



Research Paper

## Effect of Peer Tutoring and Direct Instruction on English Language of Children with Learning Disabilities in Uyo Local Government Area

Nwachukwu Kingsley Ezechinyere (Ph.D)

Department of Early Childhood and Special Education,  
Faculty of Education, University of Uyo, Uyo, AkwaIbom State Nigeria

Opara Uche Eunice

Department of Special Education  
Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education, Owerri.Imo State. Nigeria

Ndifreke Okon Jonah

Department of Early Childhood and Special Education  
Faculty of Education, University of Uyo, Uyo, AkwaIbom State, Nigeria

Ime Effiong Henry

Department of Early Childhood and Special Education  
Faculty of Education, University of Uyo, Uyo, AkwaIbom State, Nigeria

### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of peer tutoring and direct instruction on English Language of children with learning disabilities in Uyo Local Government Area. The pre-test post-test quasi experimental design was employed and used for this study. The population of the study was 8,893 with a sample size of 88 primary two pupils selected through simple and purposive sampling techniques. The instruments for the study were English Language Diagnostic Test for Learners with Learning Disabilities (ELDT) and English Language Performance Test (ELPT). Kuder Richardson Formula 20 was used to determine the internal consistency of English Language Diagnostic Test for Learners with Learning Disabilities (ELDT) and English Language Performance Test (ELPT) which yielded coefficient indices of 0.79 and 0.77 respectively. Mean analysis and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test the hypotheses. The study revealed that there is a significant difference in the reading comprehension, spelling, composition achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. Based on the findings of the study, the researcher recommended among others that teachers should adopt peer tutoring as an effective strategy for teaching comprehension, spelling and composition writing to children with learning disabilities.

**KEYWORDS:** Peer Tutoring, Direct Instruction, Learning Disabilities

Received 21 August, 2021; Revised: 03 September, 2021; Accepted 05 September, 2021 © The author(s) 2021. Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)

### I. INTRODUCTION

English language is the language of official communication in Nigeria. It is the language of instruction in almost all subjects in schools. English language is variedly used in government, business of all types and culturally, it is a unifying means of interpersonal relationship. Based on the importance of English language in Nigeria scheme of things, it has been made a compulsory subject to be passed for any upgrading in education. Unfortunately, students still perform poorly in English language especially in external examination such as common entrance almost yearly.

A learning disability is a condition that causes an individual to experience problems in a classroom learning context. A child with learning disability may require additional time to complete assignments at school. Some of the most common learning disabilities in classrooms today include Dysgraphia, Dyslexia, Dyscalculia and ADHD. Learning disability related to English is Dyslexia. Dyslexia is the most common and internationally acknowledged learning disability in the world (Nijakowska, 2010). Dyslexia refers to the difficulty to read and write. Dyslexia is a learning disorder that involves difficulty in reading due to problems identifying speech sounds and learning how they relate to letters and words. So to someone with dyslexia, the word 'cat' might read as 'tac'.

Because of this mix-up, reading can be slow and difficult. Tummer and Greany (2010) add that dyslexia is a life time disorder that is affected by a deficit in phonological skills, which amongst others, causes a difficulty in tying letters and sounds together, resulting in poor reading and writing ability. The disability in reading often causes the dyslexic students to read less than their classmates or in some cases to stagnate at a primitive reading level. Dyslexia seems to affect 10 percent of all readers (Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, 2007).

Direct Teacher's Instruction is also referred to as traditional or conventional method. It is a method used to teach any subject including number work. Gbamaja (1991) cited in Shofoyeke (2015), this method is also called talk and chalk or textbook method. According to Slofoye, this is the most commonly used method by teachers in the teaching-learning process. This method is dominated by the teacher and the learners are subjected to little participation. Shofoyeke further reiterated that the direct teachers approach considers the teacher as the repository of all knowledge while the pupils are passive recipients of knowledge transmitted by the teachers in the teaching-learning process and this characterized it as teacher-centered.

