European Journal of Education Studies

ISSN: 2501 - 1111 ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111 Available on-line at: <u>www.oapub.org/edu</u>

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2541862

Volume 5 | Issue 9 | 2019

COMPARISON OF READING ALOUD STRATEGIES VERSUS SILENT READING STRATEGIES USED ON PAKISTANI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' READING COMPARISON FOR READING PROFICIENCY & LITERAL READING SKILLS

Muhammad Khalid Mehmood Sajid¹ⁱ, Hafizoah Kassim²

¹PhD Scholar Universiti Malaysia Pahang Centre for Modern Languages & Human Sciences, Gambang Campus, Kuantan, Malaysia English Language Lecturer, English Unit, College of Applied Medical Sciences, King Saud Bin Abdul Aziz University for Health Sciences, Saudi Arabia ²Dr., Centre for Modern Languages & Human Sciences, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia

Abstract:

Reading is the best way to give knowledge. Reading is an essential part of learning. No one can neglect its importance. There are many strategies for reading. Among them, one is silent reading strategy while another one is reading aloud strategy. Pakistan is a developing country where the English language is used as a second language because the national language is Urdu. Students' base for English conversation and writing is poor in such condition reading aloud strategy is important especially for poor readers. No one can neglect its importance, and that is why the importance of read-aloud strategy is increasing as compared to silent reading strategy. The present study was conducted at a Pakistani university. A comparative analysis of read-aloud strategies versus silent reading strategies was done. Data was collected from M.Phil. Masters, and BS program students through questionnaires. The study is based on an experimental and questionnaires were used, the targeted sample was from English department in which 20 students and teachers of BS program were selected while 170 respondents including 100 male and 70 female were selected for the questionnaire. Findings show that read aloud strategies are better than silent reading because in Pakistan English language used as a second language. Students had shown a better response for reading aloud strategies for reading proficiency and literal reading skills.

Copyright © The Author(s). All Rights Reserved. © 2015 – 2019 Open Access Publishing Group

ⁱ Correspondence: email <u>interstudies2000@gmail.com</u>

Keywords: read aloud strategy, silent reading strategy

1. Introduction

Reading is an important task in the learning process and has been studied by many researchers using different reading skills and strategies. It has been the subject of many classic studies in reading comprehension. Reading skills is an increasingly important area in English language teaching. The issue of weak reading proficiency has received considerable critical attention. In understanding any text reading material, there is a need to perform various activities which are known as reading skills Harmer (2007). It is assumed that if a learner can write or understand anything, then we can say he or she is learning Hornby (2005). There is a difference between reading in your language and reading in any other foreign language. A teacher plays a significant role in developing reading skills among students, at the same time tries to keep their students to purposeful reading Hadfield (2008). Quality of the oral reading strategy is highly assessed in comprehension Pikulski & Chard (2005). In the past read aloud technique was used but being an old strategy, it still has its importance and is being used not only at primary level but also at high-level Gibson (2008). Read aloud strategy has been more helpful for poor readers as compared to silent reading Clark and Andreasen (2013). Reading was very important in learning and to improve poor readers reading attitude appreciation could play a significant role and read aloud strategy could be helpful for poor readers and this reading strategy makes them active Logan, Medford, and Hughes (2010). However, it has long been a question of great interest in a wide range of fields. In Pakistan, the English language is used as an international language, while here Urdu is the national language. Recently, researchers have shown an increased interest in reading aloud strategies in Pakistan. In Pakistan, English is a second language (Iqbal & Ahmad, 2010).

