



# Effects of Three Instructional Strategies on Senior Secondary School Students' Achievement in Summary Writing

Dr. Esther Omoakhe Okome<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Regina B. Danner<sup>2</sup> and Dr. Felicia N. Ofuani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of English, College of Education, Ekiadolor, Benin City, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup> Department of Curriculum and Instructional Technology, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup> Department of Curriculum and Instructional Technology, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

Received 20 May 2020, Revised 16 Sept. 2020, Accepted 26 Oct. 2020, Published 01 Jan. 2021

**Abstract:** The study investigated the effects of three summary writing strategies; Direct Instruction, Cognitive Strategy and Read-Test Strategy on Senior Secondary School student's achievement in English language summary writing. The study population consists of 12,766 Senior Secondary year two (SS 2) students from Edo South Senatorial District and a sample of 373 students participated in the study. Three research questions which were all hypothesized guided the conduct of the research. A pre-test and post-test quasi experimental design was used for the study. The instrument used for data collection was an Achievement Test in Summary Writing (SATSW) adopted from past West African Examination Council (WAEC) English language Paper 2 question paper. The reliability of the instrument was 0.96 with an inter-rater reliability estimate of 0.89. Both descriptive and inferential statistics such as frequency, mean, standard deviation and ANCOVA were used to analyse the data. The findings revealed significant difference in achievement amongst students taught using the different strategies. The results showed that the experimental group performed better with Direct Instruction Strategy being the most effective for teaching students summary writing. Cognitive Strategy was also found to contribute to students' summary writing than the Read-Test Strategy. Thus, it was recommended that English language teachers should be exposed to training in summary writing strategies like Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy through workshops and seminars with the hope that this would help to enhance students' summary writing skills.

**Keywords:** Summary, Writing, Strategies, Direct Instruction, Cognitive Strategy, Read-Write Strategy

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The teaching and learning of English as a second language and its strategies have been an issue of great concern to educationists and language educators in particular. Many strategies have been used in a bid to find effective ways of teaching English language, being the pivot on which the success of our educational system revolves; the effectiveness of its teaching determines the efficacy of our education.

Students at the Senior Secondary School level are exposed to the four English language skills namely – listening, speaking, reading and writing. These skills are interwoven and complementary to one another. A neglect of any of the skills may affect students' performance in English language. Indisputably, for a student to excel in any academic discipline a mastery of the writing skill is

essential. The writing skill is very vital because most judgments about students' ability in school are made in written expression (tests and examinations). However, this skill is considered to be the most difficult to acquire because it has to be learned according to certain conventions and grammatical rules that govern written communications (Eyisi, 2005; Nanglakong, Ganaa, Eric, Dery, Felix & Stanislaw, 2019). This poor ability in writing makes most secondary school students unable to write clear and precise summary. Many factors have been linked to this problem, some of which include: poor foundation in English, lack of qualified teachers, inadequate instructional materials and facilities, ineffective methodologies of teaching and learning. Studies have also shown that writing is hardly taught in any meaningful way in Nigeria (Eyisi, 2005; Obi-Okoye, 2004). While some educators view the constraint on the part of the teachers and the teaching – learning process,



some shift the blame to the learners and their attitude to learning.

### *Statement of the Problem*

Summary is an unconscious act in language use because it is impossible to give a verbatim report of everything that one has seen, read, experienced, or heard. All these point to the important role that summary skills play in communication, examinations, independent study, and everyday use of the English language. However, it is disturbing that a good number of students still do not perform well in this aspect in public examinations conducted by West African Examinations Council (WAEC) and National Examinations Council (NECO) in Nigeria. Students' poor performance in summary writing could partly be responsible for this poor performance in English language. Scholars have tried to address the problem of students' poor performance in summary writing by experimenting with various factors; teacher-related factors such as teaching methods, and student-related factors such as self-efficacy and achievement motivation, but the problem still persists. Could this poor performance be as a result of the teaching strategies used by language teachers in teaching summary writing? Would the use of other appropriate summary writing instructional strategies, besides the conventional Read-Test Strategy improve students' performance, as this method seems not to be effective? It is in view of this that this study examined the effects of three instructional strategies on Senior Secondary School students' achievement in summary writing in Edo State.

### *Research Questions*

To achieve the objectives of this study, three research questions were raised:

1. Is there any difference in the achievement of students in their selection of main ideas using the Direct, Cognitive, and Read-test strategies of teaching summary writing?
2. Is there any difference in the achievement of students in their paraphrase of ideas using the Direct, Cognitive, and Read-test strategies of teaching summary writing?
3. Is there any difference in the achievement of students in their summary writing using the Direct, Cognitive, and Read-test strategies of teaching summary writing?

