

TEACHING ENGLISH READING COMPREHENSION AND ITS IMPACT ON 6TH GRADERS' ACHIEVEMENT

Fozia Kanwal^{*1}, Hina Iqbal², Saleha Ali³, Asim Ali⁴

^{*1}EST, Govt Girls High school Hujra Shah Muqem (okara);

²Virtual University of Pakistan;

³Lecturer – Education, Virtual University of Pakistan; ⁴Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab

^{*1}foziakanwal78600@gmail.com; ²hina.iqbal@vu.edu.pk; ³saleha.ali@vu.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

Received: 05 May, 2024

Revised: 05 June, 2024

Accepted: 17 June, 2024

Published: 30 June, 2024

ABSTRACT

In the implementation of reading comprehension, teaching plays a crucial role. Global and national indicators suggest a significant insufficiency in the implementation of reading comprehension, particularly at the elementary school level. This study aimed to gain insights into the factors that influence students' performance in implementing reading comprehension at the elementary school level. The researchers used an experimental and non-equivalent control group design. The study was conducted with one 6th-grade high school class, with an experimental group of 30 participants and a control group of 29 participants. The researchers developed a pre-test and post-test, which were administered to both groups. The experimental group was then taught using English reading comprehension strategies (pre-reading, during reading, and after reading), while the control group was taught using traditional methods. After a four-week intervention period, the post-test was conducted. The data were analyzed by applied both paired sample t-tests and independent sample t-tests to calculate the significant differences. The researcher concludes that teaching through strategies enhanced students' understanding levels. The analysis showed no significant difference in pre-test scores between the control and experimental groups. However, a significant difference was found in the post-test scores, with the experimental group outperforming the control group. Furthermore, the experimental group showed a significant improvement in their post-test scores compared to their pre-test scores, while the control group's post-test scores were lower than their pre-test scores.

Keywords: English reading, Comprehension, Achievement

INTRODUCTION

Language is known as a systematized source of interacting with others while communicating one's ideas and mood through conventional symbols. Language is an organized system of collaborating ideas or moods using conventionalized symbols, gestures, and sounds that have inherent meaning. Language is the basis for communication between individuals regardless of their first or second language (Bloomfield, 2021). As the world progresses, it is crucial that we also make progress in accordance, and language is a vital source of communication, so we must understand national and international languages (Canagarajah, 2017).

In Pakistan, the majority of people, especially students, are now learning English as their second language. To gain mastery over the English language, one of the best possible solutions is the reading activity. Reading can expand students' knowledge and help enhance their English reading skills, making it a valuable solution for aiding students' learning in the English language (Grabe & Stoller, 2020). Reading is considered a vital tool and skill of language. It depends mainly upon the capability and competence of the reader, as their efforts to understand the text predict their ability as a reader (Koda, 2019).

Comprehension is considered a crucial aspect of reading, involving the reader's ability to understand the core meaning of the text (Kintsch, 2018). Reading is a complex and multifaceted process that encompasses both word recognition and comprehension (Rayner et al., 2016). Word recognition is the process of understanding written symbols and connecting them to one's verbal language, while comprehension is the process of deriving meaning from the text (Perfetti, 2007).

Reading is a meaning-making and "minds-on" activity, where readers utilize their linguistic, mental, and sociocultural resources to understand and interpret the text (Grabe, 2009). Reading comprehension involves various components, such as vocabulary knowledge, fluency, background knowledge, and awareness of reading strategies (Oakhill et al., 2015). As a composite language skill, reading comprehension requires the integration of multiple skills simultaneously (Dymock & Nicholson, 2020).

Researchers have emphasized the importance of reading skills in English as a second language (ESL) for academic and professional success (Grabe & Stoller, 2020). In the Pakistani context, English is an official language and the medium of instruction in higher education, making proficient English literacy essential for academic achievement (Iqbal et al., 2021). However, traditional teaching methods in Pakistani classrooms, such as memorization and paraphrasing, have failed to develop students' satisfactory reading skills in English (Khan & Pandian, 2018; Hussain, 2019).

The literature suggests a need for the adoption of more effective teaching approaches to enhance reading comprehension skills among Pakistani students (Tabassum & Malik, 2020). Researchers have advocated for the use of approach-based teaching methods, such as the interactive approach, as a more effective alternative to traditional teaching styles (Akkakoson, 2013; Tavakoli & Koosha, 2016). These approach-based methods aim to foster students' awareness and engagement in the reading process, enabling them to become self-directed learners (Afflerbach et al., 2013).

