Global Scientific JOURNALS

GSJ: Volume 7, Issue 6, June 2019, Online: ISSN 2320-9186
www.globalscientificjournal.com

# EFFECTS OF EXPLICIT INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY AND COGNITIVE STYLES ON ACHIEVEMENT OF SENIOR SECONDARY STUDENTS IN SUMMARY WRITING IN IBADAN, NIGERIA

**OLAGBAJU, Oladotun Opeoluwa PhD**

**Department of Linguistic Education, College of Education and Social Sciences,**

**Legacy University, The Gambia**

**+2207496052, +2348034865939**

**Email: dotunolagbaju@yahoo.com**

**Abstract**

Perennial mass failure in the English language has been largely attributed to the continued use of teacher-centred strategies and poor knowledge of students' cognitive styles. This study examined the effect of explicit instructional strategy and cognitive styles on senior secondary school students' achievement in summary writing. The study employed a pretest, posttest, control group, quasi-experimental design. Treatment lasted for eight weeks and results showed that explicit instruction and cognitive style have main significant effects on students' achievement in summary writing. Based on the findings, it was concluded that the use of explicit and cognitive styles in language pedagogy have great potentials for improving achievement in summary writing. The strategy encouraged active participation of students through practice sessions and corrective feedback.

**Keywords: Explicit Instruction; Global Learners; Analytic Learners; Cognitive Style; Summary Writing**

## 1.1 Introduction

The different skills of English language are taught as part of the English studies curriculum in Nigerian schools. Students' success and chances of progression on the academic ladder is largely dependent on their achievement in public and private English language examinations. Out of the four language skills taught and learned in English studies in Nigeria, the writing skill is perhaps the most complex. Kolawole, Adepoju and Adelore (2000) averred that one of the problems responsible for the recurring mass failure usually recorded in the English language both in the internal and external examinations is that students are not able to express themselves adequately in the aspects of the paper that deal with writing. Also, Fakeye (2010) noted that anyone who is familiar with scripts of writing

tasks in English language in the secondary school today will not disagree with the view that the students' performance in English language has fallen.

Therefore, it is obvious that students that desire to succeed in English language examinations must do well in the aspects of the examination which covers writing tasks and one of such tasks is summary writing. WAEC Chief Examiners' Report (2018) identified poor summary writing skills as one of the reasons candidates still fail the English language. The WAEC Chief Examiners' Report (2018:9) states:

> *Candidates still find summary writing difficult… teachers should pay attention to this aspect of English. If the students are not adequately exposed to the skills of summary writing; they will continue to have problems with summary questions.*

From the above, urgent steps must be taken to address students' underachievement in summary writing as an aspect of English studies. Summary writing is closely related to comprehension because it requires the ability to extract the gist of a text; however summary writing is more complex because it is a technique that enhances comprehension and retention of a written discourse (Kolawole, 2000; Aniga and Ellah, 2010). Therefore, summary writing requires a deeper processing of the text and presentation of the answers in students' own words and these constitute some of the problem areas for students in English language examinations (Olagbaju, 2015). Ojedokun (2010) averred that summary skills are needed by students to confirm that the different information gathered from books, lectures, seminars, laboratories, discussions etc. forms part of their knowledge and can be recalled when needed.

Similarly, Aragoni (2011) observed that knowing how to write a summary is essential if students are going to be active listeners, good readers, responsible researchers and efficient writers. Olagbaju (2015) opined that summary skill has become a veritable communication skill because it is a part of our daily life as one cannot give a verbatim report of everything that one has seen, read, experienced or heard. Therefore, human beings are constantly and unconsciously conducting summaries daily without the slightest knowledge of it. All these point to the fact that summary skills are important for interactional and transactional use of the English language. It is in view of this that efforts need to be intensified to ensure that summary writing, as one of the aspects of English language, is properly taught in our schools.

Considering the importance of summary skills to students' success in examinations, independent study and everyday use of the English language, it is disturbing that a good number of students still do not perform well in this aspect of English studies. Roberts and Dyer (2005), Fakeye and Ogunsiji (2009) and Olagbaju (2015) attributed poor performance

in summary writing to factors such as the inability of students to read or comprehend the passage well, text type or genre, vocabulary, sentence structure, mindless lifting, text readability and organisation, text length, inability of students to write the answers in their own words and in grammatically correct sentences, among others.

Efforts to ameliorate these problems have culminated in researches on the effectiveness of several teacher-centred instructional strategies (Olatunbosun, 2000) and learner-centred instructions (Olagbaju, 2015) and variables (Fakeye, 2008) in the teaching of English language, summary writing inclusive. Learners need to be consciously aware of their shortcomings and effective teaching requires that these areas of error must be systematically taught through corrective feedback in the course of instruction. Therefore, the use of corrective feedbacks in learner-centred instruction has been found to be of immense benefits when introduced during practice sessions, especially in the course of the lesson (Chaudron, 1998). However, most teachers during instructional procedures do not factor the importance of practice sessions and corrective feedback into their teaching process. Practice sessions and corrective feedbacks are the hallmarks of the Explicit Instructional Strategy which is one of the independent variables in this study.

The Explicit Instructional Strategy (EIS) is a teacher-directed instruction which involves a sequence of supports that are highly structured and practice-oriented. Serafini (2004) described explicit instruction as a direct, systematic, structured and effective approach to teaching basic academic skills. Explicit instruction involves modelling, observation, imitation or practice and corrective feedback during the course of instruction. Explicit instruction process moves systematically from massive teacher involvement and little student responsibility initially — to total student responsibility and minimal teacher involvement at the conclusion of the learning cycle. Van (2004) and Noles and Dole (2004) found that explicit instruction led to effective classroom interaction and improved students' performance in reading comprehension. Also, Crown (2009) conducted a study on the effects of Explicit Instructional Strategy on students' learning outcomes in narrative writing and Akinoso (2012) on Mathematics. The studies reported that the strategy had a significant effect on students' learning outcomes in these subjects.