### *Hypotheses*

The three research questions were hypothesized and tested at 0.05 level of significance.

1. There is no significant difference in the achievement of students in their selection of main ideas

using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing.

2. There is no significant difference in the achievement of students in their paraphrase of ideas using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing.

3. There is no significant main effect of treatment on the achievement of students' in summary writing using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### *Summary Writing Defined*

Summary writing is the reduction of text into its basic essentials (Eze, 2013; Nanglakong et al, 2019). In line with this, Eze (2013) asserts that summary writing is the process of re-writing a passage to make it shorter while retaining its essential points. According to Naglakong et al (2019), summary writing is "an aspect of core English language which from time immemorial posed and still poses serious problem to many students" (p.224). In agreement with this, Eze (2013) sums up that summary writing is a peculiar writing skill that requires to be learned and taught meticulously. The aim of learning summary is two-fold: a) to acquire and develop skills in extracting what is relevant or significant from a given passage or written material and to express the extracted points clearly and concisely (precisely or briefly to the point), b) to equip the learners to deal satisfactorily with the summary situations they are likely to meet in real life in terms of brevity in speech and writing (Eze, 2013).

Studies have shown that summary writing is very challenging for learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) (Kim, 2011; Yang & Shih, 2003). Akinsowon (2016) describes summary writing as a highly complex recursive reading – writing activity, which establishes the connection between the language skills of reading and writing. Students' deficiencies in reading and writing might lead to a break-down at certain points in the process of summary writing ranging from identifying key words to integrating ideas into coherent re-statement.

### *Students' Performance in Summary Writing*

Available literature on the state of English summary writing of Nigerian students has shown that the problem is an endemic one cutting across all levels of the Nigerian educational system particularly the secondary schools (Fakeye & Ogunsiji, 2009; Okome, 2018; Oni, 2014). There has not been any significant improvement in the performance of students in English language as revealed in the WAEC results from 2016 to 2018; the percentage of candidates who obtained A1-C6 range from 16.27%, 20.06% and 28.99% (National Bureau of Statistics (NBS),

2019). The implication here is that most of the candidates who desire admission into tertiary institutions will not proceed because of failure in English language. The aspects of English language where students' knowledge is tested at the Senior Secondary School Examination, conducted by WAEC and NECO include: English Language Paper 2 made up of the following sections: Essay/Letter Writing, Comprehension, and Summary Writing. Essay/Letter Writing (50 marks), Summary (30 marks) and Comprehension (20 marks). Summary writing, which carries a reasonable percentage of 30 out of 100 marks that the paper earns, is unfortunately an aspect of the language that students do not perform well (Fakeye & Ogunsiji, 2009; Okome, 2018; Oni, 2014).

In order to perform well in summary writing, students' need to identify key words or phrases in each paragraph of a text and integrate main ideas or key elements into organised and logical summary (Kirmizi, 2009). Students have not been able to do this, as when asked to write summaries, they often copy verbatim, write long detailed summaries or write inadequately short ones and omit key information. This occurs because they do not know what a summary is or how to write one. This problem may be, as observed by Gbedenio (1996), that summary writing has not been taught in secondary schools in the country as it ought to be. In agreement with Gbedenio's view Aimunmondion (2009) also stated that some teachers do not know how to teach summary writing. Thus, most students consequently encounter difficulties and remain unaware of what main ideas or relevant details to include in a summary as such, they end up not learning summary writing satisfactorily (Liu, 2011).

Also, the traditional, Read-Test Strategy of teaching summary writing mostly used by language teachers appears not to be effective. This is because summary writing is one of the skills that is not amenable to mere memorization of a set of rules, but rather calls for the development and application of summary writing skills (Obi-Okoye, 2004). At best what most teachers do is to ask students in non-specific terms such as "put the story in your own words", without providing opportunities for students to observe them or their peers in modeling how to summarise texts. This has not helped students in summarizing (Toro, Umar, & Motanya, 2017). The difficulties students face in summary writing are mostly strategic problems, which most of them are not aware of and so there is the need to expose them to the appropriate strategies to use.

