowed to rate each item on a scale of options which were numerically coded as 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); 5 (strongly agree). The population of Farzaneh & Nejadansari (2014) study comprised of 54 intermediate EFL learners, 16 male and 38 female, attending Gouyesh Language School in Gachsaran, Iran. The study stressed that although cooperative methods are becoming more prevalent in private language schools, there are few studies regarding evaluating the students’ attitude towards using cooperative learning for instructing reading comprehension in Iranian context. The study was conducted using a survey questionnaire. Analysis of the results revealed that the participants generally tend towards supporting the implementation of cooperative strategies in teaching and learning reading comprehension.

The strength of this study is that is based on two theories they are: (constructivism theory and theory of motivation). The instrument is adequate because it enable large scale numerical data to be obtained over a short period of time. Nevertheless it is insufficient due to the reason that the research failed to administer test to actually ascertain the performance of the subject of the research. Moreover, the effectiveness of method may not be ascertained using only questionnaires because human beings can be pretending especially when they are under observation. The present study is more elaborate in that it will be looking at the effect of interactive approach on reading comprehension as well as attitude of the subjects.

Also, Baltid (2014) in his study investigated “The Effect of a Problem based Learning approach on students’ attitude levels”. The aim of the study is to examine the effect of a problem-based learning approach in comparison to traditional learning approaches. The subjects of the research were 190 national and international studies carried out between 2006 and 2013 and in which pre and posttest instrument and

experimental research design were used. Nineteen (19) thesis and six (6) articles were sampled. The instruments used in the research is a meta-data analysis, the effect of meta analyses method which includes calculation of average differences between the experimental and the control group of the sampled works was tried to be determine (Hunt and Schmidt, 1990 cited in Sahin, 2005). In this research, the effect size of value “d” value which is obtained as a result of division of differences of averages between the experiment group and the control group to total standard deviation was calculated according to Thalheimer and Cook (2002) level classification. For the analysis of the effect of coefficient analysis calculated for each study, Fixed Effect Model (FEM) and Random Effect Model (REM) interpretation were made by taking these into consideration. CMA (Comprehensive Meta-Analysis), the meta Win statistical and Micro soft excel 2010 office programs were used.

Baltid (2014) came up with the findings that problem based learning approach has been used frequently in teaching different lessons and subjects in teaching environment and that it has had a positive effect on the students’ attitude. The method of data collection of this work may likely be deficient because it involves only reanalyzing of the results of different studies. Thus the information is gotten from secondary source but not primary.

Wheijen (2002) carried out study on “Interactive Teaching Approach in Year One University Physics in Taiwan: Implementation and Evaluation”. Methodologically, the program was assessed by interviewing (14) students as well as by surveying the ' opinions of (380) students in confidential questionnaires. Based on the findings of this research, the outcomes of an interactive teaching approach compared with traditional teaching were found to be significant in three areas. Firstly, the interactive teaching approach was found to successfully promote interaction and

learning engagement, including concentration, thinking, and discussion. Secondly, the program developed the learners' perspectives of their own learning. The students in the intervention group seemed to shift their focus from teaching performance to their own learning when assessing the course. They became more aware of the learning barriers and took more responsibility for their own learning. The study recommended that further research may help to reveal the strengths of the interactive teaching design as well as provide information for modifying the teaching design to better fit to the contexts.

The study of Sangoma (2008) sought to determine The Role of Interactive Teaching in Mathematics’. The study focused on determining the view of Malawian Secondary School Mathematics Teacher about the approach, meaning and implementation of interactive approach. Questionnaire and interview were used to collect data from twenty-nine Mathematics teacher in Malawi. The study employed quantitative research and descriptive analyses. The research revealed that though teachers have various views about interactive teaching, they all value its positive roles in teaching and learning mathematics. Their views however, tend to affect their knowledge about its meaning. The result also shows that Malawian secondary school mathematics teachers have limited knowledge and skills of interactive teaching and in the implementation of interactive teaching. In the course of its implementation they focus more on its surface features rather than on the desired deep features. The points of divergence between the review and the present work are in the subject of the study and the area of discipline. While Sangoma carried out his research among Malawian Mathematics teacher, this current study is set to investigate the effect of interactive teaching on attitude and comprehension of senior secondary students in Nigeria, Zaria local government in particular.

The similarity of the reviewed work and the present study is in the theoretical perspective, both works are bases on social constructivism theory propounded by Vygotsky (1978). No test was administered on the students’ performance in Mathematics thereby make the work less elaborate. Also there was no investigation of students and teachers’ attitudes. However the instrument helps in collection of good number of data in short periods of time. And the questionnaires used were designed in such a way that it gave full details of expected information.

# Summary of Related Literature

The table below summarized related literature discuss for this research work, the table also gives summary of areas relevant to the present study.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors** | **Summary of Aspect Reviewed** | **Areas Relevant to Present**  **Study** |
| Yusuf (2014) | Interactive Activities and its Impact | It gives insight of t-test procedure, Instrument sample method and method of  analysis |
| Katrina (2010) | Effectiveness of a Content Based Interactive Reading Pedagogy | Procedures of the research, statistical tools used, the nature of interview questions used in testing reading attitude and different reading strategies |
| Connel (2012) | Impact of Traditional vs Interactive Instruction | types of interactive teaching methods, short comings of interactive teaching, benefit of interactive teaching, challenges related to reading comprehension of students with cognitive disabilities |
| Raghad (2009) | Effect of Interactive Approach vs Cognitive Approach | It gives insight of t-test, concept of interactive and cognitive theories, |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors** | **Summary of Aspect Reviewed** | **Areas Relevant to Present Study** |
| Rahman. (2014) | Reading Comprehension Through Group Work Activities | Group work activities and activity under interactive approaches quantitative and qualitative research design for gathering data of strategic  changes |
| Uredi (2013) | Effect of Classroom Teachers’ Attitude Toward the Constructive Approach | Influence of teachers attitude toward Constructive Approach, 5 point likert rating scale for attitude  measurement, |
| Baltid,(2014) | The Effect of a Problem Based Learning Approach(Interactive Approach) | Interactive approaches, students’ attitude, problems of interactive approach. |
| Wheijen (2002) | Interactive Approach | Interactive Teaching Approach, comparison of interactive teaching and traditional teaching |
| Sangoma,(2008) | The Role of Interactive Teaching in Mathematics | Concept of interactive teaching, practical meaning of interactive teaching, theoretical perspective of interactive teaching , roles of interactive teaching , teachers’ role in an interactive class and application of interactive teaching in other subject area |
| Young and Collin (2004) | Constructivism Ideology | The constructivism bases. |
| Ryan (2000) | Social Constructivism | Social constructivism theory bases. |
| Hannula (2002) | Cognitive-Emotional Terms | Conceptual definition of attitude. |
| Kern(2000) | Reading | Concept of reading. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors** | **Summary of Aspect Reviewed** | **Areas Relevant to Present Study** |
| Carell (1998) | Reading | Concept of reading. |
| Daura (2014) | Teaching Reading Languages Teaching Series | Concept of comprehension, goals of reading . |
| Snow and Sweet (2003) | Reconceptualising Reading Comprehension | Concept of reading comprehension |
| Iyiola (2013) | Comprehension and Summary | Level of reading comprehension |
| Barraket (2005) | Teaching Research Method Using a Student-Centred Approach | cognitive constructivism theory , Interactive teaching method in practical teaching, interactive approach on students’ performance, Student - Centred Approach as a method under interactive teaching. |
| Farzaneh & Najadansari (2014) | Students’ Attitude towards Using Cooperative Learning for Teaching Reading Comprehension | Students’ Attitude, Cooperative Learning, teaching Reading Comprehension, nature of questionnaire used in measuring attitude. |

# Concept of Constructivism

The concept of constructivism is theory of knowledge (epistemology) that argues that human generate knowledge and meaning from an interaction between their experiences and ideas. According to Young and Collin (2004) the main focus of constructivism is that knowledge is actively constructed, and its application has an emphasis on process, collaborated learning, and teaching for understanding.

In past centuries, constructivist ideas were not widely valued due to the perception that children's play was seen as aimless and of little importance. Jean Piaget (1978) did not agree with these traditional views, because, he saw play as an important and necessary part of the student's cognitive development and provided

scientific evidence for his views. Today, constructivist theories are influential throughout much of the formal learning sector. Furthermore, the field of education has undergone a significant shift in thinking about the nature of human learning and the conditions that best promote the varied dimensions of human learning. As in psychology, there has been a paradigm shift in designed instruction; from behaviorism to cognitive and now to constructivism (Cooper, 1993).Constructivist perspectives on learning have become increasingly influential in the past twenty years and can be said to represent a paradigm shift in the epistemology of knowledge and theory of learning. The increasingly prevalent literature-based approaches to reading and process approaches to writing both share constructivist roots (McCarthy, 1990); and perusal of current school textbooks reveals the influence of constructivist views of learning (Thompson, McLaughlin, & Smith, 1995). In addition, constructivist views of learning have captured the current zeitgeist in today’s educational arena.

The term constructivism most probably is derived from Piaget’s reference to his views as “constructivist” (Gruber & Voneche, 1977), as well as from Meyer’s description of discovery learning as “constructionist” (2004). Other terms also used to refer to constructivist views of learning, include generative learning (Wittrock, 1985) situated learning and authentic instruction (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989), postmodern curricula (Hlynka, 1991); and educational semiotic(Cunningham, 1982).The central tenet of constructivist is a conception of learner and learning different from that of the objectivist tradition of learning theory which is based on either behaviourism ( associationistics models of learning) or( the cognitive science of information processing presentation of learning) (Browm, Meter, Pressley & Scheder, 1996). In addition, constructivism proposes that learners’ conceptions of knowledge are derived from a meaning-making search in which learners engage in a process of

constructing individual interpretations of their experiences. The constructions that result from the examination, questioning and analysis of tasks and experiences yield knowledge whose correspondence to external reality may have little verisimilitude. However, to the degree that most of our learning is filtered through a process of social negotiation or distributed cognition (Brown, Meter, Pressley & Schuder, 1996). Even Von Glaserfeld (1990), widely recognized as a radical constructivist has commented that, “no individual can afford not to establish a relative fit with the consensual domain of the social environment.” In furtherance, he explains that constructivism is an epistemological view of knowledge acquisition which emphasizing knowledge construction rather than knowledge transmission and the recording of information conveyed by others. And that the role of the learner is conceived as one of building and transforming knowledge. Brooks & Brooks (1999),

expound that there are five core beliefs of constructivism:

1. Students’ opinion is sought and valued.
2. Assumptions and suppositions are challenged.
3. The learning experience must be close to the life experience and relevant to students’ lives.
4. The constructivist teacher gives a broad understanding of a subject rather than focusing on small bits of information.
5. Constructivist teachers asses the whole learning experience of students rather than assessing only what can be measured by “paper and pencil assessments”.