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of different approach-based teaching methods in improving reading comprehension skills among 6th-grade students in Pakistan. The findings of this study will contribute to the existing literature on reading instruction and provide insights into the

implementation of effective teaching strategies in second language contexts.

Literature Review

Reading comprehension is a crucial skill that many students struggle to develop. Researchers have found that various instructional strategies can help improve students' understanding of complex texts. One key approach is to help students connect new information in the reading passages to their prior knowledge, allowing them to better integrate and comprehend the presented ideas (Holte, 2023). Explicitly explaining novel concepts and terminology can also facilitate students' understanding of the reading material (Holte, 2023). Additionally, providing students with appropriately challenging texts has been shown to contribute to the development of advanced comprehension skills (McCormick, 2022).

The literature also suggests that the level of reading comprehension is closely tied to overall academic performance. Students who can read and comprehend texts tend to be better performers compared to their less proficient peers (Jubani, Lama, and Gjokutaj, 2012). Interestingly, studies have found that reading stories about older individuals can also improve students' reading comprehension abilities (Buyuktasapu, 2012; Bolos, 2012). However, some students still consider comprehension to be a difficult task, especially if they have weak decoding skills (Spooner et al., 2006).

Factors Impacting Reading Comprehension

Distinct features in reading skills and challenges

Researchers have identified several key factors that impact students' reading comprehension abilities. One important aspect is the reader's attention to the reading process itself. Walczyk and Griffith-Ross (2007) found that readers need to focus not just on recognizing the words, but also on actively comprehending the meaning of the text. This allows for better understanding and retention of the information. Bolos (2012) noted that students face both challenges and benefits during reading practice. Teachers play a crucial role in motivating students to be curious and attentive to the positive aspects, such as expanding their vocabulary and making connections between words and visuals.

Another significant factor is the quality and preference of reading material. research has shown that many students dislike reading assignments in

English classes (McNamara, 2007), highlighting the need for teachers to employ effective comprehension strategies. Researchers believe that teachers need to carefully select high-quality literature that can help students enhance their reading proficiency (Bolos, 2012; Serafini & Giorgis, 2003; Wiseman, 2011).

The impact of electronic media, such as television and video games, cannot be overlooked. Studies have found that excessive exposure to these distractions can negatively influence students' concentration and reading abilities, leading to poorer academic achievement (Akanda, Hoq, & Hasan, 2013; Jordan, Hersey, McDivitt, & Heitzler, 2006).

To address these challenges, researchers have explored various effective strategies for promoting reading comprehension. Bolos (2012) highlighted fundamental approaches, including activating prior knowledge, questioning, and emphasizing the importance of comprehension. Walczyk and Griffith-Ross (2007) further suggested specific strategies, such as slow reading, pausing, re-reading, and reading aloud, to help readers overcome difficulties in understanding the text.

Teaching English Reading Comprehension through Reading Strategies

Reading comprehension is a crucial aspect of language learning, and there are several strategies that can be employed to improve it. These strategies can be categorized into various categories, and each one plays an important role in enhancing the reading experience for students.

One of the key categories is pre-reading activities. These activities are carried out before the actual reading process and aim to reduce uncertainties and enable readers to activate their prior knowledge. Pre-reading activities can include vocabulary previewing, brainstorming, and the use of a KWL (Know, Want to Know, Learned) chart. Nunam (2003) stated that experiences present in texts belong to readers' background knowledge, and pre-reading helps students to build a connection between prior and new knowledge (Ajideh, 2006). Teachers are allowed to select and combine appropriate pre-reading activities regarding the text (Hedge, 2000). The original Sterling psychological wellbeing measure was translated into Urdu, the country's official language. According to empirical research findings, SCWBS is a standardized measure that may be applied in any type of educational environment (Sarfaraz, Iqbal et al. 2022). Increased motivation in

the classroom is correlated with better emotional intelligence scores (Shinwari et al., 2023). Evidence from empirical research revealed that children's emotional and psychological wellbeing was not correlated with teacher rejection (Sarfaraz, Iqbal et al. 2022). Social capital is an intangible resource that has a highly favorable effect as a mediator, improving the social activity and consequences of employees (Jamil and Rasheed 2023). Education experts can evaluate behavior conduct in accordance with perceived teacher acceptance rejection with the use of this accessible scale (Sarfaraz and Malik 2023).

Vocabulary previewing is an essential pre-reading strategy that helps students become familiar with the words they will encounter in the text. Teachers can assist students in understanding the meaning of these words, which is crucial for comprehending the overall text (Sedita, 2010). Brainstorming, on the other hand, is a strategy that triggers students' prior knowledge and encourages them to think about the topic of the reading. This can lead to engaging classroom discussions and help students connect the new information with what they already know (de Bretagne, 2009).

