

REPEATED READING METHOD: CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AT GRADUATE LEVEL IN THE UNIVERSITY OF SINDH

Syed Ismail Shah Bukhari

Roshan Ali Mugheri

Abdul Sattar Almani

ABSTRACT

Various English language teaching methods, such as Grammar Translation Method and Lecture Method, have proved to be unproductive in developing reading skills of learners at the graduate level. This descriptive research study attempts to investigate the efficacy of Repeated Reading Method in order to develop reading skills and comprehension of learners. Repeated Reading is now practiced at the graduate level in the University of Sindh as an effective approach in developing reading skills of the language learners. Though various research studies carried out at different levels have suggested a set of implications, but those have been found not implemented at the graduate level in the University of Sindh. Hence this research is carried out in the light of hypothesis derived from current researches into the matter and the practice of Repeated Reading Method in the university. On the basis of the findings of this case study, it is recommended that Repeated Reading Method, if properly instructed, would be an effective method to develop reading skills of learners.

INTRODUCTION

The method of Repeated Reading was developed by Samuels in 1979 in order to train unskilled readers for automatic word recognition. It stresses upon re-reading a short passage silently or orally until a reader becomes capable of reading it with ease. It is called unassisted because oral reading model is not supplied. On the contrary, there is assisted repeated reading (RR) in which a live or audio-taped textual model is supplied for the reader. Thus RR is used to increase rate of reading of learners.

This descriptive research study investigates into various variables of this research problem. The required data is collected

through a research questionnaire from 40 male and female Remedial English tutors at the graduate level in the University of Sindh. The data is analyzed quantitatively in order to confirm or disconfirm the hypothesis. Thus it looks into the effectiveness of repeated reading method to teach learners reading skills and further to indicate the extent to which it will be ready for application in classroom settings.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Grabe (2004: 48) remarked, “L2/FL educators are more interested than ever in finding methods to help L2/FL learners develop efficient word recognition skills” It is considered that Grabe is justified to emphasize the selection and adoption of suitable method to develop reading skills of learners.

Mastropieri et al., (1999) held, “Research on repeated reading suggests that fluency can be improved as long as students are provided with specific instructions and procedures are used to monitor their progress”. This idea of Mastropieri and others is very useful and applicable in the said situation.

Meyer and Felton (1999:283) remarked about the effectiveness of the method of repeated reading, “The method of repeated reading improves reading speed for a wide variety of readers”. The learners should be engaged in multiple readings that are three to four times of the same passage. The teacher/remedial tutor should use instructional level texts/materials in order to develop fluency and comprehension of learners. It is very useful to provide concrete measures of progress and teacher feedback on each learner’s performance.

National Reading Panel (2000) reported, “Repeated reading is the only method to yield consistent positive results in increasing fluency”. In fact, fluency consists of rate and accuracy that is how quickly and accurately a learner reads the text/material.

Cheug and Slavin (2005: 241) remarked, “In recent years, there has been a growing recognition that quality of instruction is at least as important as language of instruction in the ultimate success of English language learners”. Of course, quality of instruction and language of instruction are equally important to become successful reader.

Heibert and Fisher (2005: 443) recommended, “Teachers should continue to look for the most efficient fluency building methods available”. Repeated reading method is amalgamation of many fluency developing approaches and techniques.

Kuhn (2005: 127) explained, “The procedure of repeated readings can take many forms. The student can reread passages as a teacher or peer reads the passage”. Kuhn has highlighted the processes of repetition, drilling and modeling in reading practice.

Hosp & Fuchs (2005:9) considered, “One-minute reading timings appear often in a useful fluency building method called repeated readings”. This idea of Hosp and Fuchs is practical and pragmatic to be adopted in the said situation.

Taguchi and Gorsuch (2002:43) argued, “In the RR approach, L2 learners read specified passages from graded readers repeatedly in order to increase learners’ sight recognition of words and phrases, resulting in increased fluency and comprehension”. The contribution and research of Taguchi and another is remarkable for the development of reading fluency and accuracy of learners.

Nelson et al (2004:186) suggested, “When repeated readings are coupled with error correction procedure, students particularly gain fluency skills”. Nelson and others emphasized repeated readings along with feedback and prompt error correction in the class.

Sherfield *et. al.*, (2005) considered, “In order to build students' speed and work on their concentration, they must read as much and often as possible”. To increase English language learners' frequency for active reading, they should consider the following items:

1. Read every chance they get.
2. Read a variety of materials including textbooks, scholarly books, research journal articles, newspapers, and magazines etc.
3. Read not only for learning, but for pleasure as well.