In another development, Brooks & Brooks (1999) further summarized a large segment of literature on descriptions of ‘constructivist teacher’. They conceive of a constructivist teacher as someone who will: encourage and accept students’ autonomy and initiative; use a wide variety of materials, including raw data, primary sources, and

interactive materials and encourage students to use them; inquires about students’ understanding of concepts before sharing his/her own understanding of those concepts; encourage students to engage in dialogue with the teacher and with one another; encourage students inquiry by asking thoughtful, open ended questions from teacher or one another; and seek elaboration of students’ initial responses; engage students in experiences that show contradictions to initial understanding and then encourage discussion; provide time for students to construct relationships and create metaphors; asses students’ understanding through application and performance of open structured tasks.

According to Ryan (2000), the primary responsibility of the teacher from the constructivist perspective, is to create and maintain a collaborative problem solving environment, where students are allowed to construct their own knowledge, and the teacher acts as a facilitator and a guide. The constructivist views outline above, suggest a set of instructional principles that can guide the practice of teaching and the design of learning environment. It is important that instructions must do more than merely accommodate the constructivist perspective; it should also support the creation of powerful learning environments that optimize the value of the underlying epistemological principle. Olsen, (2000) posits that there are ‘two main branches of constructivism: one based on philosophical theories of learning and another based on psychological theories. The diverse perspectives of constructivism are informed by many writers which include: Dewey (1938) who writes about a pragmatic approach, Vygotsky (1934) and Bruner (1960) who inform social consructivism; VonGlaserfeld (1989) looked at radical constructivism.

In addition, Maypole and Davies (2001) also observe that, constructivist theories encompass different arrays of philosophical, psychological, and

epistemological orientations. However, the key distinction within this broad theoretical camp is between cognitive constructivism and social constructivism. Cognitive constructivism is based on the Piaget’s model which emphasizes the interaction between the individual and their environment in constructing meaningful knowledge, while social constructivism is attributed to the work of Vygotsky which emphasizes the importance of students learning through interaction with the teacher and other students ( Jadallah, 2000; Maypoles and Davies, 2001). From the above review, it can be observed that constructivist learning theory is generally on the premise that learners construct knowledge themselves (Hein, 1991; Krause, Bochner & Duchesne, 2003) either through interaction with their environment or interaction with teacher and fellow students.

# Theoretical Framework: Social Constructivism: A Theory of Learning

This study is based on Social Constructivism theory of learning propounded by Vygotsky which emphases the need for social interaction in learning. According to Vygotsky (1978) qualitative changes in students’ thinking occur as they co- participate in the learning process. In other words, as students discuss and exchange ideas they are constructing knowledge about what they are discussing. Thus learners socially interact as they use the knowledge. They critically mix their knowledge about what they are reading with knowledge of others and in so doing, be able to construct new knowledge about what they are discussing. It should be stated that the thinking behind arguments raised in favor of interactive teaching is that there are certain ways in which learners can socially interact which would lead them to deeply comprehend a reading passage. Vygotsky explained furthermore that the important nature of social constructivism is collaborative social interaction which also emphasise the importance

of social exchanges for cognitive growth and learning to take place. In support of this, Freire (1970) expresses his critique on the banking system of education of behaviorism which serves to domesticate rather than liberate people. His beliefs are close to Dewey’s cognitive constructivism which states: “Were all instructors to realize that the quality of mental process, not the production of correct answers, is the measure of educative growth something hardly less than a revolution in teaching would be worked” (Dewey 1956).

The Piagetian theory (1970), on the other hand, contends that interactions lead to individual’s cognitive development through the individual’s cognitive conflicts. His thinking is that as individuals strive to resolve their mental conflicts, which in this case emanates from interactions, they recognize their mental activities and construct new knowledge. Thus though the Piagetian’s perspective does not necessarily emphasize on social aspect as much as Vygotskian perspective, it still relates to the fact that interactions can lead to knowledge construction in individuals.

In respect to this study, the central tenet of constructivism is that learning is an active process. Information may be imposed, but understanding cannot be, for it must come from within. Constructivism requires a teacher to act as a facilitator whose main function is to help students become active participants in their learning and make meaningful connections between prior knowledge, new knowledge, and the processes involved in learning. The explanation above explains the focus of this study that social interaction between teacher students brings about effective teaching and learning especially of reading comprehension. The diagram 1 below showed Teaching informed by constructivist theory which centered both student-centered and teacher directed and the diagram 2 showed different types of constructivism theory, origin and approaches.
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Figure 1 :Diagram of Teaching Informed by Constructivist Theory Centered both Student-Centered and Teacher Directed (Young and Collin , 2004)
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# Figure 2 Constructivist Sources and Approaches Adopted from Kersten (2007)

* 1. **Social Constructivism**

Social constructivism is one of the three main schools of thought in the constructivist theory of education. It is commonly thought of as an educational theory that has been of recent development. However, the modern foundations of this theory

were laid in the early 1900s by the work of John Dewey and his colleges at his ‘laboratory school’ in Chicago(Dewey 1938) This theory has also been developed and supported by many educational theorists like Vygotsky (1934), Bruner (1960).Von Glaserfeld (1989), Kern (2000). Gergen is one of the leading supporters and developers of social constructivist school of thought. The basic principle behind social constructivism is that knowledge is constructed through social interaction, and is the result of social processes (Gergen, 1995).According to Brown, Collin & Duguid, 1989), in the model of social constructivism knowledge, reality is formed by a social consensus and is based on social interaction. For the knowledge to be “truthful”, it must match the social consensus and be functional and knowledge is only viable if it works.

Social constructivism requires one primary element, two or more participants. These participants must be involved in some form of interaction for knowledge to be constructed (Gergen, 1995). The participants must come together in some form of interaction with some knowledge of prior social experience. The participants then engage in some form of interaction, generally by the use of language and/or actions. The use of language can be very flexible in determining the exact meaning of the participants’ actions. The participants’ actions can greatly influence the course of the interaction also. In the interaction between the participants’ prior knowledge is exchanged in a transaction. In the transaction, the participants negotiate a meaning. Knowledge is created as a result of this transaction. When transaction occurs both parties leave the interaction with some form of knowledge gained.

A primary factor in the social constructivist model is the use of language. In social constructivism, language is achieved through social interaction, culture and participants perspective. In the interaction, a negotiated meaning occurs between two

or more participants causing the language to make sense. Language is context dependent. How language is used and perceived is determined by where the interaction occurs. The primary function of language in social interactions is to serve a communal function (Gergen, 1995). Language helps the participants to function within a community and interact with others. Social constructivism is a means of breaking away from the “traditional” educational model. The theoretical framework that will be adopted in this research is the social constructivism propounded by Vygostky which emphasizes learning through students interacting with one another and with teacher.

# CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

# Introduction

This chapter features the methods and procedures used in carrying out the study. The chapter is structured into the following subheadings: research design, population of the study, sample and sample techniques, instrument for data collection, validity and reliability of the research instrument, procedure for data collection and analysis.

# Research Design

The research design adopted for this study is quasi- experimental research design. In it a pretest and posttest were administered. The pretest was administered before the commencement of treatment to the two groups that is in order to establish, the homogeneity of the students. A post test was administered after two weeks of teaching to determine the effectiveness of the treatment on the performance of the students in the experimental group.

# Population

The population of this study comprised of all Pubic Senior Secondary School students within Zaria Local Government Area of Kaduna State. The study area has total number of thirteen schools with a total number of three thousand and eight (3008) SS1 students. The population was tabulated as shown in table below.

Table 3.1 population of study

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/No** | **Schools** | **Population in SS1** | | **Student Enrollment in SS1** |
| **Boys** | **Girls** |
| 1. | Alhuda Huda Collage Zaria | 389 | - | **389** |
| 2. | Brewa College Zaria | 320 | - | **320** |
| 3. | GSS zaria (Kofan Kibo) | 175 | - | **175** |
| 4. | GGSS Pada Zaria | - | 160 | **160** |
| 5. | GGSS Kofan Gayan | - | 200 | **320** |
| 6. | GGSS ( Former WTC Senior) | - | 280 | **280** |
| 7. | GSS Dakace | 106 | 44 | **150** |
| 8. | GSS kaura Zaria city | 172 | 110 | **282** |
| 9. | GSS kofar Kuyan Bana | 171 | 70 | **241** |
| 10 | GSS Tudun Jukun Zaria | 165 | 131 | **296** |
| 11 | GSS Magajiya | 120 | 75 | **75** |
| 12 | Sheikh Ibrahim Arab Special  Zaria | 143 | 177 | **320** |
| 13 | Government Secondary  School, Kufena |  |  |  |
|  | **Grand Total** | **1901** | **1107** | **3008** |

(Adopted from Kaduna State Ministry of Education Zaria Zonal Headquarter, 2015)

# Sample and Sampling Techniques

According to Baba (2005) sample is a small group of elements or subjects drawn through a definite procedure from a specified population, and that samples are meant to represent population when the entire population cannot be studied. This study sampled only SS1 students from SSS within the Public Secondary Schools in Zaria Local Government. There are 3008 SS 1 students in the study area out of which 120 SS1 students were sampled from two schools. The schools were Barewa College, Zaria and Government Girls’ Secondary School (WTC). The students from each school were divided into experimental control group. The designation was structure as shown below.
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# Figure 1 Designation of Experimental and Control Groups for the Study
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Barewa College, Zaria has a total number of three hundred and twenty (320) SS1 students and Government Girls Secondary School (WTC), Zaria with the total number of two hundred and eighty (280) SS1 students. The schools were selected because they are in the same range of language proficiency. Twenty percent of the sample size was used. The total number of the sample used was therefore one hundred and twenty

(120) students from these schools based on 20% recommended sample sizes for two different precision levels by Isaac and Michael (1981); Smith (1983). Random sampling technique was used for the selection of the sample. The selection was adopted from Kamonnat (2010). Below is the table showing the sample of the study.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **Number Students** | **Number of Sampled** |
| Barewa College Zaria | 320 | 64 |
| GGSS(WTC) Zaria | 280 | 56 |
| **Total** | **600** | **120** |

# 3.4. Instrument for Data Collection

A comprehension passage extracted from Chinua Achebe’s prose “A man of the people” **“AMOP**” was used for both pre and post experimental group. The post experiment was done after two weeks of teaching the students reading comprehension using interactive approach. The students’ scripts were marked and scored for data

analysis. For the students’ attitude, a designed questionnaire format adopted from the work of Uredi (2013) was used.