The KWL chart is a graphic organizer that combines the pre-reading and post-reading processes. It allows students to activate their prior knowledge, learn new vocabulary, and then reflect on what they have learned (Tompkins, 2014). The chart consists of three columns: "What I Know," "What I Want to Know," and "What I Learned." This visual aid helps students organize information and take control of their own learning. It is particularly beneficial for learners who connect with visual aids (Bomengen, 2010).

During Reading Strategies

Coding the Text and Repeated Reading

Coding the text is an up-to-date technique for promoting prominence and captivating notes. Through this approach, students follow a classroom-oriented procedure of rules which contains signs to build connections between concepts in the text they read (Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2013). These symbols can be set up by teachers or students to provide online aid or coaching assistance. By using these signs, students can build networks between their known and unknown, and their beliefs about significant things. It also presents their agreement or disagreement behavior.

Repeated reading strategy is designed to make students fluent readers. Along with serving the purpose of reading fluency, it also helps improve reading comprehension (Flynt & Still, 2012). Repeated reading involves reading a text passage more than once. It enhances fluency by making students familiar with the words in the text and allowing them to develop effective and smooth phrasing. This results in saving students time to think about decoding individual words and phrases, and allows them to focus their attention on making sense of the whole passage.

Literature Circles and Say Something

Literature circles are a fun and engaging activity that can be used during and after reading sessions to impart reading comprehension (Briggs, 2010). In small groups ranging from 4-6 students, each member performs a specific role to facilitate reading and discussion.

In the "Say Something" strategy, learners are allocated a partner or have the freedom to choose one to discuss what they have read and learned. Students read a small section from the text, either silently or orally, and then discuss their thoughts about the section. For example, they may summarize the text and ask questions that their partner can reply to, in order to support their learning of a difficult concept (Beers, 2003).

Post-Reading Strategies

Post-reading strategies are the final step for successful reading comprehension, as they involve reflecting upon what the reader has read and self-monitoring for understanding. If readers do not take time after reading to analyze and summarize the concepts read, their comprehension will not be truly successful. Strategies such as Question-Answer Relationship (QAR), Summarizing, Whip Around, Think-Pair-Share, and Exit Slips can be used as post-reading strategies to help readers couple their prior knowledge and critical thinking skills with what they learned through reading (Marzano, 2010; PLB Blogger, n.d.; Carss, 2007; Adler, 2012; Jones, 2012).

Research Objectives

This study is based on the following objectives:

1. To examine the difference in the reading comprehension improvement of control and experimental groups in pretest.

2. To examine the difference in reading comprehension improvement of control and experimental groups in posttest.
3. To determine the impact of reading strategies on reading comprehension in the subject of English of 6th grader.

Research Hypothesis

Ho₁: There is no significant difference in the reading comprehension of control and experimental group in pretest.

Ho₂: There is no significant difference in the reading comprehension of control and experimental group in posttest.

Ho₃: There is no significant impact of reading comprehension activities on students at 6th grade.

Ho₄: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for meaning and post reading for meaning in experimental group.

Ho₅: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for meaning and post reading for meaning in control group.

Ho₆: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading to rationalize and post reading to rationalize in experimental group.

Ho₇: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading to rationalize and post reading to rationalize in control group.

Ho₈: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for facts and post reading for facts in experimental group.

Ho₉: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for facts and post reading for facts in control group.

Ho₁₀: There is no significant difference of students pre-opinionated questions and post opinionated questions in experimental group.

Ho₁₁: There is no significant difference of students pre-opinionated questions and post opinionated questions in control group.

Ho₁₂: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for ideas and post-reading for ideas in experimental group.

Ho₁₃: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for ideas and post-reading for ideas in control group.

Research Methodology

The design of the research is experimental. For this purpose, quasi experimental non-equivalent control group design was used.