- *Strategies for Teaching Summary Writing*

Language learning involves the use of learning strategies, which assist learners in learning effectively. These strategies help learners to learn language skills efficiently, particularly writing skill, summary writing inclusive, which ultimately aid communication (Griffiths, 2006; Lee, 2003, Jurkovic, 2011). There are several known and tested strategies for teaching summary writing. Three of these strategies used in the study are discussed in this section.

- *Read-Test Strategy*

In literature, the Read-Test Strategy goes by various names; Reading-Test Prep, Read-Write or Reading-to-Write Strategy. This strategy is defined as "goal directed activity of reading in order to write" (Flower et al, 1990, p.5). According to Findley (2019), the Read-Test Strategy helps students "work the text". That is, it gives them a purpose for their reading and helps them focus on the text, keeping them engaged while they are reading and to scaffold their comprehension of the story. It also helps readers transform information for their own purposes in order to write afterwards. It serves to reinforce ESL learners' writing in terms of grammatical and syntactic forms (Raimes in Tangpermpoon, 2008). This approach focuses on the appropriate use of vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devices (Pinca in Badger & White, 2000).

This strategy has its root in the product approach to writing, which serves as the conventional classroom practice based on the production of a piece of writing without much emphasis on acquisition of the knowledge, art and skill of writing (Ghufron, 2016). The use of this strategy has not been beneficial to students as the West African Examination Council (WAEC), Chief Examiner's reports (2018) indicate that students find it difficult to read and understand summary passages and so end up copying both relevant and irrelevant points as answers to summary questions. These reports generally reveal that most of the candidates who wrote the examination show evidence of lack of understanding of the content of the set summary passage (Toro, Umar, & Motanya, 2017).

- *Direct Instruction*

Direct Instruction is the use of straightforward, explicit teaching techniques, usually to teach a specific skill. This is why it is also referred to as Explicit Instruction Strategy, which has been described as a highly organised and structured, teacher-directed, and task-oriented teaching strategy. Mcshane (2005) described Direct Instruction strategy as the process by which a teacher presents the content clearly and directly by providing step-by-step directions and modelling which is followed by guided



practice with feedback, independent practice, and frequent reviews. According to Baumann in (1983), the strategy is hinged on the idea that students learn better what they are taught directly by the teacher. In the Direct Instruction, the teacher is at the heart of the instructional paradigm, he/she tells, shows, models, demonstrates and teaches the target skill. (Baumann, 1983; 1984). Cho (2012) asserts that summary writing taught through Direct Instruction helps students to develop their text comprehension and summarize effectively.

There are various models of the Direct Instruction strategy, but they share similar procedures. For example, Irwin (2007) provides one model of Direct Instruction; EMTA, which includes the following components: explanation, modeling, transferring and application (p.23-29). The model adopted for this study is the model suggested by Baumann (1983), which follows a five-step procedure: introducing the skill (Introduction), providing an example (Example), directly teaching the skill (Direct Instruction), providing application and transfer exercises under the teacher's supervision, so that corrective feedback is provided (Teacher – Directed Application,) and administering practice exercises (Independent Practice) (p. 284-294). In this model, students practice summarizing from single paragraphs to groups of paragraphs by receiving enough teacher explanation and modeling overtime. Teachers actively monitor students' work and give appropriate feedback both individually and through class discussion.

Olagbaju's (2019) study examined the effect of Direct Instruction strategy and Cognitive styles on senior secondary school students' achievement in summary writing. The study employed a pretest, posttest, control group, quasi-experimental design. The sample was made up of 200 Senior Secondary School Two (SSS II) students in four intact classes drawn from four purposively selected senior secondary schools in two randomly selected local government areas in Ibadan Metropolis. Treatment lasted for eight weeks and three instruments were used for data collection, which included: (i) Summary Writing Achievement Test (SWAT), (ii) Cognitive Style Inventory (CSI), and (iii) Teachers' Evaluation Sheet (TES). The data collected were analysed using inferential statistics of Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA). The Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was computed to show how the groups performed and to detect the source of significant difference between the two groups. The results revealed significant main effect of treatment on student's achievement in summary writing, with the Direct Instructional Strategy being more effective at improving students' achievement in summary writing than the conventional method.

- *Cognitive Strategy*

Another strategy for teaching summary writing is the Cognitive Strategy, which is an explicit instructional approach that teaches students specific and general cognitive strategies which help them to improve learning and performance by facilitating information processing (Krawec & Montague, 2012). The term "Cognitive Strategy" in its simplest form is the use of the mind (cognition) to solve a problem or complete a task. Cognitive strategies may also be referred to as procedural facilitators (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987), procedural prompts (Rosenshine, 1997) or scaffolds (Palincsar & Brown, 1984). A related term is metacognition, the self-reflection or "thinking about thinking" necessary for students to learn effectively (Baker, Gersten, & Scanlon, 2002).