# Procedure for Data Collection

The study involve three main stages. At stage one a pre-test was administered to the two groups that is control and experiment group. At stage two the experimental group were taught reading comprehension using interactive Approach teaching for two weeks. Language text book using different Comprehension passages from their English. The control group held their normal lesson taught by their teachers.

At stage three A Post Test on the passage used in the first stage was administered on the two groups to determine the effect of interactive teaching on the performance of the experimental and control group. For the step by step teaching procedures for both groups see appendix G on page 131-133.

# Pilot Study

Twenty (20) students from Government Girls Secondary School Pada, Zaria were selected for the pilot study. Same passage was given to the students and they were asked to answer the questions on the passage. The students’ scripts were marked and recorded. Thereafter, the questionnaires were issued to them in order to determine the reliability of the research instrument. For the results of the pilot study see appendix A table 3.

# Validity of the Instrument

The content validity of the instrument was established by forwarding the sample passage and questions to the supervisor in the Arts and Social Sciences Department at Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria for corrections, observations and suggestions all corrections made were duly effected. After validation of the

instrument marks were assigned to each questions as follows: Question 2, 3 and 6 were used to answer the research question one and each questions carried 10 marks. Question 1 and 9 where used to answer research question two and 1 and 9 carries 5 marks each while question 10 carries 10 marks. For research question three, question 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 were used each question carries 10 marks. While research question 4 was analyses using frequency and percentages for students’ attitudes. Detail of the marking schemes is attached in appendix G1.

# Reliability of the Instrument Used

A test-re-test technique was used to test the reliability of data collected for the study. Immediately after the test, the questionnaire was administered to the two groups of respondents containing the same set of questions. Therefore, the response to the questionnaire at the two occasions was measured using Cronbach’s Alpha test of reliability and Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient and obtained the coefficient of 0.78 and 0.71 respectively. These indicate that the instrument is appropriate for use.

# Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics comprises mean and standard deviation, non-parametric test was used to answer the research questions while pair sample size was used to test the research hypothesis in other to determine the differences between the results’ of the two groups that is control and experimental groups.

# CHAPTER FOUR

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

# Introduction

This chapter presents the result and analysis of data collected for the study. Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data at two different levels, viz: descriptive and inferential levels. Mean and standard deviation were used for descriptive analysis and t-test for inferential analysis. All the analysis for inferences were done based on alpha (α) value of 0.05. Summary of the result and discussion of major findings were also presented.

# Respondents’ Characteristics

**Table 4.1: Respondents Characteristics based on Sample Participants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Group Type** | **Number of Participants** |
|  | Experimental | 60 |
|  | Control | 60 |

# Source: SPSS output Authors work, 2016.

Table 4.1 above shows participants for the study, the participants were divided into two groups. The first is the experimental group while the second is the control group. Each group consists of sixty (60) students. That is thirty (30) for each school.

In answering research questions, mean score performance of students in both experimental and control groups in the post test were used to answer research questions one, two and three. While the last research question was analysed using frequency and percentage to ascertain students’ attitudes (view) on the method used for teaching. For inferential testing one sample T-test was adopted to test the significant effect of the Interactive Approach on the students’ performance in reading comprehension.

# 4.2 Respondents Data set for pre and Post control and experimental Scores in Different Research Questions

Table 4.2: Statistics of Data set score of research questions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | group | N | Mean | Std.  Deviation | Std. Error  Mean |  |
| Predictive | Pre Experiment | 60 | 4.2667 | 4.50236 | .82202 |  |
|  | Pre Control | 60 | 1.3333 | 1.25774 | .16237 |  |
|  | Post Experiment | 60 | 16.6667 | 11.01201 | 2.01051 |  |
|  | Post Control | 60 | 9.6667 | 8.12334 | 1.04872 |  |
| Questioning | Pre Experiment | 60 | 4.2667 | 4.25144 | .77620 |  |
|  | Pre Control | 60 | 1.3333 | 4.28755 | .55352 |  |
|  | Post Experiment | 60 | 13.6667 | 4.90133 | .89486 |  |
|  | Post Control | 60 | 10.8000 | 4.86008 | .62743 |  |
| Summarising and Seeking | Pre Experiment | 60 | 8.3333 | 7.69385 | 1.40470 |  |
| Clarification | Pre Control | 60 | 11.0000 | 8.27494 | 1.06829 |  |
|  | Post Experiment | 60 | 38.3333 | 10.69429 | 1.95250 |  |
|  | Post Control | 60 | 24.3333 | 11.62503 | 1.50078 |  |
| Score | Pre Experiment | 60 | 13.9333 | 11.32569 | 2.06778 |  |
|  |  | Pre Control | 60 | 16.0333 | 10.81895 | 1.39672 |  |
|  |  | Post Experiment | 60 | 61.9355 | 18.33382 | 3.29285 |  |
|  |  | Post Control | 60 | 42.4667 | 15.38596 | 1.98632 |  |
|  | a. type = post |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.2 above present summary of the result for pre and post control and experimental groups from SPSS version 16 output. The break done and interpretation are as follow:

# Answering the Research Questions

This section presented the answers to the research questions set in chapter one **Research Question One**: What are the roles of interactive approach in determining students’ predictive responses to passage?

This question was answered by the descriptive statistic presented in table 4.3 and 4.4 below

# Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for Pre- Test Result of Control and Experimental group on the Role of Interactive Approach in Determining Students’ Predictive Responses to Passage

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** |  |
| Experimental | 60 | 4.2667 | 4.50236 |  |
| Control | 60 | 1.3333 | 1.25774 |  |

In Table 4.3 the result shows the computation mean scores and standard deviation on (predictive responses) of the pre experimental and control groups respectively. The result reveals that students in the pre-experimental group have mean performance of 4.2667 and standard deviation of 4.50236 while students in the pre control group have mean performance of 1.333 and standard deviation of 1.25774. The mean difference between the two groups is about 1.9334. This result reveals that those students in pre experimental groups slightly perform better than control group in terms of predicting responses to the comprehension passage.

# Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics for the Post Test Result of Control and Experimental group on the Role of Interactive Approach in Determining Students’ Predictive Responses to Passage

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** |
| Experimental | 60 | 16.67 | 11.01201 |
| Control | 60 | 9.6667 | 8.12334 |

In Table 4.4 the result shows the computation mean scores on responses (predicting) and standard deviation of the post experimental and post control groups respectively. The result reveals that students in the post experimental group have mean performance of 16.67 and standard deviation of 11.01 while the post control group have mean performance of 9.67 and standard deviation of 8.12. The mean difference between the two groups is about 7.0. This result reveals high level of improvement on the performance of students in post experimental group compare to post control group students. The result shows that interactive approach helps in determining students’ predictive responses to comprehension passage.

**Research Question Two:** What is the role of interactive approach in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions?

This question was answered by the descriptive statistic presented in table 4.5 and 4.6 below

# Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics Showing Pre-Test Result of Control and Experimental group on the Role of Interactive Approach in Establishing Questioning Strategies for Answering Reading Comprehension Questions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** |
| Experimental | 60 | 3.1667 | 4.25144 |
| Control | 60 | 3.700 | 4.28755 |

In Table 4.5 the result shows the computation mean scores and standard deviation on (Questioning strategies) of the pre experimental and control groups respectively. The result shows that students in the pre experimental group have mean performance of 3.1667 and standard deviation of 4.25144 while the students in the pre-control group have mean performance of 3.700 and standard deviation of 4.28755. The mean difference between the two groups is about 0.5333. This result shows that in the pre-

test the two groups have almost the same performance in terms of ability of students’ in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions.

# Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics Showing Post Test Result of Control and Experimental group on the Role of Interactive approach in Establishing Questioning Strategies for Answering Reading Comprehension Questions

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** |  |
| Experimental | 60 | 13.6667 | 4.90133 |  |
| Control | 60 | 10.8000 | 4.86008 |  |

In Table 4.6 the result shows the computation mean scores and standard deviation (Questioning strategies) of the experimental and control groups respectively. The result indicates that students in the post experimental group have mean performance of 13.67 and standard deviation of 4.90 while the students in the post control group have mean performance of 10.80 and standard deviation of 4.86. The mean difference between the two groups is about 2.8. This result indicates some level of improvement in the performance of post experimental group which might be due to the use of interactive approach. The result shows that interactive approach increases students’ ability in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions.

**Research Question Three:** How does interactive approach help in enhancing students’ ability to summarize ideas of the comprehension passage?

This question was answered by the descriptive statistic presented in Table 4.7 and 4.8 below:

# Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics Showing Pre-Test Result of Control and Experimental group on the Interactive Approach Help in Enhancing Students’ Ability to summarize ideas of the Comprehension Passage

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** |
| Experimental | 60 | 8.3333 | 7.69385 |
| Control | 60 | 11.0000 | 8.27494 |

In Table 4.7 the result shows the computation mean scores and standard deviation on (summary idea of the comprehension passage) of the pre experimental and pre control groups respectively. The result reveals that students in pre experimental group have mean performance of 8.333 and standard deviation of 7.69385 while the pre control group students have mean performance of 11.00 and standard deviation of 8.27494. The mean difference between the two groups is about 2.8. This result reveals that students in pre control group perform better compare with pre experimental group in terms of students’ ability to summarise the ideas of the comprehension passage.

# Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistics Showing Post Test Result of Control and Experimental group on Interactive Approach Helps in Enhancing Students’ Ability to Summarizing Idea of the Comprehension Passage

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** |
| Experimental | 60 | 38.34 | 10.69429 |
| Control | 60 | 24.33 | 11.62503 |

In Table 4.8 the result shows the computation mean scores and standard deviation on (summarizing idea of the writer’s message) of the post experimental and post control groups respectively. The result reveals that students’ in post experimental group have mean performa0nce of 38.34 and standard deviation of 10.69 while the post control group have mean performance of 24.33 and standard deviation of 11.625. The mean difference between the two groups is about 14.01. This result reveals high level of

improvement in the performance of post experimental group this could be due to the use of interactive approach on the groups. The result shows that interactive approach increases students’ ability to summarize idea of the comprehension passage.

**Research Question Four:** What is the effect of interactive approach on the attitude of students in senior secondary school?

# Answering Research question Four

Table 4.9 : Teacher’s way of teaching helped me to understand the passage very well

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 3 | 2.5 |
| Disagree | 12 | 10.0 |
| undecided | 33 | 27.5 |
| Agree | 42 | 35.0 |
| strongly agree | 30 | 25.0 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: Filed work, 2017

Table 4.9, shows that 2.5% out of total sample frame representing three respondents strongly disagreed that Teacher’s way of teaching helped students to understand the passage very well, 10.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing twelve respondents disagreed, 27.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty three respondents were undecided, 35.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty two respondents were agreed while 25.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.10: The way the teacher taught increased my interest in English lesson.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 3 | 2.5 |
| Disagree | 9 | 7.5 |
| Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |
| Agree | 45 | 37.5 |
| strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: Filed work, 2017

Table 4.10: shows that 2.5% out of total sample frame representing three respondents strongly disagreed that the way the teacher taught increased students interest in English lesson, 7.5% out of total retrieved sample frame representing nine respondents disagreed, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided, 37.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty five respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.11: The way the teacher taught made lesson more enjoyable and more interesting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
| disagree | 8 | 6.7 |  |
| Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |  |
| Agree | 49 | 40.8 |  |
| strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |  |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Filed work, 2017

Table 4.11: shows that 6.7% out of total sample frame representing eight respondents disagreed that the way the teacher taught students using interactive method made lesson more enjoyable and more interesting, 30.8% out of total retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided, 40.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty nine respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.12: The way the teacher taught made me to contribute and participate in the lesson.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
| strongly disagree | 2 | 1.7 |  |
| Disagree | 12 | 10.0 |  |
| Undecided | 39 | 32.5 |  |
| Agree | 44 | 36.7 |  |
| strongly agree | 23 | 19.2 |  |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.12: shows that 1.7% out of total sample frame representing two respondents strongly disagreed that the way the teacher taught made students to contribute and participate in the lesson, 10.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing twelve respondents disagreed, 32.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty nine respondents were undecided, 36.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty four respondents were agreed while 19.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty three respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.13: The teacher’s way of teaching made it easier for me to remember what I learned in the lesson

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 7 | 5.8 |
| Disagree | 16 | 13.3 |
| Undecided | 34 | 28.3 |
| Agree | 38 | 31.7 |
| strongly agree | 25 | 20.8 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.13: shows that 5.8% out of total sample frame representing seven respondents strongly disagreed that the teacher’s way of teaching made it easier for me to remember what I learned in the lesson, 13.3% out of total retrieved sample frame representing sixteen respondents disagreed, 28.3% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty four respondents were undecided, 31.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty eight respondents were agreed while 20.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty five respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.14: I enjoyed the lesson, because I shared ideas with the other students and teachers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| Disagree | 10 | 8.3 |
| Undecided | 53 | 44.2 |
| Agree | 57 | 47.5 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.14: shows that 8.3% out of total sample frame representing ten respondents disagreed that students enjoyed the lesson, because they shared ideas with the other students and teachers, 44.2% out of total retrieved sample frame representing fifty three respondents were undecided, 47.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing fifty seven respondents were agreed.

Table 4.15: The teacher way of teaching aided my understanding and summary of the passage content very well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 2 | 1.7 |
| Disagree | 9 | 7.5 |
| Undecided | 48 | 40.0 |
| Agree | 36 | 30.0 |
| strongly agree | 25 | 20.8 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.15: shows that 1.7% out of total sample frame representing two respondents strongly disagreed that the teacher way of teaching aided students understanding and summary of the passage content very well, 7.5% out of total retrieved sample frame representing nine respondents disagreed, 40.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty eight respondents were undecided, 30.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty six respondents were agreed while 20.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty five respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.16: I found the opportunity to learn from my class mates with positive atmosphere created by the teacher’s method of teaching.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 3 | 2.5 |  |
|  | Disagree | 6 | 5.0 |  |
|  | Undecided | 35 | 29.2 |  |
|  | Agree | 51 | 42.5 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 25 | 20.8 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.16: shows that 2.5% out of total sample frame representing three respondents strongly disagreed that studdent found the opportunity to learn from their class mates with their teacher method of teaching. 5.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing six respondents disagreed, 29.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty five respondents were undecided, 42.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing fifty one respondents were agreed while 20.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty five respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.17: I preferred lessons to be taught in the teacher’s way of teaching

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
| strongly disagree | 2 | 1.7 |  |
| Disagree | 6 | 5.0 |  |
| Undecided | 35 | 29.2 |  |
| Agree | 52 | 43.3 |  |
| strongly agree | 25 | 20.8 |  |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.17: shows that 1.7% out of total sample frame representing two respondents strongly disagreed that students preferred lessons to be taught in interactive approach method of teaching, 5.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing six respondents disagreed, 29.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty five respondents were undecided, 43.3% out of retrieved sample frame representing fifty two respondents were agreed while 20.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty five respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.18: If other English teachers used the same method of teaching, I will enjoy lessons more.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 2 | 1.7 |
| Disagree | 6 | 5.0 |
| Undecided | 40 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 42 | 35.0 |
| strongly agree | 30 | 25.0 |
| Total | 120 | 100.0 |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.18: shows that 1.7% out of total sample frame representing two respondents strongly disagreed that students enjoy class activities when taught with intercative teaching method, 5.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing six respondents disagreed, 33.3% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty respondents were undecided, 35.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty two respondents were agreed while 25.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.19: It was easier to draw students’ attention when the teacher was teaching with interactive method.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 1 | .8 |  |
|  | Disagree | 12 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |  |
|  | Agree | 44 | 36.7 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.19: shows that 0.8% out of total sample frame representing one respondent strongly disagreed that students the teaching method used by the teacher made it easier to sustain students attitude while teaching, 10.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing twelve respondents disagreed, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided, 36.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty four respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.20: Words and phrases are clearly understood because of the way the teacher interacts with students during the lesson.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
| strongly disagree | 5 | 4.2 |  |
| Disagree | 15 | 12.5 |  |
| Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |  |
| Agree | 38 | 31.7 |  |
| strongly agree | 25 | 20.8 |  |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.20: shows that 4.2% out of total sample frame representing five respondents strongly disagreed that words and phrases are clearly understood because of the way the teacher interacts with students during the lesson, 12.5% out of total retrieved sample frame representing fifteen respondents disagreed, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided, 31.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty eight respondents were agreed while 20.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty five respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.21: The method used by the teacher assisted in learning and completion of the activities.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 2 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Disagree | 1 | .8 |  |  |
|  | Undecided | 42 | 35.0 |  |  |
|  | Agree | 45 | 37.5 |  |  |
|  | strongly agree | 30 | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.21: shows that 1.7% out of total sample frame representing two respondents strongly disagreed that the method used by the teacher assisted in learning and completion of the activities, 0.8% out of total retrieved sample frame representing one respondent disagreed, 35.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty two respondents were undecided, 37.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty five respondents were agreed while 25.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.22: The questioning strategies used by the teacher helped me in thinking and predicting the answers correctly.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 3 | 2.5 |  |
|  | Disagree | 8 | 6.7 |  |
|  | Undecided | 33 | 27.5 |  |
|  | Agree | 47 | 39.2 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 29 | 24.2 |  |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.0 |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.22: shows that 2.5% out of total sample frame representing three respondents strongly disagreed that the questioning strategies used by the teacher helped students thinking and predicting the answers correctly, 6.7% out of total retrieved sample frame representing eight respondents disagreed, 27.5% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty three respondents were undecided, 39.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty seven respondents were agreed while 24.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty nine respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 2.23: The teaching method used by the teacher enabled me to respond quickly and positively to questions and discussion during the lesson.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | Strongly disagree | 4 | 3.3 |  |
|  | Disagree | 10 | 8.3 |  |
|  | Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |  |
|  | Agree | 43 | 35.8 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.23: shows that 3.3% out of total sample frame representing four respondents strongly disagreed that the teaching method used by the teacher enabled students to respond quickly and positively to questions and discussion during the lesson, 8.3% out of total retrieved sample frame representing ten respondents disagreed, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided,

35.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty three respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.24: The interactive method of teaching gives me the opportunities to ask and answer questions on the passage very well.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 5 | 4.2 |  |
|  | Disagree | 14 | 11.7 |  |
|  | Undecided | 35 | 29.2 |  |
|  | Agree | 40 | 33.3 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.24: shows that 4.2% out of total sample frame representing five respondents strongly disagreed that the teaching gives students the opportunities to ask and answer questions on the passage very well, 11.7% out of total retrieved sample frame representing fourteen respondents disagreed, 29.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty five respondents were undecided, 33.3% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.25: I am sure, I will be doing better in English language, if I am taught the way the teacher did