The population of the study was all students in govt girls high schools of Hujra Shah Muqem and the sample was 59 students including of 30 members in experimental group and 29 members in control group. In this study, the school was selected through convenient sampling. Afterwards, the section was selected through simple random sampling. There were four sections in grade VI and the researcher randomly selected two intact sections. Afterwards the nominated classes were also randomly allocated as control and experimental groups. For Instrument development, a self-developed achievement test was used for assessing reading comprehension of the students. The test was administered on reading comprehension, the purpose of which is to identify the achievement domains being measured. Ten passages were given to students which were according to their mental level through which learners were enquired to recite the paragraph to check their word recognition. Five questions at the end of each paragraph were asked from the learners to give responses through which their sentence construction was assessed. The structure of sentences of learners in script had helped to assess the

understanding level of learners' reading. To make an idea of the comprehension of the students, the answer of the questions had also helped a lot. The period of the experiment lasted for 12 weeks. Afterwards, the treatment was given to an experimental group according to the lesson plans. The instrument (achievement test) was certified its validity through the experts' opinion. Cronbach Alpha was applied for reliability and .88 was found its value. After permission of head teach the students' and collect the data.

Inferential statistical analysis was applied to analyze the data. To check the mean difference, independent sample t-test and to discover the substantial modification among control and experimental groups in their learning through achievement scores before and after intervention were determined.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Ho₁: There is no significant difference in the reading comprehension of control and experimental group in pretest.

Table 1 Comparison of English reading comprehension between control and experimental groups in pretest.

Pre test	Mean	N	SD	t	df	P	Cohen's d
Experimental	57.66	30	6.39	1.85	57	.069	0.48
Control	54.39	29	7.14				

Table 1 reflect that no significant difference in reading comprehension between the control and experimental groups in the pre-test, as indicated by the non-significant t-test score ($t(57) = 1.85, p > .05$). However, there was a statistically significant decrease in the control group's pre-test scores ($M = 54.39, SD = 7.14$) compared to the experimental

group's pre-test scores ($M = 57.66, SD = 6.39$), with a small effect size of 0.48 and null hypothesis is accepted.

Ho₂: There is no significant difference in the reading comprehension of control and experimental group in posttest.

Table 2 Comparison of English reading comprehension between control and experimental groups in post test.

Post test	Mean	N	SD	t	df	P	Cohen's d
Experimental	93.23	30	2.09	3.80	57	.001	7.98
Control	51.06	29	7.18				

Table 2 reflect that a significant difference in reading comprehension between the control and experimental groups in the post-test, as indicated by the significant t-test score ($t(57) = 3.80, p < .05$). The experimental group's post-test scores ($M = 93.23, SD = 2.09$) were substantially higher than the control group's post-test scores ($M = 51.06, SD = 7.18$), with

a large effect size of 7.98. This suggests that the intervention had a significant impact on the reading comprehension achievements of the students in the experimental group and a null hypothesis is rejected.

Ho₃: There is no significant impact of reading comprehension activities on students at 6th grader.

Table 3 Comparison of English reading comprehension between control and experimental groups in pre and post test.

Pre & post test	Mean	N	SD	t	df	P	Cohen's d
Experimental pre	57.66	30	6.39	1.85	57	.069	0.48
Experimental post	93.23	30	2.09	3.80	57	.001	7.98
Control pre	54.39	29	7.14				
Control post	51.06	29	7.18				

The results presented in Table 3 indicate that the experimental group's t-test score, $t(57) = 3.80$, was statistically significant. Since the p-value was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis stating "There is no significant impact of reading comprehension activities on 6th-grade students" is rejected. An independent sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the intervention on reading comprehension achievement scores. The experimental group showed a substantial increase in

post-test scores ($M=93.23$, $SD=2.09$) compared to their pre-test scores ($M=57.66$, $SD=6.39$), $t(57)=1.85$, $p=.001$, indicating a large effect size of 7.98. Conversely, the control group did not exhibit any significant differences between their pre-test and post-test scores.

Ho4: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for meaning and post reading for meaning in experimental group.

Table 4 Comparison of pre-reading for meaning post- reading for meaning of experimental group

	Mean	N	SD	t	df	P	Cohen's d
Pre reading for meaning	49.18	30	5.73	23.8	29	.001	5.35
Post reading for meaning	71.73	30	1.61				

The results presented in Table 4 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = 23.8$, was statistically significant with a p-value less than 0.05. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the effect of the intervention on students' reading for meaning achievements, and the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading for meaning and post-reading for meaning in the

experimental group" was rejected. The experimental group showed a substantial increase in post-test scores ($M=71.73$, $SD=1.61$) compared to their pre-test scores ($M=49.18$, $SD=5.73$), $t(29)=23.8$, $p=.001$, indicating a large effect size of 5.35.

Ho5: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for meaning and post reading for meaning in control group.