Knoester (2012) posits that the traditional classroom is suppressive; it limits the movement of children, giving them few opportunities to use activities to discover meaning. Quietness and orderliness are placed at a high premium than engagement of learners. Direct Instruction is seen as a highly structured approach that uses explicit teaching and well scripted lesson plan (Rumph, Ninness, McCuller, Holland, Ward and Wilborn, 2007 cited in Ewing, 2011). Any method that is teacher centered is an example of direct teacher's instruction such as lecture/expository method, demonstration method, etc. Direct teacher's instruction is one of the most widely used teaching strategies but it has been criticized as ineffective and scorned at as a teaching method used by teachers who are not prepared (Markusic,2012). Markusic observed that direct teaching is rigid and hinders teachers' creativity.

Attempts to estimate peer effect on educational achievement directly have been relatively limited. Hanushek (1992) finds no peer achievement effects, while Zimmer and Toma cited in Ene (2002) report positive influences of higher achieving peers at least for some students. But when observations are made in primary, secondary and even tertiary institutions, one will clearly see some phenomena such as imitation, group formation and group play of different types. Students can be clearly observed teaching others. This is peer tutoring that occurs in the school and is student-initiated, as children spontaneously help their peers, mates and friends.

Peer tutoring can be organized such that students are assembled in groups of two or more and are trained to work together on a specific academic task. These students take turns acting as the tutor and the tutee for instruction and review of academic material with teacher's supervision. Peer tutoring was developed and tested for children with academic needs by Pigott, Fantuzzo, Heggie and Clement (1984). Greenwood, Carts and Maheady (2001) identified three of the basic principles underlying peer tutoring interventions as increasing academic engagement, increasing the opportunity to respond, and increasing timely feedback regarding students' responses.

Several studies have been carried out in relation to students' academic achievement, but there is dearth of literature relating to influence of peer tutoring on English Language performance of learners with learning disabilities. However, Bridget (2018) conducted a study on the impact of a peer-tutoring model on the academic performance of secondary students. The study described the impact of a peer-tutoring model in a secondary introductory computer science classroom, Information Technology Foundations (ITF), at a Midlands High School (MHS) (pseudonym), a suburban high school located in the Midlands region of South Carolina. The course is required for graduation and student-participants in the study were diverse in their ages and learning abilities.

Matching one peer-tutor with five or six peer-tutees enabled student-participants to work through a Google Drive unit that was designed by the teacher-researcher. Action research methods were used to collect data with 17 students over a seven-week period in the Fall 2017 semester. Quantitative data in the form of a pre and post test and qualitative data in the form of semi-structured interviews, journals, and classroom observations were used to answer the research question. An action plan was designed to enable other teachers with heterogeneous, multi-aged groupings of students in their courses to implement a peer-tutoring model for greater academic gains and student relationship building.

In another study, Yusuf (2017) examined the effect of peer tutoring and the moderating effect of gender on the academic performance of economics students in Ilorin-South Local Government of Kwara State, Nigeria. Two intact classes in two different secondary schools were selected for this study. The experimental (peer tutoring) group had a population of 40 students while the control (conventional instruction) group had a population of 38 students. A 50-item multiple-choice objective test titled Economics Performance Test (EPT) was used to measure academic performance. Students in the peer tutoring group obtained higher EPT scores than students in the conventional instruction group.

This effect was not moderated by gender. Kibuthu (2009) carried out a study on the effectiveness of peer tutoring on academic performance of standard four pupils with learning disabilities in Nyeri Central Sub-County, Kenya. The study adopted descriptive survey research design utilizing both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The target population was all teachers teaching class four pupils in Nyeri central sub-county, Nyeri County, Kenya. The study used questionnaires, interview guide and observation checklist as the data gathering instruments. The data collected was edited, coded, classified on the basis of similarity and then presented in form of charts, graphs, and tables for clarity. Pearson Correlation analysis was also used as the inferential statistical methods. Since the study was a descriptive study, descriptive statistics in SPSS such as percentages, frequencies tables, graphs, and trend analysis were used to summarize and relate variables.