Cognitive Strategy embeds metacognitive or self-regulation strategies in structured cognitive routines that help students monitor and evaluate their comprehension. The Cognitive Strategy makes use of mental processes for accomplishing a particular cognitive goal. Other activities used in this strategy include; developing the thinking skill, planning and remembering in which the students plan, think about what they are going to write and organize these ideas before initiating writing (Krawec & Montague, 2012). In this strategy, the teacher facilitates the exercise of summary writing skills by activating the learners' potentials through collaborative learning, which empowers students to make decisions about the direction of their writing through discussion and task. The teacher gives students the opportunity to explore their ideas with little guidance. The goal is to make students active in the teaching/learning process.

Hooshang and Rabbani Nia (2014), in their study on the use of summarizing strategies on writing abilities of Iranian intermediate EFL students, adopted a quasi-experimental research design. Fifty (50) intermediate undergraduate students of Maritime, University in Chabehar, participated in the study. Two groups of students were assigned to experimental and control groups. The experimental group in addition to writing instruction was taught summarizing strategies explicitly through Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). The control group only received the writing instruction the traditional way. The result of the pre and posttest showed the positive effect of summarization instruction on students writing ability as there was significant difference; the experimental group outperformed the control group.



### 3. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a pretest, posttest, quasi-experimental, control group research design. The population of the study was the 12,766 SS 2 students in the forty-six (46) public Senior Secondary schools in Ikpoba-Okha, Egor and Oredo Local Government Areas of Edo State. A sample of 373 made up of 202 male and 171 female students drawn from the three selected schools took part in the study. The sample was further classified under school type, with 92 students from all-boys school, 124 from all-girls school and 157 from co-education schools. Simple random sampling procedure was used to select three intact classes from each of the schools making a total of nine intact classes. The intact classes were labeled A, B and C in each school. The subjects in the A and B classes were the experimental groups taught with Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy respectively while the subjects in the C classes were the control group taught with the Read-Test Strategy.

A research instrument titled “Students Achievement Test in Summary Writing (SATSW)” was used as pretest and posttest to collect data from the students. The summary test was adopted from past WAEC English Language question papers. The validity of the instrument was ascertained by three language education experts of the Faculty of Education, University of Benin. A pilot study was conducted to establish the reliability of the instrument. In order to determine the reliability, the Kendalls Coefficient of Concordance was conducted. To achieve this, the rating of three English language teachers were obtained and used for computation. The inter-rater reliability estimate of 0.89 was obtained. This indicates a significant positive relationship among the scores of raters. The instrument was therefore considered reliable.

The study was conducted using intact classes and the duration of study was ten weeks the collection of data was in three phases. During the first phase (first week) a pretest was administered to both the experimental and control groups on summary writing. This was to ascertain the students’ summary writing ability. This was followed by the second phase of eight weeks of instruction. During this period the students in group A were taught summary writing using the Direct Instruction while the students in group B were exposed to the Cognitive Strategy, and the students in the Control group were taught using the conventional Read-Test Strategy. The same summary passages were used in teaching both the experimental and control groups. The following summary writing topics: identifying main ideas, identifying topic sentence of main ideas, identifying supportive details, learning parts of a paragraph, learning paraphrasing skills, summarizing expository passages, and independent practice were taught during the intervention period. The third phase, which was

the tenth week, featured the administration of the posttest to both the experimental and the control groups. This was to determine whether there was any difference in scores in their summary writing achievement after treatment. The same instrument was used for both the pretest and posttest.

### 4. RESULTS

The data collected were analysed using both descriptive (mean, standard deviation) and inferential statistics, such as, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) and The Least Significant Difference Analysis was used to determine sources of observed differences. The preliminary analysis of data revealed that there were significant differences in the pre-test mean scores in main ideas, paraphrase of ideas and summary writing of students in the three summary writing strategies. Thus, to marshal out these initial differences, ANCOVA was used to test all three hypotheses while using the pretest scores as covariates.

#### *Research Question One*

Is there any difference in the achievement of students in their selection of main ideas using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test Strategies of teaching English language summary writing?