Table 5 Comparison of pre reading for meaning post reading for meaning of control group

	Mean	N	SD	t	df	P	Cohen's d
Pre reading for meaning	46.08	29	5.99	20.35	28	0.0048	0.714
Post reading for meaning	41.74	29	6.17				

The results presented in Table 5 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = -20.35$, was not statistically significant, as the p-value was higher than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading for meaning and post-reading for meaning in the control

group" was accepted. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the traditional method on students' reading for meaning achievements. The control group showed a statistically significant decrease in post-test scores ($M=41.74$, $SD=6.17$) compared to their pre-test

scores (M=46.08, SD=5.99), $t(29)=-20.35$, $p<.05$, indicating a smaller degree of effect (0.714).

Ho6: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading to rationalize and post reading to rationalize in experimental group.

Table 6 Contrast of pre reading to rationalize post reading to rationalize of experimental group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre reading to rationalize	8.48	30	2.33	20.35	29	<.001	6.58
Post reading to rationalize	21.50	30	1.55				

The results presented in Table 6 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = 20.35$, was statistically significant with a p-value less than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading to rationalize and post-reading to rationalize in the experimental group" was rejected. A paired sample t-test revealed a

statistically substantial increase in the experimental group's post-test scores (M=21.50, SD=1.55) compared to their pre-test scores (M=8.48, SD=2.33), $t(29)=20.35$, $p=.001$, indicating a larger degree of effect (6.58).

Ho: 7 There is no significant difference of students pre-reading to rationalize and post reading to rationalize in control group.

Table 7 Comparison of pre reading to rationalize post reading to rationalize of control group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre reading to rationalize	8.31	29	2.35	1.72	28	.096	0.39
Post reading to rationalize	9.34	29	2.93				

The results presented in Table 4.7 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = 1.72$, was not statistically significant, as the p-value was higher than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading to rationalize and post-reading to rationalize in the control group" was accepted. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the

traditional method on students' reading to rationalize achievements. The control group showed a statistically insignificant increase in post-test scores (M=9.34, SD=2.93) compared to their pre-test scores (M=8.31, SD=2.35), $t(29)=1.72$, $p<.05$, indicating a smaller degree of effect (0.39).

Ho8: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for facts and post reading for facts in experimental group.

Table 8 Comparison of pre_ reading for facts to post_ reading for facts of experimental group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre reading for facts	64.43	30.00	11.21	14.05	29	.001	3.58
Post reading for facts	93.70	30.00	2.85				

The results presented in Table 8 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = 14.05$, was statistically significant with a p-value less than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading for facts and post-reading for facts in the experimental group" was rejected. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the intervention on students' achievements.

The experimental group showed a statistically substantial increase in post-test scores (M=58.34, SD=10.79) compared to their pre-test scores (M=64.43, SD=11.21), $t(29)=-14.05$, $p=.001$, indicating a large degree of effect (3.58).

Ho: 9 There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for facts and post reading for facts in control group.

Table 9 Comparison of pre_ reading for facts to post_ reading for facts of control group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre reading for facts	58.34	29	10.79	.553	28	.585	0.15
Post reading for facts	56.82	29	9.30				

The results presented in Table 9 show that the t-test score, $t(28) = 0.553$, was not statistically significant, as the p-value was higher than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading for facts and post-reading for facts in the control group" was accepted. A paired sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the traditional method on students'

achievements. The control group did not show a statistically significant difference in pre-test ($M=58.34$, $SD=10.79$) and post-test scores ($M=56.8$, $SD=9.30$), $t(28)=0.553$, $p<.05$, indicating a smaller degree of effect (0.15).

Ho10: There is no significant difference of students pre-opinionated questions and post opinionated questions in experimental group.

Table 10: Comparison of pre opinionated questions on post opinionated questions of experimental group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre opinionated	51.50	30.00	1.13	14.80	29	.001	4.36
Post opinionated	90.25	30.00	5.84				

The results presented in Table 10 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = 14.80$, was statistically significant with a p-value less than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-opinionated questions and post-opinionated questions in the experimental group" was rejected. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the intervention on students' achievements. The experimental group showed a

statistically significant increase in post-test scores on opinionated questions ($M=90.25$, $SD=5.84$) compared to their pre-test scores ($M=51.50$, $SD=11.13$), $t(29)=14.80$, $p=.001$, indicating a large degree of effect (4.36).

Ho11: There is no significant difference of students pre-opinionated questions and post opinionated questions in control group.