Although the findings of the studies above have produced useful insights into the effects of Explicit Instructional Strategy on students' achievement in the different subject areas, there are still some obvious limitations. Some of the limitations include the fact that Crown (2009) worked on narrative writing and Akinoso (2012) on Mathematics. None of the studies investigated the effect of explicit Instruction on students learning outcomes in summary

writing which is the concern of this research. Invariably, scholars have argued that there are other factors that can influence students' achievement especially in language pedagogy apart from the teacher's choice of instructional strategy. Some of these factors are students' verbal ability, gender and cognitive styles, teachers' quality, attitude and subject mastery to mention but a few.

Another variable in this study is students' cognitive style. Cognitive style is a psychological concept that emphasizes the fact that individuals perceive and process information in very different ways. Learners confront learning tasks with different unique qualities or attributes which can be physical, social, intellectual, etc and these qualities play very important roles in their learning. It is an individual's most consistent approach to learning and processing of information. It naturally influences how an individual perceives, receives and processes information (Zeeb, 2004). When a mismatch occurs between learners' cognitive style and the teaching style of the teacher in a classroom situation, it is unlikely that learning will take place. It is logical to state that an understanding of 'how' an individual perceives and processes information in a teaching and learning situation is fundamental to improving students' achievement.

Learning can occur in diverse ways. Therefore, there are different cognitive style dimensions which include field divergent/convergent, field dependent/independent, holistic/sequential, reflective/impulsive, global/analytic cognitive styles. However, the focus of this present study is on the global/analytic cognitive style dimension. While analytic learners need to break the processing of information into its component parts, global learners will have to view the task as a whole before proceeding to construct meaning. Studies (Ezike, 2007; Fakeye, 2008) have found cognitive styles to have significant effects on students' achievement in chemistry and reading comprehension. On the contrary, Garton, Spain, Lamberson and Spiers (2010) found a low positive relationship between cognitive style and students' achievement. With these conflicting reports on the effects of cognitive styles on students' achievement, this study examined the effects of cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing when Explicit Instructional Strategy is used.

**1.2** Hypotheses

Based on the stated problems, the following null hypotheses will be tested at 0.05 level of significance

**$HO_1$**: There is no significant main effect of treatment on students' achievement in summary writing.

**$HO_2$**: There is no significant main effect of cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing.

**$HO_3$**: There is no significant interaction effect of treatment and cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing.

## 2.0 Review of Related Literature

### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

#### 2.1.1 Bruner's Theory of Instruction (Constructivist Theory)

Jerome Bruner (1915–) was one of the 20th century's most influential educational psychologists. Bruner's theory of instruction considers learning as an active process in which learners construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current or past knowledge. The learner selects and transforms information, constructs hypotheses, and makes decisions, relying on a cognitive structure to do so. This theory states that the process of instruction should be highly structured to increase the learner's ability to grasp, transform, and transfer what he is learning. Bruner (1960) emphasised that a child's cognitive structures mature with age and this enables the child to increasingly think and organize more complex materials. The theorist stressed that the instructional approach should be highly practical and the process of teaching and learning should be structured rather than simply the mastery of facts and techniques. The role of the instructor should be to guide the learners and provide them with corrective feedbacks until they become independent problem-solvers and take over the corrective function themselves. This is similar to the practice of the Explicit Instructional Strategy which is teacher-directed through a highly structured and systematic approach where the teacher guides the learners to independence through modelling, guided and independent practice sessions and corrective feedbacks during the process of instruction.

#### 2.1.2 Bandura's Social Learning Theory

Bandura's Social Learning Theory posits that people learn from one another through observation, imitation, and modelling. The theory as propounded by Bandura (1977) emphasized the importance of observing and modelling the behaviours and attitudes of others. The theory explains human behaviour in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioural, and environmental influences. That is, people learn through observing others' behaviour, attitudes, and outcomes of those behaviours. The social learning theory presents cognition as very important in the process of learning and therefore, attention plays a critical role in learning. The theory states that for learning to take place, learners need to observe or pay attention to the model. With reference to this study, the processes involved in Explicit Instructional Strategy involve modelling and the use of visual instructional plan

(VIP) during the course of the lesson. Students' roles during instruction are to observe the models (teacher and/or the visual instructional plan), and imitate or practise the processes that have been modelled until they can attain reproduction. Hence, the aspects of social learning theory on modelling, imitation and reproduction are germane to the principle of Explicit Instructional Strategy.

### 2.1.3 Personality Trait Theory

This theory was propounded by a psychologist named Gordon Allport (1936) who viewed traits as building blocks of personality. Traits refer to the ways in which we generally describe a person and the trait approach is one of the most vital areas of study in psychology that helps identify a person's personality. A trait is a stable characteristic that causes a person to portray a reaction to any situations in certain ways. Traits are always constant regardless of the situations. Trait theory focuses on personality differences between individuals which influences and affects the way they learn behave or express their personality. In relation to this study, the personality trait theory explains that individuals vary in the way that they receive, perceive, process and make use of information during the process of learning which are the concerns explained by the concept of cognitive styles. Also, the personality trait theory establishes the fact that every learner is unique with varying abilities and characteristics that they bring into the teaching and learning process.