As described by Rasheed, Saleem, Bukhsh, and Rasool (2011), English and Urdu languages have no similarity because these languages are differing, and the Pakistani nation cannot understand the English language easily. For Pakistani people, it is difficult to learn English as a foreign language, and they feel difficulty in spoken English. There are multiple reasons that people feel difficulty in understanding English mainly students have a weak base for learning English, and they are unable to write a more straightforward sentence. Students are habitual of cramming system or rotism. They don't know the actual meanings of the paragraph because of poor tense command, other language weaknesses, and poor grammar strategies. In schooling, students are forced to read aloud while at college level teachers follow silent reading strategy. Students who are poor readers are unable to read a simpler paragraph, or even they are unable to read in chunks. Students who have their base from Urdu medium institutes found more difficulties in learning and speaking the English language. Because from Urdu to English course transition is difficult for Urdu medium students, so they have been habitual of read-aloud strategies. Urdu medium students have poor pronunciation and vocabulary, and they are unable to decode and comprehend any written text. In Pakistan, students' performance is better for reading aloud strategy as compared to silent reading for English as a second language. Recently, a considerable literature has grown up around the theme of reading comprehension for literal reading skills of Pakistani students. Recent developments in the field of literal reading skills have led to a renewed interest in literal reading comprehension for reading proficiency of low proficient Pakistani reader students.

Moreover, it is still not known whether Pakistani university students have good literal reading proficiency by using reading aloud or silent reading strategies at the university level. Currently, there is no data on it. Very little is currently known about it. What is not yet clear is the impact of reading aloud strategies on reading proficiency and literal reading comprehension as an oral reading literal skill. This indicates a need to understand the various perceptions of this issue that exist among the variables mentioned above. It is now well established that reading aloud strategies work at school level students very well. However, the influence of reading aloud strategies on university students for literal reading skills and reading proficiency has remained vague.

2. Literature Review

In this section, a review of various studies will be discussed based on a comparison of read-aloud strategies and silent reading strategies.

Gibson (2008) has explained the read-aloud strategies as a helping tool in learning. This previous research stated that read aloud strategy had played a significant role in reading by reinforcing. A series of recent studies have indicated that read aloud strategies were helpful for students in autonomous learning and in speaking without difficulty. Read aloud strategies were assumed to be an old reading method, but it was still helpful in the learning process especially for those students who had a poor reading. Thus, read aloud was helping teachers too because they might point out their grammatical mistakes and correct them in pronunciation. Overall, read-aloud strategies had a significant role in the learning process. Hasbrouck & Tindal (2006) pointed out oral reading fluency as an assessment tool for reading. The study explained that reading was a complex procedure which involves multiple challenges including cognitive and linguistic. Previous studies have shown that reading with fluency was playing an important role in enhancing competency and for becoming competent learner guidance is required. Overall, reading with fluency was playing an important role in competency.

Especially in comprehension, it was very important. Most early studies, as well as current work focus, were on the effectiveness of reading aloud strategies. For instance, the following studies were conducted on this issue such as Hazzard (2016) has explained the effects of read-aloud strategy on student's comprehension. It was found effective on student's comprehension and in acquiring a high score. Data was collected with the help of questionnaire and survey technique, and it was found that average and weak students were performing well with read-aloud strategies. It was found that read aloud strategies were helpful for younger students as well as for college-level students. Mork (1972) has highlighted silent reading strategies in the classroom. The study finds that silent reading is helpful for examining the private skills of own and in developing their ideas secretly and they spend a maximum of time for silent reading in classrooms. Jafari (2013) points out a comparison between reading aloud and silent reading strategy for Iranian EFL learners. A sample size of 100 learners was selected, and the sample was grouped for silent reading and reading aloud comprehension. Results showed that in read-aloud strategies participants showed significant results while in silent reading strategy there was no difference among male and female participants. It was found that silent reading strategies were supported at a high level for EFL in Iranian students. Results of reading loud strategy were more significant as compared to silent reading comprehension, so it was found that topic familiarity had played a significant role in reading comprehension. Güler (2013) has highlighted about reading aloud as effective strategies. Read aloud was found as a traditional method but was effective for primary as well as higher level.

A sample size of 24 students was taken, and data was collected through questionnaire and interview technique. Results showed that there was no significant difference between quantitative methods, but in qualitative data, results were in favor of teachers read aloud task. Interview results were highly significant for read-aloud strategy. Findings showed that teachers should use a balanced approach read aloud as well as silent reading strategy in the learning process because these both methods are important for achieving significant results in learning. Paribakht and Wesche (1993) explained Reading Comprehension and Second Language Development in a Comprehension-Based ESL Program. A sample size of 37 respondents was chosen at an intermediate level which was studying under the semester system program. Findings showed that students had gained more in grammatical knowledge for four skills class while the learners with a comprehension-based study performed well for vocabulary knowledge.