The study found that the methods used to identify learners with LD were observation of pupils behavioural characteristics. It was also established that the teachers were adequately trained and well prepared to incorporate peer tutoring in their classes. The activities that peers engaged in were peer tutor demonstrating to tutee as an activity while learning socializing well, asking each other questions, concentration on task and asking guidance from the teacher. It was also found that some types of peer tutoring affected academic performance more positively than others.

In a similar study, Asaf (2017) examined the effects of peer tutoring as a strategy of teaching on students' success in the subject of mathematics at secondary level. It was an experimental study and it followed pre-test post-test equivalent research design. The experiment was carried on 200 students from two different schools (boys and Girls). One hundred students were taken as sample from each of the school and on the basis of teacher made pre-test, students were randomly divided into experimental and control groups. The experiment lasted for eight weeks and post-test was taken to examine the effects of peer tutoring on students' academic achievement. An effort was made to control all other variable like academic and professional qualification of teachers, academic achievement of students, and socioeconomic status of students and teachers etc. It was found that peer tutoring brought about positive changes in the results of students in mathematics.

Baleni, Malatji and Wadesango (2016) conducted a study on the influence of peer tutoring on students' performance in South Africa. The researchers used quantitative research design. Systematic random sampling was used to select students studying one module in one faculty in the University under study.

In order to make sense of data, final results of students for academic year 2013 were used to determine if peer tutoring has assisted students to improve their results. Data collected were through document analysis presented statistically. The study revealed that 45 percent of students who attended more than 4 tutorial sessions are the ones who scored higher marks. However, results showed that 55 percent of the sampled students did not attend tutorial sessions and this affected their results. The study concluded that attendance of tutorial sessions seemed to have an effect on improving academic performance. Baleni, Malatji and Wadesangois similar to the present study in that both look at peer tutoring as a teaching method.

In contrary Ndirika and Ubani (2017) did a work on effect of Peer Tutoring teaching strategy on academic achievement of Biology students in Umuahia . Four research questions were posed and four hypotheses were set for analysis at  $p \leq 0.05$  level of significance. Quasi experimental design was utilized. Purposive sampling was used to draw 40 students from two private schools in Umuahia education zone. Mean and standard deviation were used to analyze the research questions and Analysis of Covariance was used to analyze the hypotheses. Results show that the mean achievement scores of student taught peer tutoring was 56.100 and those taught with Conventional teaching method, 47.100. The mean gain in achievement scores of students taught with Peer tutoring was 11.65 and that for Conventional teaching method was 9.20. The mean achievement scores of High ability, Average ability and low ability level students taught with Peer Tutoring were 74.000, 69.111 and 70.000 respectively.

The mean achievement scores of High ability, Average ability and low ability level students taught with Conventional teaching method are 49.889, 50.222 and 40.000 respectively. There was no statistically significant difference in the mean achievement scores of students exposed to Peer Tutoring and Conventional Teaching methods, mean gain in achievement of students taught with the two strategies, male and female students taught with the two strategies. However a statistically significant difference

was found between adjusted mean of the students' ability level and the two techniques used, implying that there is interaction effect of instructional techniques and ability level on academic achievement of students.

Ezenwosu and Nworgu (2013) investigated on the efficacy of peer tutoring and gender on students' achievement in biology in Aguata Education zone of Anambra state, Nigeria. Two research questions and three hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted quasi-experimental design. Specifically the design is a pretest-posttest non-equivalent control group design. The instrument used was Biology Achievement test (BAT). The population of the study comprised 1731 SS11 students. The sample size for this study was 228 SS11 students from two co-educational secondary schools in the zone. Mean and standard deviation was used to analyze the research questions while the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA). The results among others showed that students taught biology using peer tutoring performed significantly higher in BAT than those taught biology using the conventional lecture method. The result further revealed that male students slightly performed better than female students.

Alegre-Ansuategui, Moliner, Lorenzo and Maroto (2018) researched on peer tutoring and academic achievement in mathematics in Spain. A meta-analysis of findings from 50 independent studies of peer tutoring programs in Mathematics at multiple educational stages showed that 88% of these programs have positive effects on the academic performance of the participants (Hedge's  $g = 0.333$ ). Some of the variables to be taken into account when developing a peer tutoring experience were analyzed. Results showed that variables such as the ages of the participants, roles, skills of the tutees (disabled or at academic risk vs non-disabled and not at academic risk), length of the sessions and frequency were not significant moderators of the academic achievement.