## 2.2 Summary Writing Instruction: Nature, Problems and Practice

Kirkland and Saunders (1991) described summary writing as a highly complex, recursive reading-writing activity. Summary writing establishes the connection between language skills, especially the reading and writing skills. Cho, 2012 reported that reading and writing influence each other and when writing is used as a follow-up to reading, the interaction between the two skills will create a synergy. Olagbaju (2015) averred that effectiveness in reading aids the retention of a mental sketch of the vital points in the passage. Other scholars (Rice, 2001; Ojedokun, 2010) stressed the importance of pre-teaching key vocabularies, grammatical structures, phrases, idioms, and/or cultural information in the passage in order to aid the comprehension of the text. Therefore, language teachers should pay attention to these aspects of the passage in the teaching of summary writing to facilitate comprehension and retention of the gist.

Several tasks are involved in the teaching and learning of summary writing as an aspect of the English language. According to Olatunbosun (2000) and Aniga and Ellah (2010), these tasks include effective reading of the passage, identification of the topic

sentence or thesis statement from the different sentences in the paragraph, differentiation between the topic sentence and other supporting sentences which are usually in form of illustrations and examples, identification and replacement of the key vocabularies in the topic sentences and rewriting the summary answer in the students' own words. It is important that English language teachers pay attention to the tasks discussed above when teaching summary writing as an aspect of English language in schools.

Due to the complexities involved in the teaching of summary writing, teachers need to ensure that this aspect of English language is properly taught in schools. This is perhaps why Aragoni (2011) argued that students would not learn how to summarise without receiving help — and lots of it. However, summary writing as an aspect of English language has continued to be dreadful to many candidates because they are not properly taught by teachers who rely heavily on conventional discussion and inquiry-based instructional strategies in teaching this complex aspect of the English language. Therefore, Ojedokun, 2010 and Cho, 2012 suggested the use of appropriate instructional strategy to improve students' achievement in summary writing. These scholars agreed that poor performance of students in summary writing is largely due to the continued use of teacher-centred instructional strategy.

Teacher-centred instructional strategies encourage rote learning which renders learners passive in the process of instruction; unlike the learner-centred instruction. Studies reported that learner-centred instructional strategies contributed significantly to students' achievement. However, in spite of these findings, learning outcomes in summary writing have not improved significantly. This situation might not be unconnected with the fact that these earlier strategies did not allow students the opportunity to practise and receive prompt corrective feedbacks during the course of instruction. Therefore, there is a need to bridge the gaps that exist in literature with regards to the use of most learner-centred instructional practices through the use of explicit instructional strategy.

### 2.3 Explicit Instructional Strategy

Explicit Instructional Strategy has been described as a highly organised and structured, teacher-directed, and task-oriented teaching method. Ellis (2005) described Explicit Instructional procedure as the process by which an instructor communicates information to learners using linear steps which are specific to the content and instruction. The goal of explicit teaching is to move the students through a sequenced set of materials or tasks (Ronsenshrine, 2008). Goeke, St.¨uhrenberg and Witt (2008) posited that the framework of Explicit Instructional Strategy is flexible and holds wide applicability for teachers across grade levels (elementary, middle, and secondary), settings (whole group, small group, general

education, special education), and content areas. It provides a contemporary middle ground for teachers who may avoid traditional direct instruction approaches, but who acknowledge that many students - particularly in today's inclusive classrooms - need instructions that are explicit, meaningful, and effective.

According to Mcshane (2005), explicit instruction is a structured approach to teaching which is similar to instructional strategies such as direct instruction, active teaching, or expository teaching. In the words of Mcshane, explicit instruction involves teachers presenting 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. Goeke (2009) submitted that Explicit Instructional Strategy will be appropriate under the following conditions: when the goal is teaching a well-defined body of information or skills that all students must master, when assessment data indicate that students have not acquired fundamental skills, strategies, and content, when assessment data indicate that students' progress toward mastery of skills, strategies, or content needs to be accelerated, and when inquiry-oriented or discussion-based instructional approaches have failed.

Explicit instruction allows for partnership between teachers and students during instructional procedure. The teacher is expected to model the steps and present the objectives of the lesson, demonstrate clarity and enthusiasm while the students participate actively through guided practice sessions, independent practice session and corrective feedbacks. Crown (2009) published the outcome of a study using Explicit Instructional Strategies to teach narrative writing and found that students were able to transfer the skills they had gained in narrative writing to writing in another genre – in this case, poetry. Also, Adebiyi (2012) examined the effects of Explicit and Generative Instructional Strategies on students' achievement in reading comprehension and found that Explicit Instructional Strategy has a significant effect on students' achievement in reading comprehension. Similarly, Duke (2001) conducted a study to investigate the effect of building comprehension through explicit teaching of comprehension strategies on students' performance and found that Explicit Instructional Strategy has a significant effect on students' comprehension.

Hall (2002) found that students that received Explicit Instruction in reading, mathematics, language, and spelling achieved better in these basic skills, as well as reading comprehension, problem solving, and mathematics concepts. Also, students' scores in the group exposed to Explicit Instruction were reported to be above the other treatment groups. Also, Akinoso (2012) investigated the effects of Explicit Instructional Strategy on Mathematics and reported that the strategy had a significant effect on students' achievement in and attitude to the

subject. Although the findings of the studies above have produced useful insights into the effects of Explicit Instructional Strategy on students' achievement in the different subject areas, there are still some obvious limitations. None of the studies investigated the effect of Explicit Instruction on students learning outcomes in summary writing. Therefore, this study investigated the effects of Explicit Instruction on students' achievement in summary writing.