Schimmel and Ness (2017) highlighted the effects of an oral and silent reading on reading comprehension for fourth-grade learners. A repeated test design along with correlation test was applied to check learner's response towards silent and oral reading comprehension. Findings showed that silent reading influenced more in comprehension reading as compared to oral reading comprehension. It was found that student's response for the silent reading strategy was greater in reading a narrative passage, but for comprehension question, no difference was found. Narrative comprehension text was much stronger as compared to expository comprehension text. This has been discussed by a great number of authors in literature where research provided evidence for the effectiveness of RAS. Alharbi (2015) stated reading strategies and learning style in comprehension reading and found a correlation in reading, learning and reading comprehension. The study was applied to Saudi EFL college learners. The survey method was applied to find the result for reading comprehension. Two groups were

Muhammad Khalid Mehmood Sajid, Hafizoah Kassim COMPARISON OF READING ALOUD STRATEGIES VERSUS SILENT READING STRATEGIES USED ON PAKISTANI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' READING COMPARISON FOR READING PROFICIENCY & LITERAL READING SKILLS

selected one for silent reading and other for oral reading and findings showed that there was no statistically significant difference was found for oral versus silent reading. It was found that reading strategies were helpful for low visual style learners while these strategies were not helpful or significant for high visual learners. Mork (2018) points out about silent reading at the school level. The study showed that many teachers and learners had devoted their time for silent reading strategies and found that reading silently give an opportunity to learners to assess their skills independently and they felt confidence instead of being shy in front of others. The study has shown the significant importance of silent reading strategies at school level learners. Amer (1997) explained the effect of teachers read aloud strategies on the reading comprehension of EFL. The study showed that read aloud had a significant impact over learners in reading in their language while initially it was thought that for EFL silent reading strategy was not helpful but gradually it was felt that silent reading was important especially for word by word reading. A sample size of 75 participants was taken one for silent reading while other for reading aloud. Findings showed that read aloud strategy had a significant influence over silent reading particularly for reading a comprehension passage it had outer performed over silent reading. Prior et al. (2011) examined a comparison for reading aloud and silent reading on comprehension. A sample size of 173 students was taken to compare the impact of silent and read aloud strategies on students' reading comprehension. For the initial five levels, oral reading was found helpful for level sixth; there was no clear difference while for grade seven. Findings showed that both modes were found important for student's development and in understanding any given instruction and both modes were needed to consider especially for the elementary school level.

Mccallum (2004) pointed out a comparison between oral and silent reading comprehension and its efficiency. A sample size of 74 students was selected, among them 39 students were selected to read silently while rest of 35 were for reading orally. Results showed that there was no statistical difference found between silent and oral reading strategies. Jacobs (2014) explained reading aloud to students. The study was conducted for the primary and intermediate level to check the influence of read-aloud strategy. Old teachers were doing less reading practice as compared to fresh teachers. Overall reading aloud was better for primary level. Miller and Smith (1984) highlighted the differences in literal and inferential comprehension. The study was conducted about oral and silent reading. ANOVA analysis was applied to measure the results. Results showed that silent reading strategies were not helpful for students learning for poor readers oral reading strategy was helpful. Yoon (2002) highlighted about the effectiveness of sustained silent reading on reading attitude and in reading comprehension. The study was conducted for a fourth grade of Korean students. The study has highlighted about the effectiveness of SSR in reading comprehension and in reading attitude. A sample size of 58 students was taken as an experimental group and 61 as a control group. The study showed that there was found a significant role of activity in reading while it has no role in comprehension reading. Overall, it was found