Variables such as educational stage, design of the study, duration of the program, level of knowledge of the tutors, time of the day (school time vs out of school time) and sample size turned out to be significant moderators. Spencer (2006) in a study titled peer tutoring and students with emotional or behavioral disorders, using strict methodological criteria. Reviewed 38 studies from 1972 to 2002 where some form of tutoring was used for students with emotional or behavioral disorders. The researcher discovered that "in the 38 research studies indicate that peer tutoring has been demonstrated to be an effective instructional strategy".

And the most effective form of the peer tutoring was a reciprocal method where the students reverse roles of tutor and tutee were used regularly. The research indicated that, When students are required to explain their thought process in such a way that the other students will understand, they get a deeper understanding of the concept themselves. Therefore, it is not enough to pair students, give them a set of problems, and expect them to succeed at a higher level.

Similarly, Parsons, Croft, and Harrison (2009) conducted a research using eighty students, to investigate whether Students' confidence in their ability in physics can be improved through peer tutoring? Instrument used was ability assessment through survey method. After the assessment, forty students agreed that they were good at fractions. The students increased to sixty Students within 15 days and to eighty students by next 22 days. That means, there was a 50% increase in students who felt that they were good at fractions over the six-week unit. The findings of the study shown that, some of the same students, who typically do not complete their homework, began completing their homework and increased their participation. These students not only participated with their peer tutor, but also in whole class discussions. The researchers noted that "We have seen improvement in the "effort, work completion and participation" from so many students. Never the less, despite the fact that students are more confident in their work, it is still unclear, whether this is directly attributed of peer tutors.

Furthermore, Cohen, Kulik and Kulik (2002) examined education outcome of peer tutoring: A meta analysis in science findings. A total number of 120 undergraduate students were sampled. The instrument used was experiment for pre-test and post test measurement. The data collected were analyzed using ANCOVA statistics. The findings showed that, 45 students out of 60 students of treatment group performed excellently well. And there was also evidence that peer tutoring improved tutee attitude in class, as well as tutee self-concept. And 33 students of control group performed well.

This implies that peer tutoring is a strong factor to improve science educational outcome. In another study by Bobko (1999) investigated on effective use of undergraduate as tutors for college science students. In the research, cross year small group tutoring were used, where upper year undergraduates (or post-graduates) act as tutors to lower year undergraduates, each tutor dealing with a small group of tutee simultaneously. Among the 8 studies, three studies reported reduced dropout in association with such tutoring. Five studied reported improved academic achievement. The research interview with the tutees shows increases in confidence and less anxiety, while tutors reported improvement in their knowledge and ability to communicate.

Similarly, Maheady (2001) examine peer-mediated instruction and intervention on students with mild disabilities. In the study, achievement outcomes of Grade point Average for peer tutored and non-tutored students were compared, male peer tutored students achieved higher GPA's than non-tutored but female tutee



did not. The subjects were self selected into groups and the outcome measure was very general and probably insensitive to small scale intervention effects students drop-out also improved. Based on this, the researcher has sought to investigate the influence of peer tutoring and direct instruction on the English performance of learners with learning disability.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The knowledge of English is an important life skill which all must master in order to actively participate in today' s society. Unfortunately, pupils still perform poorly in English language especially in external examination such as Common Entrance Examination almost yearly. Children with learning disabilities in reading, writing and spelling are at risk for low English language achievement. A number of learners for unexplained reasons are unable to use English skills as a tool for learning, getting new information, ideas, attitudes and values. Even after they have been taught, it is quite unfortunate that a large number of them are unable to read and write efficiently at higher class levels.

It is critical then to identify the most effective practices for teaching English to children with learning disabilities as many of the problems students encounter in English may stem from ineffective instructional practices. The overwhelming amount of tutoring, which takes many forms across these different settings, may cause teachers to pose an important question. Which is the most effective means of tutoring? My action research explored whether direct tutoring or peer tutoring is a more effective means of increasing pupil' s achievement. This study therefore aims to find out the influence of peer tutoring and direct instruction on the English language performance of children with learning disabilities in Uyo Local Government Area.