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 2 | 1.7 |  |
|  | Disagree | 11 | 9.2 |  |
|  | Undecided | 40 | 33.3 |  |
|  | Agree | 38 | 31.7 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 29 | 24.2 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.25: shows that 1.7% out of total sample frame representing two respondents strongly disagreed that students may perform better in English language, if they taught the way the teacher did, 9.2% out of total retrieved sample frame representing

eleven respondents disagreed, 33.3% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty respondents were undecided, 31.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty eight respondents were agreed while 24.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty nine respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.26: The method the teacher used in teaching made me feel comfortable with learning of English especially comprehension.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Option | Frequency | Percentage (%) |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 3 | 2.5 |  |
|  | Disagree | 8 | 6.7 |  |
|  | Undecided | 35 | 29.2 |  |
|  | Agree | 42 | 35.0 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 32 | 26.7 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.26: shows that 2.5% out of total sample frame representing three respondents strongly disagreed that students conformable with learning of comprehension when taught using the teacher’s method of teaching, 6.7% out of total retrieved sample frame representing eight respondents disagreed, 29.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty five respondents were undecided, 35.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty two respondents were agreed while 26.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty two respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.27: The teacher’s ways of teaching helped a lot in getting the general information and ideas of the passage

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |  |
|  | strongly disagree | 5 | 4.2 |  |
|  | Disagree | 12 | 10.0 |  |
|  | Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |  |
|  | Agree | 40 | 33.3 |  |
|  | strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |  |
|  | **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |  |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.27: shows that 4.2% out of total sample frame representing five respondents strongly disagreed that teacher’s ways of teaching helped a lot in getting the general information and ideas of the passage, 10.0% out of total retrieved sample frame representing twelve respondents disagreed, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided, 33.3% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.28: I learn better than ever with the way teacher taught

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 4 | 3.3 |
| Disagree | 13 | 10.8 |
| Undecided | 37 | 30.8 |
| Agree | 41 | 34.2 |
| strongly agree | 25 | 20.8 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.28 shows that 3.3% out of total sample frame representing four respondents strongly disagreed that students learn better than ever with the way the teacher taught, 10.8% out of total retrieved sample frame representing thirteen respondents disagreed, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were undecided, 34.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty one respondents were agreed while 20.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.29: The condition of class created gave me a lot of confidence during the lesson.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
| strongly disagree | 7 | 5.8 |
| Disagree | 15 | 12.5 |
| Undecided | 35 | 29.2 |
| Agree | 37 | 30.8 |
| strongly agree | 26 | 21.7 |
| Total | 120 | 100.0 |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.29: shows that 5.8% out of total sample frame representing seven respondents strongly disagreed that the condition of the class created gave students a lot of confidence during the lesson, 12.5% out of total retrieved sample frame representing fifteen respondents disagreed, 29.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty five respondents were undecided, 30.8% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty seven respondents were agreed while 21.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty six respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.30: The method used in teaching made me feel English is a very interesting and easy to learn subject.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 8 | 6.7 |
| Disagree | 5 | 4.2 |
| Undecided | 35 | 29.2 |
| Agree | 40 | 33.3 |
| strongly agree | 32 | 26.7 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.30: shows that 6.7% out of total sample frame representing eight respondents strongly disagreed that the method used in teaching made students feel English is a very interesting and easy to learn subject. 4.2% out of total retrieved sample frame representing five respondents disagreed, 29.2% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty five respondents were undecided, 33.3% out of retrieved sample

frame representing forty respondents were agreed while 26.7% out of retrieved sample frame representing thirty two respondents were strongly agreed.

Table 4.31: If other teachers in English language and other subjects are using the method of teaching, I feel I can pass any English Language examination.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Option** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| strongly disagree | 5 | 4.2 |
| Disagree | 7 | 5.8 |
| Undecided | 42 | 35.0 |
| Agree | 42 | 35.0 |
| strongly agree | 24 | 20.0 |
| **Total** | **120** | **100.0** |

Source: field work, 2017

Table 4.31: shows that 4.2% out of total sample frame representing five respondents strongly disagreed that If other teachers in English language and other subjects are using the method of teaching, they felt that they can pass any English Language examination., 5.8% out of total retrieved sample frame representing seven respondents disagreed, 35.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty two respondents were undecided, 35.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing forty two respondents were agreed while 20.0% out of retrieved sample frame representing twenty four respondents were strongly agreed.

# 4.2 Test of Null Hypotheses

Four null hypotheses were tested using analysis of T-test (one sample T-test) as statistical tools at 0.05 levels of significance as follows:

**Null Hypothesis One:** H01: *There is no significant difference in the predictive response of student’s thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those thought using non Interactive Approach.*

To test the null hypothesis one T-test and sig. values were used.

# Table 4. 32: One Independent T-test for Pre Test Performance of Students on effect of Interactive Approach on students Predictive responses

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** | **T** | **Df** | **Sig (2- tailed)** | **Mean differences** | **Decision** |  |  |
| Experimental | 60 | 4.267 | 4.5024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control | 60 | 1.333 | 1.258 | 6.32 | 118 | .000 | 3.93333 | Accept H01 |  |  |

Alpha value =0.05

Table 4.32 reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for pre experimental and control group performance on (Predictive responses to Comprehension passages). The significance value of the statistic is 0.000. Because this value is less than 0.05, here the study assumes that the groups have unequal variances and second test was done. The t-value is 3.411 has a corresponding P-value 0.000 at 118 degree of freedom, which was less than P–value of 0.05 level of significance, hence, the null hypothesis one(H01) is hereby accepted. This means that there is no significant difference between students’ scores in the pre experimental group compared to the scores of students in the pre control group.

# Table 4.33: One Independent T-Test for Post Test Performance of Students on effect of Interactive Approach on Students Predictive Comprehension Passages

**Group N Mean Sd**

**T**

Experimental 60 16.67 11.01201

**Df Sig (2- tailed) Mean**

**differences Decision**

Control 60 9.6667 8.12334

Alpha value =0.05

3.411 118 .001 7.00000 Reject H01

Table 4.33 reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for post experimental and control group performance on (Prediction). The significance value of the statistic is 0.002. Because this value is less than 0.10, here the study assumes that the groups have unequal variances and second test was done. The t-value is 6.32 has a

corresponding P-value 0.001 at 118 degree of freedom, which was less than P –value of 0.05 level of significance, hence , the null hypothesis one(H01) is hereby rejected. This means that there was a significant difference between students’ scores in the experimental group compared to the scores of students in the control group. This study found that interactive approach increases students’ performance in prediction of answers to comprehension passages.

***Null Hypothesis Two*** *H02: There is no significant effect of Interactive Approach in enhancing appropriate questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions by students thought using Interactive Approach and those thought using non interactive approach.*

*.*

# Table 4.34: One Independent T-Test for Pre Test Performance of Students on the Role of Interactive Approach in Establishing Questioning Strategies for Answering Reading Comprehension Question

**T tailed) Mean**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Group N** | **Mean** | **Sd Df Sig (2-** |  |
| Experimental 60 | 3.1667 | **differences**  4.251 |  |
|  | Control 60 | 3.7000 | - 118 .578 -.53333 Reject H01  4.288 |  |

**Decision**

.558

Alpha value =0.05

Table 4.34, reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for pre experimental and control group performance on (questioning strategies). The significance value of the statistic is 0.866. Because this value is greater than 0.05, here the study assumes that the groups have equal variances and second test was done. The t-value is -0.588 has a corresponding P-value 0.578 at 118 degree of freedom, which was greater than P –value of 0.05, hence, the study discovered that the equal variance is due to the method employed. This means that there was no significant difference between students’ scores in the experimental group compared to the scores of students in the control group**.**

# Table 4.35: One Independent T-Test for Post Test Performance of Students on Interactive Approach for Questioning Strategies for Answering Reading Comprehension Questions

**Group N Mean Sd T Df Sig (2- tailed) Mean**

**differences**

**Decision**

Experimental 60 13.6667 4.90133

Control 60 10.8000 4.86008

Alpha value =0.05

2.630 118 .010 2.86667 Reject H01

Table 4.35, reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for post experimental and control group performance (Questioning Strategies). The significance value of the statistic is 0.539. Because this value is greater than 0.05, here the study assumes that the groups have equal variances and second test was done. The t-value is 2.630 has a corresponding P-value 0.01 at 118 degree of freedom, which was less than P –value of

0.05 level of significance, hence, the study accepted that their equal variance is due to the method employed . This means that there was a significant difference between students’ scores in the experimental group compared to the scores of students in the control group. Finally, from these two test of hypothesis one, the study accepted that interactive approach increases students’ performance in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions.

***Null Hypothesis Three:*** *H03: There is no significant difference in the summary ability of student’s thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those thought using non Interactive Approach.*

# Table 4.36: One Independent T-Test for Pre Test Performance of Students on Interactive Approach in Summarizing ideas in a Comprehension Passages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** | **T** | **Df Sig (2- tailed) Mean**  **Differences** |
| Experimental | 60 | 8.3333 | 7.69385 |  |  |
| Control | 60 | 11.0000 | 8.27494 | -1.474 | 118 .144 -2.667 |

Alpha value =0.05

Table 4.36, reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for experimental and control group performance (summary of ideas). The significance value of the statistic is 0.756. Because this value is greater than 0.10, here the study assume that the groups have equal variances and second test was done. The t-value is -1.474 has a corresponding p-value 0.000 at 118 degree of freedom, which was less than P –value of 0.05 level of significance hence, the study accepted that their equal variance is due to the method employed.

# Table 4.37: One Independent T-Test for Post Test Performance of Students on Interactive Approach for Summarizing ideas in a comprehension Passages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **Mean** | **Sd** | **T** | **Df** | **Sig (2- tailed) Mean**  **differences** | |
| Experimental  Control | 60  60 | 38.34  24.3333 | 10.69429  11.62503 | 5.528 | 118 | .000 14.00 |  |

**Group**

Alpha value =0.05

Table 4.37, reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for post experimental and control group performance (summary and seeking general information). The significance value of the statistic is 0.806. Because this value is greater than 0.10, here the study assumes that the groups have equal variances and second test was done. The t-value is 5.528 has a corresponding P-value 0.000 at 118 degree of freedom, which was less than alpha–value of 0.05 level of significance, hence, the study accepted that their equal variance is due to the method employed. This means that there was a significant difference between students’ scores in the experimental group compared to the scores of students in the control group. This study rejects the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative ones. This means that there was significant difference between students’ scores in the experimental group compared to the scores of students in the control group. From these two tests of research question three the study finally

concludes that interactive approach increases students’ performance in summarizing ideas in a comprehension passages.