that activity had a significant role in reading in Korean students of primary level. Kingtsang (2014) has highlighted an impact on the effect of reading and writing for writing performance of students. Results showed that there was no link between these factors, but only reading was affecting the student's performance in the area of languages while for mathematics there was no relation between reading and writing in student's performance. Kragler (2015) has explained about the transition from oral to silent reading strategy. A sample size of 32 students was taken, and study had shown that oral reading was preferable among students. Students had performed well for oral reading, and it was supporting the Vygotsky's theory of language development. Rosseau (2012) highlighted the effects of silent reading for college-level students. The study showed that silent reading was very effective for enhancing student's capabilities and their reading attitude. Silent reading was also helping students in getting excel in their reading achievement. Overall, read-aloud strategy was better than silent reading strategy. Gray (2018) has explored about the importance of intelligent silent reading at primary school. The study was conducted to know students' attitude towards silent reading strategy and it was found that most students had not performed well even for a very piece of reading they were unable to pronounce it well and accurately. In short, the literature pertaining to the effectiveness of reading aloud strategies in comparison of silent reading strategies, which strongly suggest that these oral reading strategies were helpful.

3. Material and Methods

The present study was based on a comparative analysis of read-aloud strategies and silent reading strategies. The study was conducted in a Pakistani university in Southern Punjab. Data was collected from the English department where different programs were being offered including English Literature, Linguistics, Master and BS classes. Data was collected with the help of a questionnaire, pre-test and post-test instrument which were based on MCQs type and prepared form novel was also provided to collect information. The sample size of 170 students was taken including MPhil, Master, and BS program students among them 100 were male while 70 were female respondents. While for pre-test post-test instruments 20 students from BS English were selected and they were divided into two groups as a control group and experimental group. The pretest was based on the novel "Pride and Prejudice" was selected while for the post-test novel "The mill on the floss" was selected and these instruments were MCQ's based. The pre-test was provided to them initially, and the results were calculated. After three weeks when students were being taught by read-aloud strategies post-test was given to them to check the effectiveness of read-aloud strategy on students' reading proficiency and literal reading skills. An experimental research analysis was done, and comparison was calculated for both reading strategies.

4. Results and Discussion

In table 1, it can be observed that results from pre-test and post-test were found entirely different. In pre-test analysis respondent 1, has scored the 20% marks while in post-test response was 80%. In pre-test respondent 2, has scored 10% while in post-test response is 100%. In pre-test respondent 3, has scored 60% while in post-test response has been 70%. In pre-test respondent 4, has scored the 10% while in post-test response was 90%. In pre-test respondent five has scored the 30% while in post-test response was 100%. In pre-test respondent six has scored the 40% while in post-test response was 70%. In pre-test respondent seven has scored the 30% while in post-test response was 60%. In pre-test respondent eight has scored the 20% while in post-test response was 90%. In pre-test respondent nine has scored the 10% while in post-test response was 70%. In pre-test respondent 10 has scored the 30% while in post-test response was 60%. In pre-test respondent 11 has scored the 10% while in post-test response was 70%. In pre-test respondent 12 has scored the 50% while in post-test response was 60%. In pre-test respondent 13 has scored the 50% while in post-test response was 70%. In pre-test respondent 14 has scored the 10% while in posttest response was 90%. In pre-test respondent 15 has scored the 50% while in post-test response was 60%. In pre-test respondent 16 has scored the 30% while in post-test response was 80%. In pre-test respondent 17 has scored the 50% while in posttest response was 90%. In pre-test respondent 18 has scored the 40% while in post-test response was 70%. In pretest respondent 19 has scored the 30% while in post-test response was 90%. In pre-test respondent 20 has scored the 60% while in post-test response was 100%.

Pr	e-test results	Post-test results		
Respondents	Obtained percentage	Respondents	Obtained percentage	
1	20%	1	80%	
2	10%	2	100%	
3	60%	3	70%	
4	10%	4	90%	
5	30%	5	100%	
6	10%	6	70%	
7	30%	7	60%	
8	20%	8	80%	
9	10%	9	90%	
10	30%	10	70%	
11	10%	11	60%	
12	50%	12	70%	
13	50%	13	60%	
14	10%	14	70%	
15	60%	15	90%	
16	30%	16	60%	
17	50%	17	80%	
18	40%	18	90%	
19	30%	19	70%	
20	60%	20	100%	

Table 1: Comparison of Pre-test and Post Test results in percentages

In table 2, the results of pre-test and post-test were compared by using the t-statistics. Results were obtained by using SPSS. Results show that mean value for pre-test was .55 while for post-test it was .75. The standard deviation of pre-test was .510 while for posttest it was .444. Standard error mean for pre-test was .114 while for post-test it was .099.