### 2.4 Cognitive style: Global and Analytic Dimensions

Students come into the classroom and learning situations with their individual traits as well as diverse unique attributes which can be physical, social, intellectual etc and these qualities play very important roles in their learning. People differ in the way they receive; process and make use of information during teaching/learning encounters and this has been technically referred to as cognitive style (Martin, 1998; Okoruwa 2007; Ezike, 2007; and Fakeye 2008). An individual's cognitive style is his or her consistent way of responding to, interpreting and using stimuli in the context of learning. Therefore, cognitive style is not really concerned with what learners want to learn, rather it is the unconscious cognitive processes involved in the way they learn. Many of these traits have been identified by scholars (Jonassen and Grabowski, 1993; Ford, 2002; Cassidy, 2004) as empirically stable forms of information seeking behaviour. Cognitive style is both innate and habitual approach to processing information especially when one is exposed to tasks such as problem solving, thinking, perceiving and remembering.

Reid (1995) classified the cognitive style into different dimensions or categories which are Field-independent/Field-dependent **(**Field-independent learners learn more effectively step by step, beginning with analyzing facts and proceeding to ideas. Field-dependent learners, in contrast, prefer to learn in context and holistically). Analytic/Global (Analytic learners learn individually, and prefer setting goals. Global/holistic learners, on the other hand, learn more effectively through concrete experience; and by interaction with other people). Reflective/Impulsive (Reflective learners learn more effectively when they have time to consider options before responding while, impulsive learners are able to respond immediately and take risks).

This study views cognitive style from the global/analytical dimension. Ford (2002) reported that in a series of experiments (Pask and Scott, 1972; 1973; Pask, 1988), Pask and his colleagues monitored the routes taken by learners through a range of complex academic topics. In these experiments, people used one of two basic approaches which are either the global or analytic cognitive style. Global learners tend to adopt a global approach to learning, that is, examining interrelationships between several topics early in the learning process, and

concentrating first on building a broad conceptual overview into which detail could subsequently be fitted. The analytical learners on the other hand make use of a predominantly local learning approach which examined one thing at a time, and concentrated on separate topics (parts) and the logical sequences linking them. Then the overall picture would emerge relatively late in the learning process.

Woolfolk (1998) remarked that global learners are people who perceive a pattern as a whole; they do not separate one element from the total visual field. Learners with the global cognitive style have difficulty focusing on one aspect of a situation, picking out important details or analysing a pattern to different parts. That is, people with the global cognitive style dimension tend to organise information in whole by forming the 'big picture'. Similarly, Fleming (2005) averred that a global person likes to start with a big idea or concept, then go on to study and understand the parts. People with the analytical cognitive style like to learn things step-by-step, or sequentially. They are otherwise called sequential learners because analytic learners are more likely to respond to a problem with logic first, instead of emotion, divide and label notes into parts etc. analytic learners thrive when they are able to know all the details first, and then put them together. Crowl, Kaminsky and Podell (1997) averred that analytic learners perform better in structured situations and efficient in formal settings with minimal guidance or supervision. Global learners require lesser structure, and fewer instructions to perform well in school tasks. The scholars submitted that global learners tend to glaze over material to pursue the big idea and this can be ineffective; especially, during test or examination situations and those minute details often show up in tests. To Okoruwa (2007), educators are increasingly coming to terms with the importance and differences in the cognitive style among students because a learner with a particular style is more likely to benefit more from a particular teaching strategy than the others.

Analytic learners are good at cognitively sorting information for the purpose of easy recall or remembrance and they perform when seated in the front row to avoid distractions. In relation to learning summary writing, students with the analytic cognitive style dominance will prefer to break the summary passage into composite parts and take each part sequentially. They prefer to process the information in bits to arrive at text comprehension while learners with the global cognitive style will seek to maintain a holistic approach to learning by reading the whole passage before comprehension and summary can occur.

The effect of cognitive style on students' achievement has been investigated in a number of studies. For example, Fakeye (2008) investigated English as Second Language (ESL) students' cognitive style and English Comprehension Achievement in South - West

Nigeria and found a significant positive relationship between cognitive style and students' achievement. Therefore, Fakeye (2008) concluded that cognitive style plays an important role in students' achievement in the comprehension of reading text. The result of the study showed that learners with the global/holist cognitive style performed significantly better than their analytic counterparts.

However, Garton et al (2010) investigated the relationships between students, cognitive style, instructor's teaching performance, and student achievement in an introductory animal science course and reported that a low positive relationship was found between students' cognitive style and their achievement in the course. From the foregoing, the research findings on the effects of cognitive style on students' achievement are inconclusive. Therefore, there is a need for further research on the effects of cognitive style on students' achievement, especially in the aspect of summary writing which has not been adequately covered in research and literature.

## 3.0 Methodology

### 3.1 Research Design

The pretest, posttest, control group, quasi-experimental research design was adopted for this study. The study made use of two instructional groups - one experimental group and one control group; the experimental group was exposed to treatment in Explicit Instructional Strategy while the control group was exposed to the Conventional method of teaching summary writing.



### 3.2 Variables in the Study

The following are the variables in the study

#### 3.2.1 Independent Variables

The independent variables are the instructional strategy and cognitive style namely:

i. Explicit Instructional Strategy

ii. Cognitive Style at two levels: (a) Global, (b) Analytic

#### 3.2.2 Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is:

i. Achievement in Summary Writing

### 3.3 Selection of Participants

Two local government areas were randomly selected from the five local government areas in Ibadan Metropolis. The participants were made up of Senior Secondary School Two (SSS II) students in intact classes from four purposively selected senior secondary schools in the randomly selected local government areas. Two senior secondary schools were

purposively selected from each of the selected local government areas based on the following criteria:

i. The school must have at least one graduate teacher of English language with a minimum of five years experience who has been a WAEC or NECO examiner,

ii. The school must have been presenting candidates for public examinations for at least five years.

Each local government area selected was randomly assigned to treatment such that the two schools in the same local government area were used for the same treatment group. To this end, two schools were assigned to Explicit Instructional Strategy and the other two schools were for control.