**Null Hypothesis Four**: *H04: There is no significant effect of Interactive Approach on the attitudes of student’s thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those thought using non Interactive Approach.*

# Table 4.16: One Independent T-Test for the Impact of Interactive Approach on the Attitude of Students in Senior Secondary School

**Group Type F T df p-value Decision N Mean Std. Deviation**

experimental 60 3.0552 .40532

.210 .649 20 0.0108 Reject H01

Control 60 2.8583 .40777

Alpha value =0.05

Table 4.16, reveals the t-test analysis of significant difference for experimental and control group on (attitude). The t-value is 0.649 has a corresponding P-value 0.0108 at 23 degree of freedom, which was less than P –value of 0.05 level of significance P=0.01 is significant, hence, the null hypothesis one(H04) is hereby rejected. This means that there was a significant difference between students’ scores in the experimental group compared to the scores of students in the control group. This study found that interactive approach brings about students’ positive attitude on reading comprehension.

# Summary of Major Findings

Based on the research topic the following are major findings:

1. The mean performance of experimental group is 16.67 and that of control group is 9.667. This means that the experimental group with mean 16.67 outperformed the control group with mean performance of 9.667 in term of predictions to comprehension passages. Hence, ***this study found that the use of interactive***

***approach increases students’ performance in prediction of answers to comprehension passages.***

1. The mean performance of experimental group is 13.67 and that of control group is

10.80. This means that the experimental group with mean 13.67 outperformed the control group with mean performance of 10.80 in term of establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions. ***It is therefore concluded that the use of interactive approach in teaching comprehension increases students’ performance in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions.***

1. The mean performance of experimental group is 38.34 and that of control group is

24.33. This means that the experimental group with mean 38.38 did better that control group with mean performance of 24.33 in term of summarizing of idea in the passages. ***Therefore the study concluded that interactive approach increases students’ performance in summarizing of ideas in a comprehension passages.***

1. The mean score of experimental group is 3.0552 and that of control group is 2.858.

This means that the experimental group with mean 3.0552 slightly show positive attitude than the control group with mean scores of 2.858. Hence ***the study found that the use of interactive approach in teaching comprehension brings about positive attitude of students toward learning reading comprehension.***

# : Discussion of the Findings

As shown in the results, the use of interactive approach in teaching reading comprehension helps greatly in determining students’ predictive response to passage. This could be attributed to the fact that in interactive teaching, teacher tends to guide the students, rub mind with them and facilitate learning, promote active learners engagement as well as promote learning through interactive decision making thereby

giving room to students to think critically on the task given and in turn come up with useful active prediction of what the writer’s intention is all about. The findings concur with what Sangoma (2008) advances that interactive approach is associated with positive learning outcomes that are of deep understanding of meanings of concepts by learners; learners develop confidence and are motivated in learning by doing as well as helps in the development of higher thinking in learners and resilient attitude required in solving problems especially in reading comprehension. The results also concurred with that of Salama (2015). Salama reports that interactive approach is learner centered and thereby brings about positive attitude of students because it emphasized students actual roles in the process of learning which go a long way in enhances creative and critical thinking of students in acquiring knowledge, skills and competences.

The findings also concord with work of Ojo(1993). Ojo (19993) stresses that the ability to read, taking general comprehension requires the reader to draw information from the text and combine it with the information and expectations that the reader already has.

Furthermore, the results revealed that the use of interactive approach in teaching reading comprehension helps a lot in establishing effective questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions due to the sharing of ideas by the teachers with the students and with the fellow students. The findings is in line with the work of Pica (1994) which shows that the objective of interactive approach is to teach students the strategies that will help them develop into independent readers who can monitor their own thinking while link prior knowledge to the new information in their text. The findings also agree with the findings of Haller (2000) which show that interactive approach helps students to be successful in preparing for

reading, developing vocabulary, understanding, using structure knowledge, process information, summarizing, note taking, voluntary/recreational reading and most importantly generate effective questioning for answering reading comprehension questions.

In the same vein, Raghad (2009) cogently concludes after his findings on the effect of interactive approach vs. cognitive approach on students’ reading comprehension that interactive approach has positive and greater effect in enhancing and promoting students’ reading comprehension. This is however contrary to the findings of Connel (2012). According to Connel (2012), interactive approach may not actually aid comprehension but it may be benefit provided it reinforce rather than distract the attention of students from text being read. In addition, the findings also revealed that interactive approach helps in enhancing students’ ability to summarize ideas in a comprehension passage and makes them to understanding the phrases and words used in the passage in the passage clearly due to them interacting freely and rubbing of minds with the teacher and with fellow students as well as sustain their attention because of their involvement and concentration in the teaching and learning process. Moreover, due to the teaching of predictive and questioning strategies, students were helped to become independent leaners who can link prior knowledge with the new information in the text. The findings correlate with that of Snow and Sweet (2003) and Pica (1994) which stress that interactive approach creates the opportunity to negotiate, provide learners with increase chances for comprehension of the ideas and acquire the target message of the writer. In the same vein, Yan (2011) also stresses that the use of interactive approach in teaching helps to improve students’ reading, comprehension, summary abilities as well as encourage them to read extensively in class.

The use of interactive approach in teaching reading comprehension helps students in developing positive attitude towards reading comprehension due to the fact that by involving students in the teaching and learning process they benefit a lot thereby makes their attitude towards learning become positive and see English language in general and comprehension in particular as a subject and topic that is simple to learn. This is in line with the findings of Farzaneh & Nejadansari (20014) which holds that the use of interactive approach in teaching brings about positive attitude of students. This is probably because when students work in group they feel that they can depend on others for help and this gives them confidence to think, solve problems and enjoy learning. In relation to attitude the findings of this study are supported by Guthrie & Humnick (2004). Their findings states that several aspect of intrinsic motivation support for reading. And that meaningful conceptual content in reading instruction increases motivation for reading and text comprehension. Angelo(1993) in her findings also agrees that interactive approach interacting encouraged active participation of students, brings about understanding of learning, and helps to improving teaching and learning performance.

. The findings also correlate with that of Sangoma (2008) is of the opinion that interactive approach is associated with positive learning outcomes of deep understanding of meanings concepts by learners; learners develop confidence and are motivated in learning by doing as well as helps in the development of higher thinking in learners and resilient attitude required in solving problems especially in reading comprehensions. Interactive mode of teaching has many roles in teaching and learning of English language, especially in reading comprehension. Being process based, it tends to enhances learning more than the transmission mode of teaching. This is

achieve because, the quality of teaching and learning process is the main objective for it successful implementation.

Among previous studies some scholars explain that interactive approach have positive impacts on students attitude for examples Uredi (2013) conducted a study on ‘the Effect of Classroom teachers’ Attitude toward the Constructive Approach (which is the theory behind interactive approach teaching model). The finding shows that classroom teachers have positive attitude towards this approach; majority of the teachers have established a consructivist learning environment and there has been a significant positive effect of interactive approach on their attitude.

In another development, Baltid (2014) in his study ‘The Effect of a Problem based Learning Approach (Interactive Approach) on students’ attitude levels came up with the findings that the approach has been used frequently in teaching different lessons and subjects in teaching environment and that it has had a positive effect on the students’ attitude.

In addition Salama (2015) reports that interactive approach is learner centered and their-by brings about positive attitudes of the students because it emphasized students actual role in the process of learning which go a long way in enhances creative and critical thinking of students in acquiring knowledge , skills and competencies. The finding also concurred with Alexander and Minohy (2000) who posits that personal involvement, intrinsic motivation, personal commitment and confidence in one’s ability to succeed and a perception of one’s control over learning leads to more learning and higher achievement and positive attitude in school.

# CHAPTER FIVE

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

# Introduction

This chapter deals with the summary conclusion, recommendations and suggestion for further studies with hope that the recommendations founded will be useful and implemented by different stakeholder in educational process.

# Summary

This work investigates the effect of interactive approach on the reading comprehension and attitude of students in public secondary schools within Zaria Local Government Area of Kaduna State. The inability of students to comprehend instruction on materials given to them which in return bring about massive failure of students especially WASSEC and SSCE examination was what aspired researcher to carry out this study.

The research questions encompass the following areas: The role of interactive approach in determining students’ predictive responses to passage, establishing questioning strategies, and summarization of comprehension passage as well as on the attitude of the students. The research hypotheses are there is no significant difference in the predictive response of students thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those thought using non Interactive Approach; there is no significant effect of Interactive Approach in enhancing appropriate questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions by students thought using Interactive Approach and those thought using non interactive approach; there is no significant difference in the summary ability of students thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those thought using non Interactive Approach and there is no significant effect of Interactive Approach on the attitudes of

students thought reading comprehension using Interactive Approach and those thought using non Interactive Approach.

The research instrument for the study are comprehension extract from Chinua Achebe’s prose “A man of the People” with questions as well as a questionnaire that is use for evaluation of students attitude. The data were collected through three stages pre-test, treatment and post -test. The stage one involved grouping and administering of pre-test to students in control and experimental group, in the second stage, the experimental group were given two weeks teaching “treatment” using interactive method. Then the third stage involved administration of test to both groups and questionnaire to the experimental group. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistic comprised of mean and standard deviation as well as frequency and percentage. The study found that the use of interactive approach increases students’ performance in prediction of answers to comprehension passages, increases students’ performance in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions, helps students in summarizing ideas in the comprehension passage and brings about positive attitude of students toward learning of comprehension.

# Conclusion

This study concluded that interactive approach increases students’ performance in terms of prediction of answers to comprehension passages; in establishing questioning strategies for answering reading comprehension questions; in summarizing ideas of a comprehension passage. And brings about positive attitude of students towards reading comprehension.

It is equally concluded from the study that interactive approach teaching method is the type of method that encourages classroom interaction that is face to face

communication between teacher and students. So teachers are thereby advice to create an interactive teaching environment that will allow students to ask and answer questions, teacher explaining student confusion or repeating point which at the end of the day will bring about enhancement of students comprehension ability and effective predictive responses to comprehension passage.

Furthermore, it was discovered that interactive teaching method involves varieties of teaching method such as sensory method, music integration, kinesthetic approach (snap words card for teaching site words), teaching integration, storytelling etc and so was concluded that teacher should choose which ever method that will suit the need of their students.