		Tabl	e 1: Pa	aired Samples Statistics	
Statistica	l Analysis for Pa	ired Samples T	ſ-Test		
		Mean	Ν	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test	.55	20	.510	.114
rair 1	Post-test	.75	20	.444	.099

Table 3 reveals the paired samples test difference which shows that mean value difference of pre-test post-test was -.200, for standard deviation it was .616, standard error mean was .138 and t= 1.453. Statistical analysis results show that students' performance was better for read-aloud strategies at the university level as compared to silent reading strategies. Not only experimental research showed read aloud as better strategies but also the questionnaires obtained results were better for read-aloud strategies.

	Pair	ed Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-
	Me	n Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confide of the Di				tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test –20 Post-test	0.616	.138	488	.088	-1.453	19	.163

4.1 Students Questionnaire responses

Table 3: Read Aloud S	Strategies helr	o me in evaluating what I have read	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S.A	80	47.1	47.1	47.1
	А	66	38.8	38.8	85.9
	Ν	18	10.6	10.6	96.5
	D.A	6	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	170	100.0	100.0	

According to table No. 3 which is about the students' response, the mean value of Q.1 "Read aloud helps me in evaluating what I have read" was 1.7. The number of respondents who strongly agreed with the statement that read aloud strategies was helping them in evaluating whatever they read was 47.1%, while 38.8% respondents agreed, 10.6% were neutral, 3.5% disagreed while no response was found for strongly disagree.

Muhammad Khalid Mehmood Sajid, Hafizoah Kassim COMPARISON OF READING ALOUD STRATEGIES VERSUS SILENT READING STRATEGIES USED ON PAKISTANI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' READING COMPARISON FOR READING PROFICIENCY & LITERAL READING SKILLS

Table 4: Q.2 Read aloud strategy is helpful in the transition						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	S.A	77	45.3	45.3	45.3	
	А	67	39.4	39.4	84.7	
	Ν	19	11.2	11.2	95.9	
	D.A	7	4.1	4.1	100.0	
	Total	170	100.0	100.0		

The mean value for Q.2, *"read aloud strategies is helpful in transition"*, was 1.7. Collected information shows that 45.3% of respondents strongly agreed that read aloud strategies are helpful in transition, 39.4% respondents agreed, 11.2% of respondents were neutral, 4.1% of respondents disagreed, while no response was found for strongly disagree.

	Table 5: Q3 If teachers read aloud, I can easily understand						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	S.A	66	38.8	38.8	38.8		
	А	65	38.2	38.2	77.1		
	Ν	33	19.4	19.4	96.5		
	D.A	6	3.5	3.5	100.0		
	Total	170	100.0	100.0			

The mean value for Q.3, *"if teachers read aloud I can easily understand"*, was 1.8. According to provided response, 38.8% of respondents strongly agreed that whatever teachers read aloud they can easily understand, 38.2% of respondents agreed, 19.4% of respondents were neutral, 3.5% of respondents disagreed while no response was found for strongly disagree.

	Table 6: Q.4 I feel confidence while reading aloud						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	S.A	74	43.5	43.5	43.5		
	А	56	32.9	32.9	76.5		
	Ν	36	21.2	21.2	97.6		
	D.A	4	2.4	2.4	100.0		
	Total	170	100.0	100.0			

The mean value for Q.4, "*I feel confidence while reading aloud*", was 1.8. According to the provided information, 43.5% of respondents strongly agreed that they feel confidence with read-aloud strategies, 32.9% of respondents agreed, 21.2% of respondents were neutral, 2.4% of respondents disagreed while no response was found for strongly disagree.