### 3.4 Selection of Content

The content of the instructional package for this study comprised passages taken from the participants' recommended textbooks, magazines and newspapers excerpts. It covered eight summary passages on different topics. Teachers' instruction manuals were prepared on these passages for Explicit and the Conventional method.

### 3.5 Research Instruments

Three instruments were used for this study, they include:

(i) Summary Writing Achievement Test **(SWAT)**

(ii) Cognitive Style Inventory **(CSI)**

(iii) Teachers' Evaluation Sheet **(TES)**



### 3.5.1 Summary Writing Achievement Test (SWAT)

The instrument was a passage adopted from the students' recommended textbook. It was a summary passage titled: Genetic Engineering. SWAT was used as both the pretest and posttest to measure students' achievement in summary writing. Questions set on the passage were made parallel to those obtained in WASSCE examinations The reliability of the instrument was determined by using test-retest method, and a reliability co-efficient of 0.81 was obtained.

### 3.5.2 Cognitive Style Inventory (CSI)

The instrument was adapted from Lorna Martin (1998) to assess the global and analytic cognitive style dimensions. The instrument was an inventory which contained 36 items numbered using alphabets range of A to JJ with a five point scale of Strongly Agree **(SA)**, Agree **(A),** Undecided **(U)**, Disagree **(D)** and Strongly Disagree **(SD)** to be scored 1,2,3,4 and 5 respectively before it was adapted into a 30-item four point scale of Strongly Agree **(SA)**, Agree **(A),** Disagree **(D)** and Strongly Disagree **(SD)**. The scoring was based on

4, 3, 2, and 1for strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. Also, the numbering pattern was changed from alphabets to numeral range of 1 to 30. All the items in the inventory were positively stated; items that fall into the odd number-group addressed the global cognitive style dimension while the items in the even number-group covered the analytic group. CSI was validated and for reliability, the instrument was then administered to 80 SS Two students from two schools that were not part of the schools selected for the main study. Using Cronbach alpha formula, the standardised alpha value of 0.74 was obtained.

### 3.5.3 Teachers' Evaluation Sheet (TES)

The TES was a self-designed instrument to assess the research assistants' competence at using the Explicit Instructional Strategies. It was used to grade or score the research assistants during the practice sessions in preparation for the treatment stage. Explicit Instructional Strategy Teachers' Evaluation Sheet **(EISTES)** has six components of Explicit Instruction according to Goeke (2008) and it was used to observe and assess the research assistants. Two language teachers with the highest score in the TES were selected to participate in the study. The reliability of TES was determined through inter-rater reliability and using Scott Pie, reliability co-efficient of .81was obtained.

### 3.6 Administration of the Pretest and Posttest

The pretest was for a week (the first week of the experiment). This involved exposing students in the experimental and control groups to a pretest using the summary writing achievement test (SWAT), and cognitive style inventory (CSI). The posttest was administered in the eighth and final week of the experiment. This involved exposing students in the experimental and control groups to post- achievement test in summary writing (SWAT). The researcher was directly involved with the administration of both pretest and posttest.

### 3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

The data collected were analysed using inferential statistics of Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) with the pretest scores as covariates. The Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was computed to show how the groups performed, while Scheffe Post Hoc analysis was used to detect the source of significant difference between the two groups where such existed. All the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

## 4.0 Results and discussion of findings

### 4.1 Testing of Hypotheses

**$HO_1$**: There is no significant main effect of treatment on students' achievement in summary writing.

**Table 4.1: Summary of ANCOVA table showing the significant main and interaction effects of Treatment groups, Gender and Cognitive style on Student Achievement to Summary Writing.**

| Source of variance | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Eta Squared |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 4671.809 | 12 | 389.317 | 26.634 | .000 | .631 |
| Pre Achievement | 13.352 | 1 | 13.352 | .913 | .340 | .005 |
| Main Effect: | | | | | | |
| Treatment Group | 357.186 | 1 | 178.593 | 12.218 | .000* | .116 |
| Cognitive Style (CS) | 973.645 | 1 | 973.645 | 66.608 | .000* | .263 |
| 2-way Interactions: | | | | . | | |
| Treatment x CS | 43.467 | 2 | 21.733 | 1.487 | .229 | .016 |
| Error | 2733.471 | 187 | | | | .009 |
| Total | 7405.280 | 199 | 14.617 | .819 | .442 | |

*Significant at p<.05

From Table 4.1, the result shows that treatment has significant effect on variation in students' achievement in Summary Writing ($F_{(1,187)}$= 12.21; p <.05). The implication of this is that there is a significant difference in achievement in Summary Writing of students exposed to Explicit Instructional Strategy and those in the Control group. Hypothesis 1 is therefore rejected. Table 4.2 shows information on the relative performance of the various groups in posttest achievement.

**Table 4.2: Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) showing the direction of the difference in Students' Achievement to Summary Writing between Treatment groups, Gender and Cognitive style.**

| Variable + Category<br><br>Grand Mean = 14.94 | N | Unadjusted variation | Eta | Adjusted for independent + covariates deviation | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treatment Group: | | | | | |
| Explicit | 105 | 4.65 | | 1.88 | |
| Control | 95 | -4.32 | | -2.03 | |
| | | | .62 | | .28 |
| Cognitive Style: | | | | | |
| Global | 105 | -4.60 | | -3.75 | |
| Analytic | 95 | 5.08 | | 4.15 | |
| | | | .79 | | .67 |

From Table 4.2, students in the explicit instructional group had a higher adjusted posttest achievement score ($\bar{x}$ = 16.82) than their counterparts in the control group ($\bar{x}$ = 12.91). The findings imply that the Explicit Instructional Strategy proved to be more effective than the conventional method on students' achievement in summary writing.