Table 11 Comparison of pre opinionated questions on post opinionated questions of control group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre opinionated	51.20	29	3.05	.060	28	.953	0.01
Post opinionated	51.37	29	12.31				

The results presented in Table 11 show that the t-test score, $t(28) = 0.060$, was not statistically significant, as the p-value was higher than the significant value of 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-opinionated questions and post-opinionated questions in the control group" was accepted. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the traditional method on students' opinionated

achievements. The control group did not show a statistically significant difference in pre-test ($M=51.20$, $SD=3.05$) and post-test scores on opinionated questions ($M=51.37$, $SD=12.31$), $t(28)=0.060$, $p<.05$, indicating a smaller degree of effect (0.01).

Ho12: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for ideas and post-reading for ideas in experimental group.

Table 12 Comparison of pre reading for ideas to post reading for ideas of experimental group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre reading for ideas	50.50	30	16.51	13.84	29	<.001	3.63
Post reading for ideas	94.44	30	4.51				

The results presented in Table 12 indicate that the t-test score, $t(29) = 13.84$, was statistically significant with a p-value less than 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading for ideas and post-reading for ideas in the experimental group" was rejected. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the intervention on students' achievements. The experimental group showed a statistically

significant increase in post-test scores on reading for ideas ($M=94.44$, $SD=4.51$) compared to their pre-test scores ($M=50.50$, $SD=16.51$), $t(29)=13.846$, $p=.001$, indicating a large degree of effect (3.63).

Ho13: There is no significant difference of students pre-reading for ideas and post-reading for ideas in control group.

Table 13 Comparison of pre reading for ideas to post reading for ideas of control group

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pre reading for ideas	49.94	29	13.32	.073	28	.047	0.62
Post reading for ideas	41.32	29	14.45				

The results presented in Table 13 show that the t-test score, $t(28) = 0.073$, was not statistically significant, as the p-value was higher than the significant level of 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of students' pre-reading for ideas and post-reading for ideas in the control group" was accepted. A paired sample t-test was conducted to estimate the impact of the traditional method on students' achievements. The control group did not show a statistically significant difference in pre-test scores on reading for ideas ($M=49.94$, $SD=13.32$) and post-test scores ($M=41.32$, $SD=14.45$), $t(28)=0.073$, $p<.005$, indicating a smaller degree of effect (0.62).

comprehension activities conducted using technology-based tools. This aligns with the 2019 findings of Doty, who concluded that reading comprehension activities in an electronic environment were more effective than those using printed materials. Thooft's 2018 research described the positive effect of audiobooks on students' reading comprehension. Similarly, Brown's 2020 study found that computer-aided reading comprehension activities played a vital role in enhancing students' reading comprehension abilities. The data collected in the current study clearly shows that the use of different teaching strategies had a positive impact on students' performance, helping to enhance their English reading comprehension. The study employed an experimental design, with an experimental group receiving strategy-based teaching and a control group receiving traditional instruction. An achievement test was used to assess the change in scores between the two groups. The results of the study indicate that the experimental group, taught using various strategies, demonstrated significant improvements in their English reading comprehension abilities compared to the control group. This suggests that the implementation of strategic teaching methods can be an effective approach in enhancing students' reading comprehension skills.

Discussion

Recent studies have consistently demonstrated the positive impact of various teaching strategies on improving students' English reading comprehension abilities. These studies have provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of incorporating different approaches in the classroom. The findings showed that they comprehend much better from the first lesson until the last lesson. A comprehensive review of the literature reveals several notable findings. In 2021, a study by Berktaş-Turkmen examined the effect of using technology in education on reading comprehension. The results showed that students were more successful in reading

Conclusions and recommendations

After the results obtained from the study in English reading comprehension, improvement in students' reading comprehension were revealed. The method of teaching which was found on the use of different strategies was more fruitful to increase the academic success of the students. Students were active learners in strategy based teaching methods and the knowledge gained was purposeful. Teaching method based on strategies were useful in increasing English reading comprehension capability of students in the comparison of lecture method. Application of strategy based instruction in the schools can leads towards the improvement of English reading comprehension ability through which the students will be capable to comprehend English language in an improved manner. So, it can be sum up that by using teaching methods based on strategies can leads the country towards the positive prospect.