TABLE 1: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN THEIR SELECTION OF MAIN IDEAS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING AT POSTTEST

Strategies	N	Mean	Std Dev.
Direct Instruction	153	5.58	1.61
Cognitive Strategy	109	4.74	1.77
Read-Test Strategy	111	4.11	1.59

Significant at .05

Table 1 shows that the Direct Instruction ranked the highest, followed by the Cognitive Strategy, while the Read-Test Strategy ranked the least. This shows that there is a difference in students’ achievement in the selection of main ideas. To determine whether the differences in means were significant, hypothesis one was tested.

#### *Hypothesis One*

There is no significant difference in the achievement of students in their selection of main ideas using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing.



The result of the ANCOVA conducted to test whether the differences in means in the selection of main ideas among students taught using the Direct Instruction, Cognitive Strategy and Read-Test Strategy of teaching English language summary writing was significant is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. ANCOVA OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS' SELECTION OF MAIN IDEAS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING

Source	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean	F	Sig
Corrected model	328.498	3	109.499	48.939	0.000
Intercept	372.935	1	372.935	166.676	0.000
Pretest-main ideas	185.108	1	185.108	82.731	0.000
Strategy	111.808	2	55.904	24.985	0.000
Error	825.631	389	2.237		
Total	10103.000	373			
Corrected t	1154.129	372			
Total					

R-squared = 0.285 (Adjusted R-squared = 0.279) = 0.05

Table 2 shows an F-value of 24.985 for the instructional strategies and a P-value of 0.000. Testing at an alpha level of 0.05, the p-value is less than the alpha level, so hypothesis one is rejected. Consequently, there is a significant difference in the achievement of students in their selection of main ideas in English language summary writing. In order to determine the direction of the difference, a post-hoc analysis was conducted. The result is presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3. LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE (LSD) MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN SELECTION OF MAIN IDEAS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY

i) Strategy	j(Strategy)	Mean Difference	Std error	Sig
Direct Instruction	Cognitive Strategy	0.595	0.189	0.002
Direct Instruction	Read-Test Strategy	1.323	0.187	0.000
Cognitive Strategy	Read-test Strategy	0.729	0.202	0.000

Table 3 shows the mean difference between Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy as 0.595 and P-value of 0.002, between Direct Instruction and Read-Test Strategy as 1.323 and P-value of 0.000, between Cognitive Strategy and Read-Test Strategy as 0.729 and P-value of 0.000. These comparisons are significantly different since the P-value are less than the alpha value of 0.05 showing therefore that Direct Instruction is more effective than the Cognitive Strategy and the Read-Test Strategy, and the Cognitive Strategy is more effective than the Read-Test Strategy.

#### Research Question Two

Is there any difference in the achievement of students in their paraphrase of ideas using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test Strategies of Teaching English language summary writing?

TABLE 4. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN THEIR PARAPHRASE OF IDEAS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING (POSTTEST)

Strategy	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Direct Instruction	153	6.84	5.63
Cognitive Strategy	109	3.31	5.17
Read-Test Strategy	111	.71	2.07

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of students' achievement in paraphrase of ideas. This shows that students in the Direct Instruction group have the highest mean, followed by those in the Cognitive Strategy group. Those in the Read-Test Strategy group have the least mean. This shows that there is a difference in students' achievement in the paraphrase of ideas. To determine whether the differences in means were significant, hypothesis two was tested.

#### Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference in the achievement of students in their paraphrase of ideas using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing.

The result of the ANCOVA conducted to test whether the differences in means in the paraphrase of ideas among students taught using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing was significant is presented in Table 5.



TABLE 5. ANCOVA OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN THEIR PARAPHRASE OF IDEAS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING AT POSTTEST

Sources	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Corrected model	3034.990	3	1011.663	98.779	.000
Intercept	3899.310	1	3899.310	188.011	.000
Pre-paraphrase	540.744	1	540.744	26.075	.000
Strategy	2086.675	2	1043.338	50.306	.000
Error	7652.968	369	20.740		
Total	16624.000	373			
Corrected Total	10687.957	372			

R squared = 0.284 (Adjusted R squared = 0.278) = 0.05

Table 5 shows an F-value of 50.306 for instructional strategies and a P-value of 0.000. Testing at an alpha level of 0.05, the P-value is less than the alpha value. This means there is a significant difference in the students' paraphrase of ideas using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing. Hypothesis two is therefore rejected. In order to determine the direction of the difference, a post-hoc analysis was conducted. The result is presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6. LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE (LSD) MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN THEIR PARAPHRASE OF IDEAS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGES SUMMARY WRITING