Through this research it was determined that using interactive method to teach comprehension can be time consuming, thus teachers are advised to be conscious of this and manage their time effectively when teaching comprehension. Additionally, it was concluded that interactive teaching encourages students’ participation and hold their attention, it may not actual aid comprehension especially when using technological instructional materials such as television, radios, films, computers etc. therefore, teacher should be extra careful when using such materials in teaching so as for the materials to reinforce rather than distract the students attentions.

Finally, it was also concluded that it is important to ensure that students are fully aware and understand the learning expectation before reading a passage. As it can be a challenge to determine what precisely students comprehend, The expectation of task need to be clearly stated as shown in the lesson plan used in the cause of this research (Appendix F**)** .The outline of the expectation may entail pre-teaching of the comprehension passage questions in order for students to understand what type of answers are expected of them on the passage.

# Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made:

1. There is need for teachers of English language to employ Interactive Approach Teaching Methods while teaching comprehension because, this method brings about comprehension and improves understanding, enhances interaction between teachers and students as well as facilitates learning and remembering etc. It is necessary for teachers to understand those interactive activities which are of benefit to learners’ development and contribute to their interest in learning. To do this, it is recommended that teachers should attends workshop and training where they can rob minds with other collogues and expert in this field. So as for them to learn more about different interactive teaching methods and activities
2. The use of interactive approach in teaching comprehension is also a challenge to teachers. It is expected of them not only to teach students the nifty-gritty of reading comprehension but also to painstaking create interactive classroom environment, to take time in giving them encouragement in the form of praises or prizes for every attempt made by the students so as to bring about self-confidence and motivation and positive attitudes.
3. It is also recommended that English language teachers should be available to students, answer their questions, and ask them questions by creating a learning community in the classroom which will not just focused on improving achievement and learning skills, but also helps them to grow mentally. Moreover, if interactive method is used in teaching comprehension in the classroom the ultimate goals that all educators strive toward will be accomplished, to the benefit of the students.
4. It is also recommended that more time and period should be allocated for the teachers of English Language, this is to enable them to have opportunity to create interactive environment between themselves and students so as to facilitate learning.
5. Furthermore, workshop, seminars, conferences meeting etc should be organized by the school managements, Ministry of education where teachers will be put through on the need to teach comprehension and English Language in general interactively.
6. In addition, when planning lesson, teacher should develop a plan that will include a range of group and interactive teaching techniques so as to support learners’ comprehension skill. They should also develop a plan that will create idea for interactive activities and effective questioning strategies in teaching of reading comprehension.
7. Lastly, the study recommended that book writers should select comprehension passages and activities that will encourage interactions in their books so as to help students to respond to comprehension questions and use English in real communication situation.

# Suggestion for Further Studies

This study is limited to study of effect of interactive approach on the comprehension and attitude of students in SS1. It is therefore suggested that further studies should be conducted on the use of interactive teaching methods by other researchers on other levels of secondary schools and private schools.

Although, many studies have been conducted on interactive approach in language learning, sciences, mathematics and ICT, little have been done on the use of interactive approach on secondary schools especially in Nigeria, hence it is suggested that further study should be extended to other aspect of English language teaching like lexis and structure, vocabulary development etc.

Further studies should include teachers’ attitude towards interactive approach in Nigerian secondary schools as well as in teaching of other languages and subjects.
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# APPENDIX A

**Table for Students Scores for Pre and Post Test Groups for the Comprehension Questions**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/no** | **Group** | **Test** | **Predicting** | **Question strategies** | **Summarising and Seeking Clarification** | **Total Score** |
| 1. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 50 |
| 2. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 35 | 50 |
| 3. | 1 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 40 | 60 |
| 4. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 50 |
| 5. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 55 |
| 6. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 80 |
| 7. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 40 | 65 |
| 8. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 80 |
| 9. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 40 | 60 |
| 10. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 40 | 55 |
| 11. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 45 | 65 |
| 12. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 70 |
| 13. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 15 | 35 | 70 |
| 14. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 45 | 75 |
| 15. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 15 | 40 | 75 |
| 16. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 55 | 70 |
| 17. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 20 | 45 | 85 |
| 18. | 1 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 50 | 80 |
| 19. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 15 | 40 | 75 |
| 20. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 15 | 30 | 65 |
| 21. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 40 | 60 |
| 22. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 55 | 85 |
| 23. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 15 | 55 | 90 |
| 24. | 1 | 1 | 30 | 10 | 50 | 80 |
| 25. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| 26. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 50 |
| 27. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 50 |
| 28. | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| 29. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 45 |
| 30. | 1 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 45 |
| 31. | 2 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 45 | 75 |
| 32. | 2 | 1 | 30 | 5 | 30 | 55 |
| 33. | 2 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 25 | 45 |
| 34. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 35 | 45 |
| 35. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/no** | **Group** | **Test** | **Predicting** | **Question Strategies** | **Summarising and Seeking Clarification** | **Total Score** |
| 36. | 2 | 1 | 25 | 10 | 40 | 65 |
| 37. | 2 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 55 | 75 |
| 38. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 65 |
| 39. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 35 | 55 |
| 40. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 35 |
| 41. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 50 |
| 42. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 20 | 44 |
| 43. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 44. | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 35 |
| 45. | 2 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 35 |
| 46. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| 47. | 2 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 25 |
| 48. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 49. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| 50. | 2 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 10 | 25 |
| 51. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 50 |
| 52. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 30 | 45 |
| 53. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 50 |
| 54. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 45 |
| 55. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 56. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 40 |
| 57. | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 25 | 35 |
| 58. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 40 |
| 59. | 2 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 45 |
| 60. | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 45 |
| 61. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 35 |
| 62. | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 35 |
| 63. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 35 |
| 64. | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 35 |
| 65. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 66. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| 67. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 68. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 69. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 70. | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 25 |
| 71. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 25 |
| 72. | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 73. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 74. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 75. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/no** | **Group** | **Test** | **Predicting** | **Question Strategies** | **Summarising and Seeking Clarification** | **Total Score** |
| 76. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 15 |
| 77. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 78. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 79. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| 80. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 81. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 82. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 83. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 84. | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 15 |
| 85. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 86. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 87. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 88. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 89. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 90. | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 91. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 35 |
| 92. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 93. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 94. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 95. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 96. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 97. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 98. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| 99. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| 100. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 35 |
| 101. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 102. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| 103. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 104. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 105. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 106. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 107. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 35 |
| 108. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 109. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 110. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 111. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 112. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 113. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 114. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| 115. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/no** | **Group** | **Test** | **Predicting** | **Question Strategies** | **Summarising and Seeking Clarification** | **Total Score** |
| 116. | **2** | 2 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| 117. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| 118. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 25 |
| 119. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 18 |
| 120. | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 35 |

# Appendix B

Descriptive Statistics table for attitude questionnaires for the experimental and control groups

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptive Statistics** | | | | | |
| Questions | N | Experimental | | Control | |
| Mean | Std.  Deviation | Mean | Std.  Deviation |
| Teacher’s way of teaching helped me to understand the passage very well. | 60 | 3.25 | .830 | 3.26 | .785 |
| The way the teacher taught increased my interest in English lesson. | 60 | 3.05 | 1.059 | 3.21 | .932 |
| The way the teacher taught made lesson more enjoyable and more interesting. | 60 | 2.82 | 1.020 | 2.72 | .790 |
| The way the teacher taught made me to contribute and participate in the lesson. | 60 | 3.04 | 1.149 | 3.12 | 1.061 |
| The teacher’s way of teaching made it easier for me to remember what I learned in the lesson. | 60 | 3.53 | 1.120 | 3.84 | .644 |
| I enjoyed the lesson, because I shared ideas with the other students and teachers. | 60 | 3.35 | 1.061 | 3.84 | .644 |
| The teacher way of teaching aided my understanding and summary of the passage content very well. | 60 | 2.74 | 1.316 | 2.72 | 1.196 |
| I found the opportunity to learn from my class mates with the teacher’s method of teaching. | 60 | 3.07 | 1.266 | 2.83 | 1.028 |
| I preferred lessons to be taught in the teacher’s way of teaching. | 60 | 3.56 | 1.086 | 4.05 | .223 |
| If my other English teachers used the same method of teaching, I will enjoy lessons more. | 60 | 2.26 | .955 | 3.88 | .623 |
| It was easier to keep my attention when the teacher was teaching. | 60 | 2.91 | 1.214 | 3.14 | .999 |
| Words and phrases are clearly understood because of the way the teacher interacts with students during the lesson. | 60 | 3.09 | 1.214 | 3.64 | 1.266 |
| The method used by the teacher assisted in learning and completion of the activities. | 60 | 2.32 | .783 | 2.91 | .904 |
| The questioning strategies used by the teacher helped me in thinking and predicting the answers correctly. | 60 | 2.58 | .999 | 2.66 | .807 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionnaires** | **N** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** | **Mean** | **Std.**  **Deviation** |
| The teaching method used by the teacher enabled me to respond quickly and positively to questions and discussion during the lesson. | 60 | 3.19 | 1.187 | 3.66 | .739 |
| The teaching gives me the opportunities to ask and answer questions on the passage very well. | 60 | 3.25 | 1.005 | 3.71 | .701 |
| I am sure, I will be doing better in English language, if I am taught the way the teacher did. | 60 | 2.84 | 1.099 | 2.72 | .854 |
| The method the teacher used in teaching made me feel comfortable with learning of English especially comprehension. | 60 | 3.46 | 1.019 | 3.62 | .813 |
| The teacher’s ways of teaching helped a lot in getting the general information and ideas of the passage. | 60 | 3.23 | 4.153 | 2.74 | 1.069 |
| I learn better than ever with the way teacher taught. | 60 | 3.79 | .901 | 3.50 | .707 |
| The condition of class created gave me a lot of confidence during the lesson. | 60 | 2.54 | 1.019 | 3.16 | .854 |
| The method used in teaching made me feel English is a very interesting and easy to learn subject. | 60 | 2.82 | 1.325 | 2.71 | .955 |
| If other teachers in English language and other subjects are using the method of teaching, I feel I can pass any English Language examination. | 60 | 3.58 | .925 | 3.59 | .899 |

(adopted from Uredi 2013).