### **Objectives of the Study**

This study investigated the effect of peer tutoring and direct instruction on English language of children with learning disabilities in Uyo Local Government Area. Specifically, the study seeks to:

- i. determine the difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.
- ii. determine the difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.
- iii. determine the difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were stated to guide the study:

- i. What is the difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction?
- ii. What is the difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction?
- iii. What is the difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide this study:

- H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.
- H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.
- H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

## **II. RESEARCH METHOD**

This study is a quasi-experimental research design. Specifically, it is a pretest – post-test non-equivalent control group design. This research was carried out in the Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. The population of the study consisted of 8,893 primary two pupils in 49 public primary schools. A sample of 88 primary two pupils from four intact classes was used in the study selected through simple random and purposive sampling technique. English Language Diagnostic Test for Learners with Learning Disabilities (ELDT) and English Language Performance Test (ELPT) were used as instruments for the study. English Language Diagnostic Test for Learners with Learning Disabilities (ELDT) had two sections. Section A and B. Section A contains the pupils' personal data while section B comprises 28 -items developed by the researcher.

The items were scored 1marks each with a total of 28 marks. This was used to measure pupils with learning disability in English Language. Any pupil who scores below 10 marks was selected for the study. English Language Performance Test (ELPT) had two sections. Section A and B. Section A contains the pupils' personal data while section B comprises 30-items developed by the researcher. The items were scored 1 marks each with a total of 30 marks. This instrument was used for pretest and posttest as well. Also, the researcher also developed the lesson plans as treatment packages. The instruments' validities were determined by experts.

Kuder Richardson Formula 20 was used to determine the internal consistency of English Language Diagnostic Test for Learners with Learning Disabilities (ELDT) and English Language Performance Test (ELPT) which yielded a reliability coefficient indices of .79 and .77 respectively. Based on the geographical spread of the population, the researcher trained the teachers who served as research assistants on the use of peer tutoring. Thereafter the participants were diagnosed of exhibiting learning disability in English Language after being subjected to English Language Diagnostic Test for Learners with Learning Disabilities (ELDT). A pretest was administered on the two groups.

Thereafter the teachers assigned to the various groups were made to teach the pupils using the appropriate method for the group. The teaching was based on instructional packages; the teaching period lasted for four weeks. In each of the group teachers taught thrice a week using instructional packages and each lesson lasted for 35 minutes. Immediately after the treatment ended, posttest was administered to measure performance of the sampled pupils in each school. The posttest, English Language Performance Test (ELPT) was reshuffled and administer on the last day of the experiment. Mean and standard deviation were used in answering the research questions. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

### III. RESULTS

#### Research Question One

What is the difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction?

**Table 1: Pretest- Posttest and mean difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction**

Group	Pre-test			Post-test		Mean Difference
	n	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Peer Tutoring	47	2.36	0.64	4.80	1.22	2.44
Direct Teachers' Instruction	41	2.21	0.72	3.43	1.30	1.88

The result in Table 1 shows the difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction. The pretest reading comprehension achievement scores of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring was 2.36 with a standard deviation of 0.64 and a posttest mean of 4.80 with a standard deviation of 1.22. The mean difference for children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring was 2.44.

The result shows that the pretest reading comprehension achievement scores of children with learning disabilities when taught using direct teacher instruction was 2.21 with a standard deviation of 0.72 and a posttest mean of 3.43 with a standard deviation of 1.30. The mean difference for children exposed to direct teacher instruction was 1.88. The mean difference of peer tutoring is higher than direct teacher instruction. The result implies that peer tutoring appear more effective in improving reading comprehension performance of children with learning disabilities than direct teacher instruction.

#### Research Question Two

What is the difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction?