Following recommendations are recommended on the basis of the outcomes derived from the research: Following recommendations are recommended on the basis of the outcomes derived from the research:

1. The results of the research exposed that students teach by using strategies shows significance enhancement in English reading comprehension ability as related to those who are taught by traditional method. Therefore, it is suggested to teach the students by using strategies for the meaningful learning to take place.
2. The outcomes of teaching by the use of different strategies were productive, so it should be implemented in the schools by the teachers for teaching English. The workshops or seminars for teacher trainings should be organized for teachers who are in service to enhance their skills how to adopt the different strategies effectively in the classrooms to attain essential SLOs described in National curriculum.
3. The strategies enhance the quality education in students. So, focus on the teaching through strategies should be focus by the curriculum developers.
4. The organizations of pre-service teacher training should comprise in their curriculum the teaching through strategies to train the pre-service teachers the use of different type of strategies for effective teaching.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. It is shown from the research that in English reading comprehension enhancement the teaching methods based on strategies are useful. So, it is recommended to set side by side the effect of different teaching methods based on strategies on the learning of students.
2. The research examine the outcomes of teaching methods based on strategies in enhancing the English reading comprehension of primary grade students and demonstrated to be very valuable. More practical trials must be adopted with comparable researches on other subjects along with other grades.
3. It is observed in the course of the study that there was a clear transformation in the communal performance of learners in the class, the learners developed into more helpful and pleasant with their fellow student. Therefore, it is recommended to discover the effect of education through strategies on societal abilities of the learners.
4. It is evident from the research that the achievement scores of students calculated on English reading comprehension capabilities offer significant outcomes. Therefore, it is suggested to conduct a research in which achievement test is applied, it must be proposed on the level of Bloom's cognitive domains, since achievement scores simply cannot offer us with communicative outcomes.

References

- Adler, R. (2012, November 8). *A Favorite Formative Assessment: The Exit Slip*. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/formative-assessment-exit-slip-rebecca-alber>
- Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2013). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(5), 364-373.
- Ajideh, P. (2006). Schema-theory based considerations on pre-reading activities in ESP textbooks. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 16, 1-19. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from http://asian-efljournal.com/November_2006_Vol16_Art2.pdf

- Akanda, A. K. M., Hoq, K. M. G., & Hasan, N. (2013). Reading habit of students in social sciences and arts: A case study of Rajshahi University. *Chinese Librarianship*, (35).
- Akkakoson, S. (2013). The relationship between strategic reading instruction, student learning of L2-based reading strategies and L2 reading achievement. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 36(4), 422-450.
- Beers, K. (2003). *When Kids Can't Read: What Teachers Can Do*. Retrieved from <http://www.centergrove.k12.in.us/cms/lib4/IN01000850/Centricity/Domain/1217/Middle%20School%20Took%20Kit%20for%20Literacy.pdf>
- Berktaş-Turkmen, F. (2001). The effect of using technology in education on reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 12(3), 45-58
- Bolos, N. (2012). Successful strategies for teaching reading to middle grades English language learners. *Middle School Journal*, 44(2), 14-20.
- Bomengen, M. (2010, August 23). *Reading Strategies for Struggling Readers: KWL Charts*. Retrieved from <http://www.readinghorizons.com/blog/post/2010/08/23/Reading-Strategies-that-Work-for-Struggling-Readers-KWL-Charts.aspx>
- Briggs, S. (2010). Implementing literature circles in the classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(7), 512-515.
- Brown, J. (2006). The impact of computer-aided reading comprehension activities on student learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 22(4), 701-719.
- Buyuktaskapu, S. (2012). Effect of family supported pre-reading training program give to children in preschool education period on reading success in primary school. *Educational Sciences: Theory and practice*, 12(1), 309- 316.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2017). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 31-54.
- Carss, W.D. (2007). *The Effects of using Think-Pair-Share during Guided Reading Lessons*. Retrieved from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/2233>
- De Bretagne, R. (2009, December 8). *How Teachers can use Pre Reading Techniques to Accelerate Reading Comprehension in Students*. Retrieved from <http://www.education-space360.com/index.php/how-teachers-can-use-pre-reading-techniques-to-accelerate-reading-comprehension-in-students-2-12735/>
- Doty, D. (1999). Reading comprehension activities: Printed material vs. electronic storybooks. *The Reading Teacher*, 52(8), 772-782.
- Dymock, S., & Nicholson, T. (2020). *Reading comprehension: What every teacher needs to know*. Routledge.
- Elish-Piper, L. L., & Allier, S. K. (2013). *Literacy Strategies for Teacher Candidates*. Retrieved from http://www.pearsonhighered.com/assets/hip/us/hip_us_pearsonhighered/samplechapter/0137155891.pdf
- Flynt, C.A., & Still, K.L. (2012). *Does Repeated Reading Improve Reading Fluency and Comprehension for Struggling Adolescent Readers*. Retrieved from http://aasep.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Protected_Directory/JAASEP/JAASEP_2012/Winter_2012/Does_Repeated_Reading_Improve_Reading_Fluency_and_Comprehension_for_Struggling_Adolescent_Readers.pdf for comprehension? *Reading Teacher*, 60 (6), 560-569.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2018). *An introduction to language* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Grabe, W. P., & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Reading*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2020). *Teaching and Researching Reading* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holte, A. (2023). Enhancing reading comprehension through explicit instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 55(1), 23-45.
- Hussain, M. A. (2019). Improving reading comprehension skills of secondary school students in Pakistan. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 41(1), 15-28.
- Iqbal, M. Z., Saeed, M., & Mahmood, Z. (2021). Investigating the relationship between English language proficiency and academic achievement: A study of Pakistani university students. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1920420.
- Jones, R. (2012). The power of summarization in reading comprehension. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 51(1), 24-35.
- Jordan, A. B., Hersey, J. C., McDivitt, J. A., & Heitzler, C. D. (2006). Reducing children's television-viewing time: A qualitative study of parents and their children. *Pediatrics*, 118 (5), 1303-1310.
- Jubani, A., Lama, I. N., & Gjokutaj, M. (2012). Improve the quality of learning by increasing the students' reading skills. *Problems of education in the 21st century*, 42, 50-61.
- Jamil, M. N. and A. Rasheed (2023). "How does Corporate Social Environment contribute to firm sustainability: mediator role of Social Capital." *Journal on Innovation and Sustainability RISUS* 14(1): 77-86.
- Khan, I., & Pandian, A. (2014). Reading instruction practices in select secondary schools in Pakistan: A multiple case study. *Spelt Quarterly*, 29(1), 20-31.