Table 7: Q5 I enjoy with read-aloud strategies					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S.A	65	38.2	38.2	38.2

	ON OF READIN SED ON PAKIST	NG ALOUD STRAT TANI UNIVERSITY	mood Sajid, Hafizoah Ka TEGIES VERSUS SILEN ' STUDENTS' READING 'Y & LITERAL READIN	F READING STRATEGIES G COMPARISON
Α	60	35.3	35.3	73.5
Ν	39	22.9	22.9	96.5
D.A	6	3.5	3.5	100.0
Total	170	100.0	100.0	

The mean value for Q.5, "*I enjoy with read-aloud strategy*", was 1.9. According to the collected information, 38.2% of respondents strongly agreed that they enjoy with read-aloud strategy, 35.3% agreed, 22.9% were neutral, 3.5% disagreed, while no response was found for strongly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S.A	81	47.6	47.6	47.6
	А	51	30.0	30.0	77.6
	Ν	29	17.1	17.1	94.7
	D.A	9	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	170	100.0	100.0	

Table 8: Q6 Read aloud is better than silent reading strategies

The mean value for Q.6, *"read aloud is better than silent reading strategy"*, was 1.8. According to the collected information, 47.6% of respondents strongly agreed, 30% of respondents agreed, 17.1% of respondents were neutral, 5.3% of respondents disagreed, no response was found for strongly disagree.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
S.A	83	48.8	48.8	48.8	
А	57	33.5	33.5	82.4	
Ν	24	14.1	14.1	96.5	
D.A	5	2.9	2.9	99.4	
S.D.A	1	.6	.6	100.0	
Total	170	100.0	100.0		
	A N D.A S.D.A	S.A 83 A 57 N 24 D.A 5 S.D.A 1	S.A 83 48.8 A 57 33.5 N 24 14.1 D.A 5 2.9 S.D.A 1 .6	S.A 83 48.8 48.8 A 57 33.5 33.5 N 24 14.1 14.1 D.A 5 2.9 2.9 S.D.A 1 .6 .6	

Table 9: Q7 Read aloud strategies improve pronunciation

The mean value for Q.7 "*read aloud strategies improve pronunciation*", was 1.7. According to the collected information, 48.8% of respondents strongly agreed, 33.5% of respondents agreed, 14.1% of respondents were neutral, 2.9% of respondents disagreed while .6% of respondents strongly disagreed.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S.A	76	44.7	44.7	44.7

European Journal of Education Studies - Volume 5 | Issue 9 | 2019

	Muhammad Khalid Mehmood Sajid, Hafizoah Kassim						
COMPARIS	ON OF READIN	NG ALOUD STRA	FEGIES VERSUS SILENT	TREADING STRATEGIES			
US	SED ON PAKIST	ANI UNIVERSITY	STUDENTS' READING	S COMPARISON			
	FOR READ	NING PROFICIENC	CY & LITERAL READING	G SKILLS			
А	52	30.6	30.6	75.3			
Ν	28	16.5	16.5	91.8			
D.A	14	8.2	8.2	100.0			
Total	170	100.0	100.0				

The mean value for Q.8, *"read aloud is helpful in solving problems"*, was 1.8. According to provided response, 44.7% of respondents were strongly agree that read aloud strategies are useful in solving problems, 30.6% of respondents agreed, 16.5% of respondents were neutral, 8.2% disagreed while no response was found for strongly disagree.

		Table 11: Q9 Reading is important in the learning process						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid	S.A	67	39.4	39.4	39.4			
	А	72	42.4	42.4	81.8			
Ν	Ν	28	16.5	16.5	98.2			
	D.A	3	1.8	1.8	100.0			
	Total	170	100.0	100.0				

The mean value for Q.9, *"reading is essential in the learning process"*, was 1.8. According to students' response, 39.4% respondents strongly agreed that reading is important in the learning process, 42.4% respondents agreed, 16.5% respondents were neutral, while 1.8% respondents disagreed, no response was found for strongly agree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid S. A A N D.A	S. A	74	43.5	43.5	43.5
	А	62	36.5	36.5	80.0
	28	16.5	16.5	96.5	
	D.A	6	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	170	100.0	100.0	

Table 12: Q10 Do you feel confident with reading any text aloud?

The mean value for Q.10, "*do you feel confident with reading any text aloud*", was 1.8. According to provided information, 43.5% of respondents strongly agreed that they think confidence while reading any text aloud, 36.5% of respondents agreed, 16.5% of respondents were neutral, 3.5% of respondents disagreed, while no response was found for strongly disagree.