**Table 2: Pretest- Posttest and mean difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction**

Group	Pre-test			Post-test		Mean Difference
	n	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Peer Tutoring	47	2.36	0.64	4.80	1.22	2.44
Direct Teachers' Instruction	41	2.21	0.72	3.43	1.30	1.88

Peer Tutoring	47	3.44	0.80	4.91	1.28	1.47
Direct Teachers' Instruction	41	3.51	0.67	3.19	0.95	-0.04

The result in Table 2 shows the difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction. The pretest spelling achievement scores of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring was 3.44 with a standard deviation of 0.80 and a posttest mean of 4.91 with a standard deviation of 1.28. The mean difference for children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring was 1.47.

The result shows that the pretest spelling achievement scores of children with learning disabilities when taught using direct teacher instruction was 3.51 with a standard deviation of 0.67 and a posttest mean of 3.19 with a standard deviation of 0.95. The mean difference for children exposed to direct teacher instruction was -0.04. The mean difference of peer tutoring is higher than direct teacher instruction. The result implies that peer tutoring appear more effective in improving spelling performance of children with learning disabilities than direct teacher instruction.

### Research Question Three

What is the difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction?

**Table 3: Pretest- Posttest and mean difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction**

Group	Pre-test			Post-test		Mean Difference
	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Peer Tutoring	47	2.61	0.49	5.04	1.19	2.43
Direct Teachers' Instruction	41	2.60	0.49	3.09	1.04	0.49

The result in Table 3 shows the difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct teachers' instruction. The pretest spelling achievement scores of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring was 2.61 with a standard deviation of 0.49 and a posttest mean of 5.04 with a standard deviation of 1.19. The mean difference for children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring was 2.43.

The result shows that the pretest spelling achievement scores of children with learning disabilities when taught using direct teacher instruction was 2.60 with a standard deviation of 0.49 and a posttest mean of 3.09 with a standard deviation of 1.04. The mean difference for children exposed to direct teacher instruction was 0.49. The mean difference of peer tutoring is higher than direct teacher instruction. The result implies that peer tutoring appear more effective in improving composition writing performance of children with learning disabilities than direct teacher instruction.

### Hypotheses Testing

#### Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

**Table 4: Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) of the difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction**

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	43.240 <sup>a</sup>	2	21.620	13.592	.000
Intercept	90.093	1	90.093	56.640	.000
Pretest	2.171	1	2.171	1.365	.246
Methods	38.674	1	38.674	24.314	.000
Error	135.203	85	1.591		

Total	1709.000	88
Corrected Total	178.443	87

a. R Squared = .242 (Adjusted R Squared = .224)

The result in Table 4 shows that an F-ratio of 24.314 with an associated probability value of 0.000 was obtained with regards to the mean difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. Since the associated probability of 0.000 was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis one which states that there is no significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction was rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction

### Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

**Table 5: Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) of the difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction**

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	64.916 <sup>a</sup>	2	32.458	24.645	.000
Intercept	56.342	1	56.342	42.779	.000
Pretest	.151	1	.151	.115	.736
Methods	64.915	1	64.915	49.289	.000
Error	111.947	85	1.317		
Total	1666.000	88			
Corrected Total	176.864	87			

a. R Squared = .367 (Adjusted R Squared = .352)

The result in Table 5 shows that an F-ratio of 49.289 with an associated probability value of 0.000 was obtained with regards to the mean difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. Since the associated probability of 0.000 was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis one which states that there is no significant difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction was rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction

### Hypothesis Three

There is no significant difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

**Table 6: Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) of the difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction**

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	82.923 <sup>a</sup>	2	41.462	32.202	.000
Intercept	44.984	1	44.984	34.938	.000
Pretest	.084	1	.084	.066	.799
Methods	82.795	1	82.795	64.305	.000
Error	109.440	85	1.288		
Total	1698.000	88			
Corrected Total	192.364	87			

a. R Squared = .431 (Adjusted R Squared = .418)



The result in Table 6 shows that an F-ratio of 64.305 with an associated probability value of 0.000 was obtained with regards to the mean difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. Since the associated probability of 0.000 was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis one which states that there is no significant difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction was rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction.