# APPENDIX C

**Comprehension**

Overnight everyone began to shake their heads at the excesses of the last regime, at its graft, oppression and corrupt government: newspapers, the radio, the hitherto silent intellectuals and civil servants - everybody said what a terrible lot; and it became public opinion the next morning. And these were the same people that only the other day had owned a thousand names of adulation, whom praise-singers followed with song and talking-drum wherever they went. Chief Koko in particular became a thief and a murderer, while the people who had led him on - in my opinion the real culprits - took the legendary bath of the Horn- bill and donned innocence.

Koko had taken enough for the owner to see,' said my father to me. It was the day I had gone to visit Eunice and was telling him on my return how they girl had showed no interest in anything - including whether she stayed in jail or out of it. My father's words struck me because they were the very same words the villagers of Anata had spoken of Josiah, the abominated trader. Only in their case the words had meaning. The owner was the village, and the village had a mind; it could say no to sacrilege. But in the affairs of the nation there was no owner, the laws of the village became powerless. Max was avenged not by the people's collective will but by one solitary woman who loved him. Had his spirit waited for the people to demand redress it would have been waiting still, in the rain and out in the sun. But he was lucky. And I don't mean it to shock or to sound clever. For I do honestly believe that in the fat- dripping, gummy, eat-and-let-eat regime just ended - a regime which inspired the common saying that a man could only be sure of what he had put away safely in his gut or, in language ever more suited to the times: 'you chop, me self I chop, palaver finish'; a regime in which you saw a fellow cursed in the morning for stealing a blind man's stick and later in the evening saw him again mounting the altar of the new shine in the presence of all the people to whisper into the ear of the chief celebrant - in such a regime, I say, you died a good death if your life had inspired someone to come forward and shoot your murderer [Koko] in the chest - without asking to be paid.

From: CHINUA ACHEBE,A Man of the People, London, 1966 Questions

* + 1. Which person or group does the narrator condemn as being most guilty?
    2. What was the immediate cause of the shooting of chief koko?
    3. In your own opinion who is the murderer in the passage?
    4. What logical conclusion can you draw from the passage about the person or group discuss in the passage?
    5. What does the sentence in italics reveals about max and why?
    6. What general statement about the politicians can we logically deduce from this passage?
    7. What do you think is the narrator attitude towards the subject and the people under discussion?
    8. Suggest a suitable title for the passage
    9. Who are the “praise singers” in the passage?
    10. Why does narrator said the people are the real corrupts?
    11. What does the last regime encourage people and politician to do?

Dear student

# APPENDIX E QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire contains a number of statements about your attitude toward the lesson. There are no rights or wrong answers. Your opinion is what is wanted. Please tick your response to the items. Kindly assists to fill the questionnaire as quick as possible despite your tight schedule. It is purely an academic exercise, as such all information provided shall be kept confidential from any other ulterior motive. It shall be grateful for your kind consideration.

Thank you

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| Teacher’s way of teaching helped me to understand the passage very  well. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The way the teacher taught  increased my interest in English lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The way the teacher taught made lesson more enjoyable and more  interesting. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The way the teacher taught made  me to contribute and participate in the lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The teacher’s way of teaching made it easier for me to remember  what I learned in the lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I enjoyed the lesson, because I shared ideas with the other  students and teachers. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The teacher way of teaching aided  my understanding and summary of the passage content very well. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I found the opportunity to learn from my class mates with the  teacher’s method of teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I preferred lessons to be taught in  the teacher’s way of teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| If my other English teachers used  the same method of teaching, I will enjoy lessons more. |  |  |  |  |  |
| It was easier to keep my attention  when the teacher was teaching. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Words and phrases are clearly understood because of the way the teacher interacts with students  during the lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The method used by the teacher  assisted in learning and completion of the activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| The questioning strategies used by the teacher helped me in thinking and predicting the answers  correctly. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The teaching method used by the teacher enabled me to respond quickly and positively to questions  and discussion during the lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The teaching gives me the opportunities to ask and answer  questions on the passage very well. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I am sure, I will be doing better in English language, if I am taught the way the teacher did. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The method the teacher used in teaching made me feel comfortable with learning of English especially  comprehension. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The teacher’s ways of teaching helped a lot in getting the general information and ideas of the  passage. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I learn better than ever with the  way teacher taught. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The condition of class created gave  me a lot of confidence during the lesson. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The method used in teaching made me feel English is a very interesting and easy to learn  subject. |  |  |  |  |  |
| If other teachers in English language and other subjects are using the method of teaching, I  feel I can pass any English Language examination. |  |  |  |  |  |

# APPENDIX F MARKING SCHEME

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Answer** | **Research objective** | **Marks** |
| 1. Which person or group does the narrator condemn as being most  guilty? | The many people who had  encouraged Koko | **Obj. 2**  Questioning | 5  marks |
| 2. What was the immediate cause of the shooting of chief koko? | The women who love max and vowed to revenge  his death on Koko | **Obj 1**  Prediction | 10  marks |
| 3. In your own opinion who is the  murderer in the passage? | The people | **Obj. 1**  Prediction | 10  marks |
| 4. What logical conclusion can you draw from the passage about the person or group discuss in the passage? | The regime and ordinary people not encouraging moral goodness  directly | **Obj. 3**  Main idea or general information | 10  marks |
| 5. What does the sentence in italics reveals about max and why? | That Max death was not revenge by the people because they are corrupt  too. | **Obj. 3**  Main idea or general information | 10  marks |
| 6. What general statement about the  politicians can we logically deduce from this passage? | The politicians are corrupt | **Obj 1**  Prediction | 10  marks |
| 7. What do you think is the narrator attitude towards the subject and the people under discussion? | He does not like corruption and the people behavior | **Obj. 3**  Main idea or general information | 10  marks |
| 8. Suggest a suitable title for the passage | Open | **Obj. 3**  Main idea or general information | 10  marks |
| 9. Who are the “praise singers” in the passage? | The people /the villages / the  followers/ masses | **Ob2**  Questioning | 5  marks |
| 10. Why does narrator said the people are the real corrupts? | Because they are the one  encouraging the politician to steal | **Ob2**  Questioning | 10  marks |
| 11. What does the last regime encourage people and politician to do? | To steal,  embezzle | **Obj. 3**  Main idea or general information | 10  marks |

**Appendix G Treatment Procedure for Experiment Group**

**Step1:** Teacher introduced herself and the purpose of her presence was explained to the students

**Step 2:** Students were issued given the passage

**Step 3:** Teacher encouraged students to engage their minds in the reading task by setting the purpose for reading. She encourages students to participate actively by engaging them in frequent students talk and also told story of the background of the text where the passage was extracted from.

**Step 4:** Teacher set the tone before reading the passage by telling a story that is relevant to the subject of the passage asking some critical questions about the passage such as: What do you think the passage will be all about from the story just told? Who are the subjects of the story? What do you think is their behavior and why?

**Step 5** Teacher read the passage first while students listen and draw their attention to some important ideas in the passage.

**Step 6:** Teacher asked two students to read the passage while others listen.

**Step 7:** Teacher asked some of the questions the students are to answers at the end of the passage in order to draw their attention to them before asking them to read the passage silently.

**Step 8:** Teacher motivated students to use their imagination to provide additional information to the text even when such information were not explicitly stated in the passage.

**Step 9:** After reading of the passage silently, teacher shared some critical questions with the students such as: what picture of the character of Chief Koko and the people in the passage has the author successfully painted?

**Step 10:** Teacher asked students to suggest an alternative title for the passage and provide reasons for their answer (Adopted from Yusuf, 2012).

Below is a sample of Interactive Lesson Plan for the Experimental Group:

# A LESSON PLAN SHOWING INTERACTIVE TEACHING METHOD

Subject : English Language Topic : Comprehension

Class : SS1

Duration : 40 minutes

Behavioral Objectives: By the end of the lesson students should be able to:

1. Predict or guess the message or main idea of the passage
2. Explain what the passage is all about
3. To bring out the author’s intended message
4. To summarize the passage as short as possible

**Previous Knowledge**: Students have been taught comprehension on other topic

**Introduction**: Wrote the topic on the chalkboard and share the passage to the students.

# Presentation:

**Step1**: Told the students a short story and asked questions on the topic

**Step 2**: Related the story and the questions to the topic to give the students the picture for the day’s topic.

**Step3**: Asked questions so as to find out what some students might know on the topic.

**Step 4**: Read the passage aloud while students listen, thereafter, asks students to read silently.

**Step 5**: Asked students to write in five sentences what they felt the passage is all about.

**Step6:** Asked students to read what they have written and discuss them together in the class.

**Evaluatio**n: Asked students to answer the comprehension questions that follow the passage.

**Conclusion**: Collected the students’ work and summarize the lesson by explaining the answers of the questions on the passage. (Adopted from Wheijen, 2002)

# Procedure for the Control Group

**Step 1:** Teacher introduces herself and the purpose of her presence was explained to the students

**Step 2:** Students were issued with passage

**Step 3:** The passage was read by the teacher while students student listen attentively

**Step 4:** Students were asked to read the passage silently on their own

**Step 5:** students were asked to answers the questions that follow the passage.

# A LESSON PLAN SHOWING A NON INTERACTIVE OR CONVENTIONAL METHOD OF TEACHING COMPREHENSION

Subject : English Language

Topic : Comprehension

Class : SS1

Duration : 40 minutes

# Behavioral Objectives:

By the end of the lesson students should be able to:

* 1. Predict or guess the message or main idea of the passage
  2. Explain what the passage is all about
  3. To bring out the author’s intended message
  4. To summarize the passage as short as possible

**Previous Knowledge:** Students have been taught comprehension on other topic **Introduction**: Writes the topic on the chalkboard and share the passages to the students.

**Presentation**: Teacher read the passage while students listen.

**Step2:** Explained the meaning of some words in the passage in isolation.

**Step3:** Asked students to read the passage silently and moves round to inspect them. **Step4:** Read the questions for the students and asks them to answer the question that follows

**Step5:** Moved round to inspect students answering the questions.

**Evaluation**: Collected the students’ paper for marking.

**Conclusion**: Made corrections by reading the answers to the students (Wheijen, 2002).

Lastly questionnaires were administered to both groups.