Hu and Nation (2000:403) studied, “Extensive reading can only occur where there are 95% to 98% of the running words in the text are already familiar to English language learners”. In fact,

comprehension is achieved through maximum familiarity of vocabulary in the texts/materials.

Meng (2009:2) told, “Re-telling the stories allow learners an opportunity to share their stories with their fellow classmates and to practice their oral English”. It is considered that storytelling to each other is an effective informal method to develop oral practice.

White (2004:38) remarked, “In reality, every instructor is a reading instructor. No reading takes place without content, and the content that instructors must use is their own subject matter”. The contents of teaching texts/materials should be culturally familiar to learners for better results.

Ediger (2009:78) suggested, “It is also good to have students relating the course content to their own personal lives”. Ediger highlighted the relativity between course contents and local touch for better understanding of learners.

Accordingly, the brief review of related literature reveals that a great number of researchers agree that repeated readings improve word recognition, rate, and accuracy and consequently fluency. Thus a hypothesis is derived in the light of current research and its implications for further research into the problem.

HYPOTHESIS

Whether repeated reading methods is an effective method to inculcate reading skills at the graduate level in the University of Sindh.

METHODOLOGY

The population of this study comprises of total number of male and female Remedial English tutors that is 40, teaching in various faculties at the graduate level in the University of Sindh and the required data is collected from them. Likert scale of five-point is used for this purpose. Each research question is presented in tabular form. Thus quantitative data, collected under each research question is analyzed by using SPSS version 15 computer programme. The first table derives frequency, percent, valid percent and cumulative percent. The second table derives mean, standard deviation and standard error mean. The third table shows that Z-test is applied, that either confirms or disconfirms the hypothesis, wherein test value is equal to 2.

DESCRIPTIVE AND INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Table No.1.1

Ineffectiveness of English Course to Develop Comprehension

scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	15	37.5	37.5	37.5
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	75.0
Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 1.2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.25	1.410	.223

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 1.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.122	39	.269	.250	-.20	.70

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 2.1
Ineffectiveness of English Course to Develop Reading Skills

scale		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	10	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Agree	20	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
	Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 2.2
One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.38	1.334	.211

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 2.3

One-Sample Test						
	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.778	39	.083	.375	-.05	.80

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 3.1
Ineffectiveness of English Course to Develop Rate of Reading
scale

	Freque	Percent	Valid Perce	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	11	27.5	27.5	27.5
Agree	17	42.5	42.5	70.0
Uncertain	2	5.0	5.0	75.0
Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 3.2
One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.40	1.355	.214

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 3.3
One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.867	39	.069	.400	-.03	.83

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 4.1
Inappropriateness of Lecture-Method

scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	15	37.5	37.5	37.5
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	75.0
Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 4.2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.25	1.410	.223

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 4.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.122	39	.269	.250	-.20	.70

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 5.1
Teacher's Reading of Texts/Materials

scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	15	37.5	37.5	37.5
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	75.0
Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 5.2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.25	1.410	.223

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 5.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.122	39	.269	.250	-.20	.70

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 6.1
Lack of Reading Practice to Learners
scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	12	30.0	30.0	30.0
Agree	14	35.0	35.0	65.0
Uncertain	6	15.0	15.0	80.0
Disagree	4	10.0	10.0	90.0
Strongly Disagree	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 6.2
One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.35	1.292	.204

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 6.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.713	39	.095	.350	-.06	.76

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 7.1
Inadequate Teacher Training/Equipment

scale					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	14	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Agree	12	30.0	30.0	65.0
	Uncertain	4	10.0	10.0	75.0
	Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
	Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 7.2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.38	1.409	.223

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 7.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.684	39	.100	.375	-.08	.83

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 8.1
Preference to Local than Foreign Texts/Materials

scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	12	30.0	30.0	30.0
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	67.5
Uncertain	4	10.0	10.0	77.5
Disagree	4	10.0	10.0	87.5
Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 8.2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.38	1.353	.214

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 8.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Scale	1.753	39	.087	.375	-.06	.81

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 9.1
Learners Move Their Fingers/Pens over Words While Reading
scale

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Agree	12	30.0	30.0	30.0
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	67.5
Uncertain	4	10.0	10.0	77.5
Disagree	6	15.0	15.0	92.5
Strongly Disagree	3	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 9.2
One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.33	1.269	.201

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 9.3
One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.620	39	.113	.325	-.08	.73

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

Table No. 10.1
Effectiveness of Repeated Reading Method

scale					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	15	37.5	37.5	37.5
	Agree	15	37.5	37.5	75.0
	Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	87.5
	Strongly Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 10.2

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scale	40	2.25	1.410	.223

Source: Survey data (2008-9).