#### **IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

Hypothesis one aimed at finding out if there is a significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. It was found that there is a significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. This finding is in agreement with the work of Bridget (2018) who conducted a study on the impact of a peer-tutoring model on the academic performance of secondary students and found that a peer-tutoring model for greater academic gains and student relationship building.

Similarly, this finding is supported by Yusuf (2017) who found that students in the peer tutoring group obtained higher EPT scores than students in the conventional instruction group. Ndirika and Ubani (2017) contradict the finding of this study when found that there was no statistically significant difference in the mean achievement scores of students exposed to Peer Tutoring and Conventional Teaching methods, mean gain in achievement of students taught with the two strategies, male and female students taught with the two strategies. Linsay (2014) also contradicts this finding when found that the null hypothesis was rejected because the results were statistically significant that the direct instruction of reading strategies raised student achievement.

Hypothesis two aimed at finding out if there is a significant difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. It was found that there is a significant difference in the spelling achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. This finding is in line with the work of Ezenwosu and Nworgu (2013) who investigated on the efficacy of peer tutoring and gender on students' achievement in biology in Aguata Education zone of Anambra state, Nigeria. They found that students taught biology using peer tutoring performed significantly higher in BAT than those taught biology using the conventional lecture method. In the same vein the finding is supported by Spencer (2006) who found that when students are required to explain their thought process in such a way that the other students will understand, they get a deeper understanding of the concept themselves.

Achmad, Punaji, Wayan, Saida, Nyoman and Cholis (2017) contradict the finding of this study when found that there were significant differences in cognitive learning outcomes between groups of students treated with direct instructional strategies with MAR and group of students who were treated with direct instruction learning strategies with non-MAR. There is a significant difference of cognitive learning outcomes between groups of students with high achievement motivation, moderate achievement motivation and low achievement motivation group. There is an interaction between learning strategies and achievement motivation toward cognitive learning outcomes.

Hypothesis three aimed at finding out if there is a significant difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. It was found that there is a significant difference in the composition writing achievement of children with learning disabilities when taught using peer tutoring and those taught using direct instruction. This finding is supported by Parsons, Croft, and Harrison (2009) who found improvement in the "effort, work completion and participation" from so many students.

Furthermore, Cohen, Kulik and Kulik (2002) support the finding when found that 45 students out of 60 students of treatment group performed excellently well. And there was also evidence that peer tutoring improved tutee attitude in class, as well as tutee self-concept. This implies that peer tutoring is a strong factor to improve science educational outcome. The finding of this study agree with Bobko (1999) and Maheady (2001) who found that peer tutored students achieved higher academic achievement.

In contrary Oladayo and Oladayo (2012) did not support the finding of this study when found that direct instructional strategy has a better effect on students achievement in Mathematics compared to indirect instructional strategy; significant difference existed between direct and indirect instruction on students achievement in Mathematics. Viel-Ruma (2008) did not agree with the finding with finding of this study when found that when only half of the total lessons were presented to the students in both groups, the number of correct word sequences and the total number of words written increased on within-program writing probes and on a generalization measure.

## V. CONCLUSION

The results of this study showed that peer tutoring enhanced children with learning disabilities achievement in English language more than the direct instruction. This showed that involving the pupils to work in groups enabled them to understand the concepts better than they would if they were just given verbal information. Pupils understand concepts and have higher retention when they actively participate in the lesson. Teachers should move away from the talk direct instruction and select strategies that promote active learning in the classroom. It is important to involve the pupils to participate actively in the learning process. There is need for us to “ shift the emphasis from teaching to learning from our world to the children’ s world’ ’ . Above all, we should provide opportunities for the children to think for and among themselves, so that learning for them is an active and creative process.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings of this study, the researcher therefore makes the following recommendations:

- i. Teachers should adopt peer tutoring as an effective strategy for teaching comprehension, spelling and composition writing to children with learning disabilities.
- ii. Curriculum planners should incorporate peer tutoring as an approach for effective teaching of in primary schools.
- iii. The various teacher education programmes in Colleges of education and Universities should incorporate peer tutoring into their various teacher education programmes so as to prepare teachers on how to conduct instructions using peer tutoring.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Achmad, B., Punaji, S., Wayan, D., Saida, U., Nyoman, S. D. and Choliz, S. (2017) did a work on effectiveness of direct instruction learning strategy assisted by mobile augmented reality and achievement motivation on students cognitive learning results. *Asian Social Science Archive*, 13(9):137-144.
- [2]. Bobko, E. (1999). The effective use of undergraduates as tutors for college science students. *Journal of College Science Teaching* 14, 60-62
- [3]. Cohen, P. A., Kulik, J. A. and Kulik C. C. (2002). Education outcomes of tutoring: a meta- analysis of finding. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(2), 237-248.
- [4]. Ewing, B. (2011). Direct instruction in mathematics: Issues for schools with high indigenous enrolments: A Literature Review *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (5), 65-92.
- [5]. Fantuzzo, J. W., Polite, K. and Grayson, N. (2000). An evaluation of reciprocal peer tutoring across elementary school settings. *Journal of Social Psychology* 28,309 – 323.
- [6]. Greenwood, C. R. Carta, J. J. and Maheady, L. (1991). Peer tutoring programmes in the regular classroom. In G. Stoner, M. R. Shinn, and H. M. Walker (Eds) *Intervention for Achievement and Behaviour Problems* (PP. 179 – 200). Bethesda, MD: National Association of Social Psychologists.
- [7]. Hanushek, J. (1992). Understanding the reading process. Retrieved November 18, 2019 from <http://academic.cuesta.edu/acusupp/As/301htm>.
- [8]. Kroeger, L. A., Brown, R. D., & O'Brien, B. A. (2012). Connecting neuroscience, cognitive, and educational theories and research to practice: A review of mathematics. *Intervention Programmes, Early Education & Development*, 23(1), 37- 58.
- [9]. Linsay, L. (2014). The effect of direct instruction of reading strategies on the student achievement in the intermediate grades. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis of Goucher College, 27p.
- [10]. Maheady, L. (2001). Peer-Mediated Instruction and Intervention and Students with Mid Disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22 (1), 4-15
- [11]. Markusic, M. (2012). Classroom instruction: pros and cons of direct teaching. In L. M. Rinehart (ed), *bright hub education*. [www.brighthubeducation.com](http://www.brighthubeducation.com).
- [12]. Oladayo. O. T. and Oladayo, C. E. (2012). Effects of direct and indirect instructional strategies on Mathematics achievement among junior secondary school students *An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 6 (4): 349-361
- [13]. Parsons, S., Croft, T., and Harrison, M. (2009). Does students' confidence in their ability in mathematics matter? *Teaching Mathematics and Its Applications*, 28(2), 53-68.
- [14]. Pigott, R; Fantuzzo, J. W., Heggie, N. H. and Clement, K. (2004). Effects of reciprocal peer tutoring on children with academic needs. *Journal of Social Psychology* 18, 203 – 223.
- [15]. Price, G. R., & Ansari, D. (2013). Dyscalculia: Characteristics, causes, and treatments. *Numeracy: Advancing Education in Quantitative Literacy*, 6(1), 1-16.
- [16]. Raskind, W. H. and Peter, B., Matsushita, M., (2011). Global processing speed in children with low reading ability and in children and adults with typical reading ability: Exploratory factor analytic models. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 54(3), 855 -899.
- [17]. Reitz, F., Richards, T., Wu, K., Boord, P., Askren, M., Lewis, T., & Berninger, V. (2013). A low-cost computer-interfaced drawing pad for fMRI studies of dysgraphia and dyslexia. *Sensors*, 13, 5099-5108.
- [18]. Shofoyeke, A. D. (2015). The Impact of teaching methods on pre-primary school pupils' learning achievement in protection issues in selected nursery and primary schools in Ondo West Local Government. *Journals of Elementary Education*, 25 (2), 45-60.
- [19]. Viel-Ruma, K. A. (2008). The effects of direct instruction in writing on English speakers and English language learners with disabilities. Ph.D Dissertation of Georgia State University, 150p.