Table 4.3 traced the source of the significant effect of treatment on achievement.

**Table 4.3: Scheffe Post hoc Test of Achievement by Treatment**

| | | | Treatment | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treatment | N | X | Explicit | Control |
| Explicit | 105 | 16.82 | | * |
| Control | 95 | 12.91 | | |

***Pairs significantly different at p<.05

Table 4.3 shows that the explicit instructional group was significantly different ($\bar{x}$ = 16.82) from the control ($\bar{x}$ = 12.91) group. Therefore, the significant effect of treatment on achievement was due to the significant differences obtained between Explicit Instructional Strategy and the control.

**$HO_2$**: There is no significant main effect of cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing.

Table 4.1shows that cognitive style has significant main effect on students' achievement in summary writing ($F_{(2,187)}$ = 66.60, P < .05). This means that there is significant difference in the posttest achievement scores of students with the global and analytic cognitive style. Therefore, the null hypothesis 2 is rejected. Table 4.2 shows that students with Global cognitive style had a mean score of 11.19, while those with Analytic cognitive style had a mean score of 19.09 respectively.

**$HO_3$**: There is no significant interaction effect of treatment and cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing.

From Table 4.1, the result shows that there is no significant interaction effect of treatment and Cognitive Style on students' achievement in summary writing ($F_{(3,187)}$ = 1.48, P > .05). Therefore, the null hypothesis 3 is not rejected.

**Discussion of the results**

**Treatment on Students' Achievement in Summary Writing**

Findings of the study revealed a significant main effect of treatment on student's achievement in summary writing. The result showed that the Explicit Instructional Strategy was more effective at improving students' achievement in summary writing than the Conventional method (Control). Explicit Instructional Strategy is teacher-directed and a highly practical approach to learning through observation and imitation process. Explicit Instructional Strategy created opportunity for learners to practise summary writing during the course of instruction while the teacher guides them and offers corrective feedbacks until the learners attain a level of independence. The Strategy provided a gradual yet consistent systematic approach to learning through cognitive modelling, guided practice and corrective

feedbacks all through the stages of the instruction. This is in line with the submission of Devlin (2000) that hands-on activities during lessons allow students to concretise learning experiences thereby making comprehension of information more meaningful to students.

The findings of this study also supported the results of similar studies (Hall, 2002; Sawalha, 2004; 2005; Crown, 2009) which report the effectiveness of Explicit Instructional Strategy when compared with modified conventional teaching strategy on achievement of students with learning difficulties. The result also supports the findings of Duke (2001) that a significant effect of explicit instruction was recorded on students' ability to read and comprehend. The result, however, disagrees with the findings of Akinoso (2012) which found Explicit Instructional Strategy to be the least effective strategy as it does not have a significant effect on students' achievement in Mathematics.

**Cognitive Style on Students' Achievement in and Attitude to Summary Writing**

The findings of this study revealed a significant main effect of cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing. Students with analytic cognitive style had a higher mean achievement score than those with the global cognitive style. The students with analytic cognitive style were sequential in their approach to textual reading and summary writing while students with the global cognitive style perceive the text as a whole. This result is in agreement with the findings of Bassey, Umoren, and Udida (2007) that students with analytic cognitive style had a higher significant mean achievement score than those with relational and inferential cognitive style. However, the result disagrees with the findings of Awofala, Balogun and Olagunju (2011) that students with non-analytic cognitive style had significantly higher mean achievement score than students with Analytic cognitive style. Also, other similar studies in English language (Reid, 1995; Stapa, 2003; and Fakeye, 2008) reported that learner with the global cognitive style performed significantly better than their Analytic counterparts in ESL/EFL classroom.

## 5.0 Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

### 5.1 Summary of Findings

The findings of the study revealed the following:

1. There was significant main effect of treatment on students' achievement in summary writing. The mean score shows that the Explicit Instructional Strategy was higher than that of the conventional method (control).
2. There was significant main effect of cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing. Students with the analytic cognitive style had the higher mean score than those with global cognitive style.

3. There was no significant interaction effect of treatment and cognitive style on students' achievement in summary writing. However, students with the analytic cognitive style had a higher posttest mean achievement scores than their counterparts with the global cognitive style but the differences were not significant.

## 5.2 Conclusion

This study examined the effect of explicit and cognitive style on senior secondary school students' achievement in summary writing and found that the strategy and cognitive style were effective at improving students' achievement in summary writing. However, treatment is not sensitive to students' cognitive style with respect to achievement in summary writing. Based on the findings of this study, it could be concluded that the explicit instructional strategy when employed in the teaching and learning of summary writing have great potentials at improving students' achievement in this aspect of English language. The strategy facilitated improved teacher-student and student-student interactions during the lesson, developed students' self-efficacy and ultimately improve their performance in English language at public examinations.

## 5.3 Implications of the Findings

Based on the findings of this study, the following are some of the implications of the result:

1. Summary writing skills are developed and reinforced through practice.
2. The use of corrective feedbacks during the course of instruction is essential for effective teaching and learning.
3. Summary writing instruction should be planned and implemented to take cognizance of the variations in cognitive style among students.
4. Effective teaching and learning are feasible only when students interact together in small groups.
5. Students should be involved students in meaningful activities through practice sessions which will arouse their interest, improve their attitude and make them active participants in the process of teaching and learning.

## 5.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of this study:

1. The use of explicit and to facilitate learners' active participation during the teaching-learning process or classroom interaction through the use of practice sessions should be encouraged.
2. English language teachers should always take cognizance of students' cognitive style.

3. English language teachers should always introduce practice sessions and corrective feedbacks during the course of instruction to motivate students' participation.