4.2 Teachers Questionnaire Responses

Table 13: Q1 Do you prefer to read aloud							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	S.A	6	60.0	60.0	60.0		
	А	3	30.0	30.0	90.0		
	Ν	1	10.0	10.0	100.0		
	Total	10	100.0	100.0			

The mean value for Q.1 "do you prefer to read aloud", was 1.5. According to given responses, 60% of respondents strongly agreed, 30% of respondents agreed, 10% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

	Table 14: Q2 Do you prefer silent reading							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent			
Valid S.A A	S.A	4	40.0	40.0	40.0			
	А	5	50.0	50.0	90.0			
	Ν	1	10.0	10.0	100.0			
_	Total	10	100.0	100.0				

The mean value for Q.2 "do you prefer silent reading in your lecture", was 1.7. According to the provided response, 40% of respondents strongly agreed, 50% of respondents agreed, 10% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid S. A	S. A	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	А	4	40.0	40.0	90.0
	Ν	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Table 15. O3 Linitially explain difficult terms

The mean value for Q.3 "initially I define difficult terms to my students", was 1.6. According to the provided response 50% of respondents strongly agreed, 40% of respondents agreed, 10% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S. A	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	А	5	50.0	50.0	90.0
	Ν	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Table 16: (04 RA is	better fo	r comprei	nension	reading
	2110110	Denerio	i compici	ICTIOI0I1	rcuunig

The mean value for Q.4 "*read aloud is better for comprehension reading*". According to provided response, 40% of respondents strongly agreed that read aloud strategy is better for reading comprehension, 50% of respondents agreed, 10% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

Table 17: Q5 I prefer recapitulation							
Frequency Percent Valid Percent Cumulative Percent							
Valid	S. A	4	40.0	40.0	40.0		
	А	6	60.0	60.0	100.0		
	Total	10	100.0	100.0			

The mean value for Q.5 "*I prefer recapitulation after delivering my lecture*"; was 1.6. According to the provided response, 40% of respondents strongly agreed that they prefer recapitulation, 60% of respondents agreed, while no response was found for neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

	Table 18: Q6 RA keeps students active				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S. A	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	А	4	40.0	40.0	90.0
	Ν	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

The mean value for Q.6 "with reading aloud students remain active" was 1.6. According to provided response, 50% of respondents strongly agreed that read aloud strategy keeps students active, 40% of respondents agreed 10% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

	Table 19: Q7 RA is helpful for poor readers				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S. A	5	50.0	50.0	50.0
	А	5	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

The mean value for Q.7 "for poor readers read aloud strategy is helpful", was 1.5. According to the provided response, 50% of respondents strongly agreed that read aloud is useful for poor readers, 50% of respondents were agree while no response was found for neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

		Table 20: Q8 RA is helpful in improving performance				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	S. A	4	40.0	40.0	40.0	
	А	3	30.0	30.0	70.0	
	Ν	3	30.0	30.0	100.0	
	Total	10	100.0	100.0		

The mean value for Q.8 *"read aloud improve students' performance"*, was 1.9. According to responded 40% of respondents strongly agreed, 30% of respondents agreed, 30% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

	Table 21: Q9 R.A is better than silent reading					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	S.A	2	20.0	20.0	20.0	
	А	7	70.0	70.0	90.0	
	Ν	1	10.0	10.0	100.0	
	Total	10	100.0	100.0		

The mean value for Q.9 "*reading aloud is better than silent reading*" was 1.9. According to provided response, 20% of respondents strongly agreed that read aloud is better than silent reading strategies, 70% of respondents agreed, 10% of respondents were neutral, while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagree.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	S.A	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	А	4	40.0	40.0	80.0
	Ν	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Table 22: Q10 RA is better for the second language

The mean value for Q.10 "*read aloud is a better strategy for the second language*" was 1.8. According to respond 40% of respondents strongly agreed that read aloud strategy is better for learning a second language, 40% of respondents agreed, 20% of respondents were neutral while no response was found for disagreeing and strongly disagreed.