(i) Strategy	(j) Strategy	Mean difference (I-J)	Std error	Sig(2-tailed)
Direct Instruction	Cognitive Strategy	2.978	0.581	.000
Direct Instruction	Read-Test Strategy	5.729	0.573	.000
Cognitive Strategy	Read-Test Strategy	2.752	0.615	.000

Table 6 shows the mean difference between Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy as 2.978 and p-value of 0.000, between Direct Instruction and Read-Test as 5.729 and P-value of 0.000, between Cognitive strategy and Read Test as 2.752 and P-value of 0.000. These comparisons are significantly different, since the P-value is less than the alpha at 0.05; there is a significant difference between the strategies.

*Research Question Three*

Is there any difference in the achievement of students in their Summary writing using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test Strategies of Teaching English language summary writing?

TABLE 7. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING AT POSTTEST.

Strategy	N	Mean	Std Dev.
Direct Instruction	153	12.40	6.80
Cognitive Strategy	109	8.05	6.37
Read-Test Strategy	111	4.81	2.92

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of summary writing. This shows that students in the Direct Instruction group ranked the highest, followed by the Cognitive Strategy group, while the Read-Test Strategy group ranked the least. This shows that there is a difference in students' achievement in summary writing. To determine whether the differences in means were significant, hypothesis three was tested.

*Hypothesis Three*

There is no significant difference in the achievement of students in summary writing using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing.

The result of the ANCOVA conducted to test whether the differences in means in summary writing among students taught using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing was significant is presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8. ANCOVA OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING AT POSTTEST.

Sources	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig(2-tailed)
Corrected model	5299.234	3	1766.411	59.766	.000
Intercept	1448.511	1	1448.511	49.010	.000
Pre-main idea	1465.559	1	1465.559	49.589	.000
Strategy	3026.286	2	1513.143	51.196	.000
Error	10906.037	369	29.556		
Total	45667.000	373			
Corrected Total	16205.271	372			

R squared = .327 (Adjusted R squared = .322) = 0.05

Table 8 shows an F-value of 51.196 for the instructional strategies and a P-value of .000. Testing at an alpha level 0.05, the P-value is less than the alpha level, so hypothesis three is rejected. Consequently, there is a



significant difference in students' achievement in summary writing using the Direct, Cognitive and Read-Test strategies of teaching English language summary writing. In order to determine the direction of the difference, a post-hoc analysis was conducted. The result is presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9. LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE (LSD) MULTIPLE COMPARISON OF ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUMMARY WRITING.

(i) Strategy	(J) Strategy	Mean difference	Std Error	Sig(2-tailed)
Direct Instruction	Cognitive Strategy	3.358	.697	.000
Direct Instruction	Read-Test Strategy	6.922	.685	.000
Cognitive Strategy	Read-Test Strategy	3.564	.735	.000

Table 9 shows the mean difference between Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy as 3.358 and P-value of .000, between Direct Instruction and Read-Test Strategy as 6.922 and P-value of .000, between Cognitive Strategy and Read-Test Strategy as 3.564 and P-value .000 showing therefore, that Direct Instruction is more effective than the Cognitive Strategy and Read-Test Strategy. The Cognitive Strategy is, however, more effective than the Read-Test Strategy.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of three instructional strategies on senior secondary school students' achievement in summary writing in Edo State. Review of literature on previous studies carried out on summary writing have shown that summary writing is a core activity in English language teaching and learning and summarizing skills are essential to academic success. Literature has also shown that summary writing in ESL context is an under-researched area and much of the research done has involved English as Foreign Language (EFL) context carried out in countries such as China, Japan, Malaysia and other Asian countries and little or none in African countries, Nigeria inclusive. The research problem for this study is that senior secondary school students lack summarizing skills. These summarizing skills include the ability to distinguish main ideas from supporting sentences, paraphrase or reorganizing the text using their own words and writing adequate summary of a given text.

The pattern of results obtained from the use of both Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy for summary writing tasks confirm that both strategies are effective. Both experimental conditions showed greater gains in posttest achievement scores, relatively to the control group that was taught with the Read-Test Strategy. In the present study we found benefits of strategy instruction after only

eight weeks of intervention sessions. This is in agreement with some previous studies which found that strategy-focused interventions result in an increase in students' achievement in summary writing (Griffiths, 2003; Lee, 2003, Jankovio, 2011).