**References**

Adebiyi, E .F. 2012. Effects of explicit and generative instructional strategies on students' achievement in reading comprehension in Ikere Local Government Area of Ekiti State. An unpublished M.Ed Project submitted to the Department of Teacher Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Akinoso, S.O. 2012. Effects of concrete-representational-abstract and explicit instructional strategies on senior secondary school students' achievement in and attitude to mathematicsematics. A PhD Post-Field Report presented at the Joint Staff/Higher Degree Students Seminar, Department of Teacher education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Allport, G. (1936) Trait theory of personality. Retrieved online 17th May, 2019 from https://www.psychestudy.com/general/personality/trait-theory

Analytic and Holistic Cognitive style 2008. Retrieved 14th February, 2011 from http://blogs.clc.co.nz/LearningStyles/archive/2008/05/15/analytic-and-holistic-learning-styles.aspx.

Aniga, U.S. and Ellah, S.M. 2010. English language for daily communication. Ibadan: Panse Publishers Limited.

Aragoni, L. 2011. Teach how to write a summary Reading, writing, studying require it. Retrieved 17th October, 2011 from www.you-can-teach-writing.com

Awofala, A.O. A, Balogun, T. A and Olagunju, M. A. 2011. Effects of three modes of personalisation on students' achievement in Mathematics word problems in Nigeria. Retrieved 13th September, 2013 from www.cimt.plymouth.ac.uk/journal/awofala.pdf

Bandura, A. 1977. Social learning theory. New York: General Learning Press.

Banjo, A., Elugbe, B., Onaga, U., and Akano, A. 2005. New oxford secondary English course for senior secondary school 2. Ibadan: University Press Plc.

Bassey, S.W., Umoren, G. and Udida, L.A. 2007. Cognitive style, secondary school students' attitude and academic performance in chemistry in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Retrieved 13th September, 2013 from www.hbcse.tifr.res.in/episteme/episteme-2/e-proceedings/bassey

Bruner, J.S. 1960. The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

……. 1961. The act of discovery. Harvard Educational Review 31: 21-32

……..1966. Toward a theory of instruction. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

……..1996. The culture of education, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cassidy, S. 2004. Learning styles: an overview of theories, models, and measures. *Journal of Educational Psychology 24(4): 1-27.*

Celce-Murcia, M. 2001. Teaching English as a second or foreign language (3rd Ed.) New York: Dewey Publishing Services

Chaudron, C. 1998. Second language classrooms: research on teaching and learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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 23rd September, 2013 from www.minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/61052/Cho.pdf?

Christou, N. and Dinov, I.D. 2010. A study of students' cognitive style, discipline attitudes and knowledge acquisition in technology-enhanced probability and statistics education. Retrieved 22nd October, 2012 from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3098746

Cognitive style. Retrieved 8th April, 2013 from http://learn.humanesources.com/research_04.html

Crowl, T. K., Kaminsky, S., and Podell, D. M. 1997. Educational psychology: Windows on teaching. McGraw-Hill.

Crown, S.L. 2009. Using Explicit Instructional Strategies to Teach Narrative Writing. Teachers as learners: improving outcomes for Maori and Pasifika students through inquiry. Retrieved from http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Inquiry on 17th December,2012.

Duke, N.K. 2001. Building comprehension through explicit teaching of comprehension strategies. A paper presented at the Second (2nd) Annual MRA/CIERA Conference held on September 22nd, 2001. Michigan State University.

Ezike, B. 2007. Effects of cognitive style and students' achievement in chemistry. An unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Fakeye, D.O. and Ogunsiji, Y. 2009. English language proficiency as a predictor of academic achievement among EFL students in Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research 37 (3): 490-495*

Fakeye, D.O. 2008. ESL students' cognitive and English comprehension achievement in South Western Nigeria. Nigerian *Journal of Counselling and Applied Psychology, University of Ado-Ekiti. Vol. 4 (1): 23-30.*

……2010. Students' personal variables as correlates of academic achievement in English as a second language in Nigeria. *Kamla-Raj Journal of Social Science,22(3):205-211.* Retrieved July 1st, 2010 from www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSS/JSS-22-0-000-10-Web/JSS-22-3-000-10-Abst-PDF/JSS-22-3-205-10-775-Fakeye-D-O/JSS-22-3-205-10-775-Fakeye-D-O-Tt.pdf.

Federal Republic of Nigeria 2004. National policy on education. Nigerian Educational Research Development Council. Ikeja: NERDC Press, Ikeja.

Fleming, G 2005. Holistic and analytic cognitive style. Retrieved 14th February, 2011 from http://homeworktips.about.com/od/homeworkhelp/a/global.htm.

Ford, N. and Chen, S.Y. 2001. Matching/mismatching revisited: an empirical study of learning and teaching styles. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 32(2), 5-22.*

Ford, N. 1985. Cognitive style and strategies of postgraduate students. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 16(4), 65-77*.

Ford, N.J., Wilson, A. E., Foster, D.E. and Spink, A. 2002. Information seeking and mediated searching: Cognitive style in information seeking analysis. Retrieved 14th February, 2011 from http://informationr.net/tdw/publ/unis/app7.4.html.

Freeman, V.S. 1995. Delivery methods, cognitive style and outcomes for distance medical technology students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56 (07), 26-47.*

Garton, B.L.; Spain, J.N.; Lamberson, W.R. and Spiers, D.E. 2010. Cognitive style, teaching performance, and students' achievement: A relational study. Retrieved 16th February, 2011 from www.jae-online.org/attachements/article/1472/40-30-11.pdf.