Table No. 10.3

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2					
	z	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
scale	1.122	39	.269	.250	-.20	.70

Source: Survey data (2008-9)

Z-test is applied and significance value is greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted.

FINDINGS

The following findings are drawn from the data analysis of this study:

1. The majority of teachers showed their agreement that English course was ineffective in developing comprehension of learners. On the

- contrary, some of them either disagreed or were uncertain about this statement.
2. The most of teachers agreed that English course was ineffective in developing rate of reading of learners. While some of them either disagreed or were uncertain about this statement.
 3. A greater number of respondents indicated their consent that English course was ineffective in developing reading skills of learners. While some of them either disagreed or were uncertain about it.
 4. The majority of teachers viewed that English course was taught by Lecture-method. On the other hand, the remaining number of respondents did not agree or were uncertain about it.
 5. An eminent number of teachers agreed that they themselves read texts/materials in the classrooms while the rest of them either agreed or were uncertain about it.
 6. A lot of number of teachers agreed that learners were not given much reading practice and motivation in the class. On the contrary, the rest of them either disagreed or were uncertain about it.
 7. The majority of teachers confirmed that they were not fully trained and equipped to teach reading skills. While some of them either thought to be fully trained/equipped or were uncertain.
 8. A greater number of teachers agreed that they preferred local to foreign texts/materials to develop reading skills. On the other side, the rest of them either disagreed or were undecided about this proposition.
 9. A large number of teachers agreed that the majority of learners move their fingers/pens over words while reading texts /materials. While the rest of them either disagreed or were uncertain about this statement.
 10. The majority of teachers confirmed that Repeated Reading Method was effective in developing comprehension, rate of reading and reading skills of learners. On the other hand some of them either disagreed or were undecided in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The data analysis and its findings confirmed the findings of previous research into the matter. Consequently Repeated Reading Method was inferred to be an effective method to develop reading skills of learners at graduate level in the University of Sindh. The findings of this research study stipulate that the problems of learners arising from the previous ineffective practice of Grammar Translation Method and Lecture Method could be sorted out by

diligently inculcating the Repeated Reading Method for developing reading skills of learners. It is recommended to the concerned quarter for innovation, updating and revision of existing syllabi/courses, at the graduate level in the University of Sindh. It is also suggested that sample reading texts/materials may be prepared and approved by the competent authority. However, this study suggests for further research into the matter.

REFERENCES

- Cheug, A., & Slavin, R. (2005). "Effective Reading Programs for English Language Learners and Other Language Minority Students," *Bilingual Research Journal*, No.29.
- Ediger, M. (2009). "Reading Comprehension in the Science Curriculum", *Reading Improvement*, 46(2).
- Grabe, W. (2004). "Research on Teaching Reading", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Hiebert, E. H., & Fisher, C. W. (2005). "A Review of the National Reading Panel's Studies on Fluency: The Role of Text", *Elementary School Journal*, 105.
- Hu, M., & Nation, I. S. P. (2000). "Unknown Vocabulary Density and Reading Comprehension", *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 13 (1).
- Kuhn, M. R. (2005). "A Comparative Study of Small Group Fluency Instruction", *Reading Psychology*, 26(2).
- Meng, F. (2009), "Developing Students' Ability Through Extensive Reading", *English Language Teaching*, No.2.
- Meyer, M. S., & Felton, R. H. (1999). "Repeated Reading to Enhance Fluency: Old Approaches and New Directions", *Annals of Dyslexia*, 49.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and its Implications for Reading Instruction*. NIH Publication No.00-4754, Washington.
- Nelson, J. S., Alber, S. R., & Gordy, A. (2004). "Effects of Systematic Error Correction and Repeated Readings on the Reading Accuracy and Proficiency of Second Graders with Disabilities". *Education and Treatment of Children*, No.27.
- Taguchi, E. and Gorsuch, G.J. (2002). "Transfer Effects of Repeated EFL Reading on Reading New Passages: A Preliminary Investigation", *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14 (1).
- White, H.L. (2004). "Nursing Instructors Must Also Teach Reading and Study Skills", *Reading Improvement*, 41(1).