The main aim of this study was, however, to determine the relative effectiveness of three instructional strategies; Direct Instruction, Cognitive Strategy, and Read-Test Strategy on students' achievement in summary writing. The findings revealed significant difference in students' achievement in identification of main ideas, paraphrasing of ideas and summary writing. Students in the Direct Instruction group outperformed those in the Cognitive Strategy and Read-Test Strategy groups. This is akin to Olagbaju's (2019) study which also found that Direct Instruction is an effective strategy for teaching summary writing. A possible explanation for this could be that students in this group, Direct Instruction, had appropriate and sufficient explanations, these therefore had positive instructional impact on the students.

The Cognitive Strategy also had positive effect on the students' summary writing skills. This is in consonance with Hooshang and Rabani's (2014) study which found out that the use of Cognitive Strategy improves students' performance in summary writing. A possible reason for this maybe because the strategy is learner-centred. The Cognitive Strategy makes room for teachers – students, student – students and students – text interaction, which gives room for greater learner involvement in the learning process.

In contrast, the students in the control group, Read-Test Strategy, made less progress in their summary writing as observed in their posttest mean scores. The lack of significant improvement indicates that the conventional instructional practice of summary writing was not effective enough. In this traditional class room setting, there was no explicit guidance and mentoring tools to help students learn how to write summaries.

The findings from the study suggest that the Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy are potent at enhancing students' summary writing skills. Our finding confirms that, for typically developing writers, both approaches, when applied in summary writing teaching are effective.

## Conclusion

The study has established the fact that students' achievement in summary writing in the ESL context can be improved upon when they are taught summary writing skills with Direct Instruction and Cognitive Strategy It can be concluded that the Direct Instruction when employed in





the teaching and learning of summary writing has great potentials at improving students' achievement in summary writing in English language. The Direct Instruction facilitated improved teacher-student and student-student interactions during the lesson. This facilitated clear communication and minimized ambiguity, which ultimately improved their performance in summary writing in English language.

Also, the Cognitive Strategy is an effective strategy for teaching summary writing. It enables students to plan, think about what they are going to write, and organize these ideas before writing. Students are engaged in active participation through discussion and sharing of ideas with others, this enables them to exhibit their level of understanding of the content of the text and also develop a new strategy of learning. This practice enables students develop learner autonomy, independence and self-regulation.

### Recommendations

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

1. Summary writing instruction should be prioritized and taught explicitly so that students can transfer the skills to other content areas.
2. English language teachers should be encouraged to use the Direct Instruction and Cognitive Instructional Strategy and de-emphasize the use of the Read-Test strategy in the teaching of summary writing.
3. Curriculum planners should consider introducing the Direct Instruction and Cognitive strategy in secondary school curriculum; this could empower learners with the necessary skills in handling summary writing task.

### REFERENCES

- Aimunodion, M. C. (2009). *Effects of thought of low knowledge and shared reading instructional strategies on senior secondary school students' achievement in English reading comprehension and summary writing*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Akinsowon, F. I. (2016). Effects of paragraph shrinking partner reading strategies on students' achievement in English reading comprehension and summary writing in Oyo, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Teacher Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process-genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
- Baker, S. K., Gersten, R. M., & Scanlon, D. (2002). Procedural facilitators and cognitive strategies: Tools for unraveling mysteries of comprehension and the writing process, and for providing meaningful access to the general curriculum. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 17(1), 65-77.
- Baumann, J. F. (1983). A generic comprehension instructional strategy. *Reading World* 22.4
- Baumann, J. F. (1984). The effectiveness of a direct instruction paradigm for teaching main idea comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 93-115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/747654>
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cho, Y. (2012). *Teaching summary writing through direct instruction to improve text comprehension for students in ESL/EFL classroom*. An unpublished Master's Project, University of Wisconsin-River Falls. Retrieved 13th August, 2020 from: [www.minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/61052/cho.pdf](http://www.minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/61052/cho.pdf)
- Eyisi, J. (2005). *The mechanics of reading comprehension and summary writing*. Nimo: Rex Charles and Patrick Ltd.
- Eze, G. U. (2013). Large class size: An implementation to teaching and learning of leading comprehension and summary writing in senior secondary schools. *Journal of Resourcefulness and Distinction*, 6(1), 1-8.
- Fakeye, D. O., & Ogunsij, Y. (2009). English language proficiency as a predictor of academic achievement among EFL students in Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 37(3), 490-499.
- Findley, J. (2019). Reading test prep strategy – work the text. Blog – Teaching with Jennifer Findley Available at: [www.https://jenniferfindley.com](http://www.https://jenniferfindley.com)
- Flower, L., Stein, V., Ackerman, J., Kantz, M., McCormick, K., & Peck, W. (1990). *Reading to write: Exploring a cognitive and social process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gbenedio, U. B. (1996). *Teaching and learning English as a second language*. Benin: New Era Publication.
- Ghufron, M. A. (2016). Process-genre approach, product approach, and students' self-esteem in teaching writing. *Indonesia EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics and Literature*, 2(1), 37-54.
- Griffiths, C. (2006). Language learning strategies: Theory and research. *Language Teaching Journal*, 2(1), 1-29.
- Hooshang, K. & Mabbani Nia, M. (2014). Summarizing strategies and writing ability of Iranian Intermediate EFL students. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 2(4), 264-272.
- Irwin, J. W. (2007). *Teaching reading comprehension processes*. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.
- Jurkovic, V. (2012). Learner strategies and language competence: A case study in the Slovene Higher Education Area. *Uter Alia* 2,42-57.
- Kim, S. A. (2011). Characteristics of EFL reader's summary writing. A study with Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(6), 569-581.