Goeke, D., St ¨uhrenberg, D. and Witt, A. 2008. Influence of text type and text length on anaphoric annotation. Retrieved 14th March, 2012 from http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2008/pdf/368_paper.pdf

Goeke, J.L. 2009. Explicit instruction. Upper Saddle River NJ: Merrill. Retrieved 14th March, 2013 from http://newlearningonline.com/literacies/chapter-3-didactic-literacy-pedagogy-2/goeke-on-explicit-instruction/

Hall, T. 2002. Explicit instruction. Wakefield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum. Retrieved 22nd October, 2012 from http://aim.cast.org/learn/historyarchive/backgroundpapers/explicit_instruction.

Hayes, J. and Allinson, C.W. 2004. Cognitive style and its relevance for management practice. *British Journal of Management, 5(2) 23-31*.

Hidi, S., and Anderson, V. 1986. Producing written summaries: Task demands, cognitive operations, and implications for instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 56(4), 473-493.*

Hirvela, A. 2004. Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction. The Michigan Series on Teaching Multilingual Writers. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Jonassen, D.H. and Grabowski, B. 1993 Individual differences and instruction. New York: Allen and Bacon.

Kirkland, M.R. and Saunders, M.P. 1991. Maximizing students' performance in summary writing: managing cognitive load. *TESOL QUARTERLY 25.1: 105-121.*

Klavas, A. 1994. In Greensboro, North Carolina: Cognitive style program boosts achievement and test scores. *The Clearing House, 67, 149-151*.

Kolawole, C.O.O.; Adepoju, A. and Adelore, O 2000. Trends in Secondary School Students' Performance in English Language Paper 1. *African Journal of Educational Research, University of Ibadan, 6(1 and 2): 54-59.*

.....2000. English grammar and effective writing. Ibadan: Foldak Publishers.

Learning styles. Retrieved March 5th, 2010 from www.funderstanding.com/content/learning-styles.

Lukow, J. 2002. Cognitive style as predictors of student attitudes toward the use of technology in recreation courses. An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Indiana University,

Martin, L. P. 1998.The Cognitive-style inventory. The Pfeiffer Library, *Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer Vol. 8 (2) 113-127.*

McShane, S. 2005. Applying research in reading instruction for adults. First Steps for Teachers. Retrieved 17th December, 2013 from www.ed.gov/publications/pdf/applyingresearch.pdf

Noles, J.D. and Dole, J.A. 2004. Helping adolescent readers through explicit strategy instruction. in T.L. Jetton and J.A. Dole (eds.). Adolescent Literacy Research and Practice. New York: Guilford Press.

Ojedokun, R.I. 2010. Literature circle, semantic mapping and senior secondary school students' learning outcomes in summary writing in English language. An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan.

Okoruwa, E. 2007. Effects of cognitive style and primary school pupils' achievement in integrated science. An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Olagbaju, O.O. 2015. Effects of explicit and generative instructional strategy on senior secondary schools students' learning outcomes in summary writing. An unpublished Ph.d Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Olatunbosun, P.O. 2000. Letter-writing, essay-writing, comprehension and summary for senior secondary schools. Osogbo: Olatunbosun Publishers.

Overview of learning styles. Retrieved March 17th, 2010 from www.learning-styles-online.com/overview/.

Pask, G and Scott, B.C.E. 1973 CASTE: a system for exhibiting learning strategies and regulating uncertainty. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies, 5, 17-52.*

Pask, G. and Scott, B.C.E. 1972 Learning strategies and individual competence. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 4, 242-253.

Pask, G. and Scott, B.C.E. 1988. Learning strategies, teaching strategies, and conceptual or cognitive style. In: Learning Strategies and Cognitive style, edited by R.R. Schmeck. (83-99) New York: Plenum Press.

Reid, J. 1995. Cognitive style in the ESL/EFL classroom. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Rice, G. 2001. Utilizing process questions and summary writing to teach both reading and writing. Retrieved from http://epi.sc.edu/~alexandra_rowe/S0017F775 on 14th October, 2012.

Roberts, L. 2009. Summary lesson plans. Retrieved 12th February, 2011 from www.lessonplanet.com/directory_articles/reading_lesson_plans/10_September_2009/128/summary_lesson_plans.

Roberts, T. D. and Dyer, J. E. 2005.The influence of cognitive style on students' attitudes and achievement when an illustrated web lecture is used in an online learning environment. *Journal of Agricultural Education Vol. 46 (2),1–11*.

Rosenshine, B. 2008. Five meanings of direct instruction. Centre on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved 15th November, 2012 from http://www.formapex.com/telechargementpublic/rosenshine2008a.pdf

Saunders, B. 2010. The effects of explicit instruction on the writing attitude and ability of fourth (4th) grade writers. An unpublished M.A (Ed.) Project. Retieved 17th October, 2012 from http://csus-dspace.calstate.edu/handle/10211.9/1001

Serafini, F. 2004. Lessons in comprehension: Explicit instruction in reading workshop. Heinemann Portsmouth NH.

Stapa, S.H. 2003. ESL students' learning preferences: Are the teachers aware? Retrieved 14th February, 2011 from http://www.Esp-world.Info/rticles/stapa.htm.

Van, K. 2004. Fostering reading comprehension in the fifth grade by explicit instruction in reading strategies and peer tutoring. *British Journal of Educational Psychology (2004) 74, 34-70.*

West African Examinations Council 2014 – 2018. Regulations and syllabuses for the West African Senior School Certificate examination (WASSCE). Lagos: WAEC Press.

West African Examinations Council 2018. WAEC chief examiners' report for the West African Senior School Certificate examination (WASSCE). Lagos: WAEC Press.

Woolfolk, A. E. 1998. Educational psychology (7th Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Zeeb, M.S. 2004. Improving students' success through matching learning and teaching styles. An unpublished Master of Arts in Education (M.A (Ed)) Project, University of Phoenix.