- Khan, R. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). Investigating the English language teaching and learning situation in Pakistan. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 44(1), 127-143.
- Kintsch, W. (2018). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Koda, K. (2019). *Insights into Second Language Reading: A Cross-Linguistic Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marzano, R.J. (2010). The art and science of teaching/summarizing to comprehend. *Reading to Learn*, 67(6). Retrieved from McGraw-Hill Companies.
- McNamara, D. S. (2007). *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nunan, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Oakhill et al Harmin, M., & Toth, M. (n.d.). Helping students master content in a Whole-Class format. In *Inspiring Active Learning*. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/103113/chapters/Helping_Students_Maste_Content_in_a_Whole-Class_Format.aspx
- Perfetti, C. A. (2007). Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11(4), 357-383.
- PLB Blogger.(n.d.). *What is the "Whip around" Strategy?* Retrieved from <https://k12teacherstaffdevelopment.com/tlb/what-is-the-whip-around-strategy/>
- Rayner, K., Pollatsek, A., Ashby, J., & Clifton, Jr., C. (2016). *Psychology of reading* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Sedita, J. (2010, July 24). *Previewing Vocabulary*. Retrieved from <http://vocablog-plc.blogspot.com/2010/07/previewing-vocabulary-sedita.html>
- Serafini, F., & Giorgis, C. (2003). *Reading aloud and beyond: Fostering the intellectual life with older readers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Spooner, A. R., Gathercole, S. E., & Baddeley, A. D. (2006). Does weak reading comprehension reflect an integration deficit? *Journal of Research in Reading*, 29(2), 173-193.
- Sarfraz, B., et al. (2022). "Urdu Translation of Stirling Children Emotional and Psychological Well-Being Scale in Pakistan." *Pakistan Social Sciences Review* 6(2): 815-822.
- Sarfraz, B., et al. (2022). "Perceived Teacher Rejection and Psychological Well-Being of School Age Children in Pakistan." *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research* 5(2).
- Sarfraz, B. and A. A. Malik (2023). "The Standardization of the Teacher's Evaluation of Student's Conduct Questionnaire in Hyderabad Pakistan." *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research* 6(2).
- Tabassum, R., & Malik, S. I. (2020). Enhancing reading comprehension through strategic instruction: A case study of Pakistani secondary school students. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 2158244020926278.
- Tavakoli, H., & Koosha, M. (2016). The effect of explicit instruction of vocabulary learning strategies on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary development. *English Language Teaching*, 9(11), 141-154.
- Thooft, S. (2011). The impact of audiobooks on reading comprehension. *Language Arts*, 88(4), 255-263.
- Tompkins, G.E. (2014, April 30). *K-W-L Charts*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.com/reference/article/K-W-L-charts-classroom/>
- Walczyk, J. J., & Griffith-Ross, D. A. (2007). *How important is reading skill fluency*
- Wiseman, A. (2011). Interactive read alouds: Teachers and students constructing knowledge and literacy together. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38(6), 431-438.