- Kirmizi, F. S. (2009). The relationship between writing achievement and use of reading comprehension strategies in the 5<sup>th</sup> grades of primary schools *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 1(1), 230-234.
- Krawec, J., & Montague, M., (2012). A focus on cognitive strategy instruction. *Current Practice Alerts, Teaching, 19(1)*, 1-4. Retrieved from: [http://s3.amazonaws.com/ami-teachingld/alerts/21/uploaded\\_files/originalAlert19.pdf?1331403099](http://s3.amazonaws.com/ami-teachingld/alerts/21/uploaded_files/originalAlert19.pdf?1331403099).
- Lee, K. O. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of learning strategies in learning English of Korean Junior High Schools. *Asian EFL Journal, Quarterly*, 5(4), 1-36.
- Liu, P. L. (2011). A study of the use of computerized concept mapping to assist ESL learners' writing. *Computers & Education*, 57(4), 2548-2558.
- McShane, S. (2005). *Applying research in reading instruction for adults. First steps for teachers*. Retrieved 13th August, 2020 from: [www.ed.gov/publications/pdf/applyingresearch.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/publications/pdf/applyingresearch.pdf)
- Nanglakong, C. D., Ganaa, E., Dery, G., Felix, D. E., & Stanislaus, N. K. (2019). Investigating summary writing difficulty among students of senior high school: A Case of Bolgatanga Municipality. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 6(1), 224-236 Available online at [www.jallr.com](http://www.jallr.com)
- National Bureau of Statistics [NBS] (2009). *WAEC result statistics (2016 – 2018)*. Abuja: NBS Retrieved 13th August, 2020 from: [www.nieriadstatistics.gov.ng](http://www.nieriadstatistics.gov.ng)
- Obi-Okoye, A. F. (2004). *Advanced English composition: The writing process approach* Onitsha: Ganja Books.
- Okome, E. O. (2018). Effectiveness of three instructional strategies for teaching summary writing on senior secondary school students' achievement in English language summary writing in Edo State. Unpublished Ph.D thesis University of Benin, Benin City.
- Olagbaju, O. O. (2019). Effects of instructional strategy and cognitive styles on achievement of senior secondary students in summary writing in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Global Scientific Journal*, 7(6), Available at: <http://www.globalscientificjournal.com/>
- Oni, J. O. (2014). Teacher quality and student academic achievement in basic technology in junior secondary schools in South-West, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(3).
- Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Ethics & Behavior*, 1(2), 117-75. .
- Rosenshine, B. (2008). *Five meanings of direct instruction*. Centre on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved 13th August, 2020 from: <http://www.formapex.com/telechargementpublic/rosenshin e2008a.pdf>
- Tanpermpoon, T. (2008). Integrated approaches to improve students writing skills for English major students. *ABAC Journal*, 28(2), 1-9.
- Toro, M. G., Umar, M. B., & Motanya, C. C. (2017). The effect of extensive reading on students' performance in reading comprehension and summary writing. *International Journal of English Research*, 3(3), 8-11.
- West African Examinations Council. (WAEC) (2016 - 2018). *Chief examiners' report for the West African Senior School Certificate Examination (WASSCE)*, Lagos: WAEC Press.
- Yang, L. & Shih, L (2003). Exploring six MBA students summary writing by introspection. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(3), 165-192.