5. Discussion

From the results of Pre-test and post-test instruments, it could conclude that post-test results were more significant than the pretest instrument. The obtained percentage from the post-test instrument was high as compared to pre-test instrument. Post-test results were better with read-aloud strategy as compared to silent reading strategy. Selected sample was based on MPhil, Master and BS Hons students. Initially, students were divided up into two groups' experimental group and control group. The experimental group was taught with read-aloud strategies while the control group was taught with silent reading strategy. Results showed that students' reading proficiency was extraordinary under the read-aloud strategy. Students were also provided with questionnaire also teachers were asked about the reading strategies with some questions, and obtained results were in favor of read-aloud strategies. It was observed that reading could improve under read-aloud strategies; also, it was helpful in understanding the unfamiliar words. It built a relation between a reader and the printed statement. Read aloud strategies are helpful in developing confidence especially in poor readers who feel shy about reading the text in front of people. With read-aloud strategies, a reader can improve his or her pronunciation by identifying his or her mistake personally, and it keeps a reader's mind active. It was helpful in evaluating what the students read, and it was also helping students in translation. With read-aloud strategies, students easily understood whatever teachers were teaching and they enjoy while reading aloud. Read aloud strategies was found a problem solving and essential in the learning process. Teachers preferred to read aloud, and they felt that for comprehension reading read-aloud strategies were vital and important.

6. Recommendations

Read aloud strategy is important for those students who have poor literal reading and not only teachers but also parents can play an important role in improving their reading skills. In the learning, process reading is very important. In Pakistan, because English is being used as an international language, there is a strong need to understand and learn it efficiently. Educational institutes can play their fundamental and significant role in building up students' base for learning the English language. Teachers should opt for strategies especially reading strategies by considering students' ability and their performance. Silent reading could not be helpful until students are not able to read in chunks. For primary or even at school level read aloud strategy can be beneficial while after high-level silent reading strategy can be opted. In Pakistan, students don't have outclassed command over writing and reading English because their national language is Urdu and these both languages are opposite and these have no similarity. Teachers should teach students in such a way that they may be able to learn basic language skills. Students should teach to read in chunks. They must be taught about word by word reading in this way they can easily understand the written idea, and with this, they must be discouraged for rot learning. For rural background, students read aloud strategy should be used because they don't have fluency in spoken or in understanding the written material because they are not facilitated with the use of AV aids. Activities based on reading can also be helpful for poor readers because in this way they can participate, and their hesitation will be reduced. Students should provide with a type of text which is of their interest. Thus, poor readers can participate well and remain active. Reading must also be purposeful so that students can get the advantage of it as teachers should assign any written text or any paragraph and the next day students must read that in front of class this will not only improve their reading but also increase confidence in poor or weak students. There is a need to bring amendments in poorly structured policies in the educational system. Higher level students be taught with read-aloud strategies so that they become habitual for that type of reading and understanding. In contrast to that, the curriculum which is followed in Pakistani

colleges and at the university level is taught by using a silent reading strategy which should not be shifted to reading aloud strategies.

7. Conclusion

In Pakistan, the English language is used as a second language, and students feel difficulty not only in reading but also in writing, speaking and in listening to the English language. Different reading strategies are being used in an educational institute, but students found read-aloud strategy helpful in learning as compared to other reading strategies. Read aloud strategies are useful to improve visual memory and help us in enhancing spelling and in deducting the syllable also in enhancing the spelling awareness. They make students enable to infer authentic dialogues' and flowing narrative. They help in improving the internal listening skills of students. RAS help students in finding out spelling and grammatical mistakes also the vocal errors in reading and help in self-assessment.

RAS develop the interest of students in learning, listening and reading. It is an effective method of strategies. They support students in picking up their own mistakes. It is a soothing and relaxing way to enhance students speaking skills. Read aloud strategies are not only helpful in developing confidence among poor readers who feel shy while reading in front of the public, but they also develop a way of identifying their own mistakes increases self-assessment. In public educational institutes, students are habitual for read-aloud strategies because their base is with this reading habit. On the other hand, they feel difficulty in colleges and universities because they have to face entirely different learning environment for which they are not familiar.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dr. Hafizoah KASSIM who worked as my PhD supervisor from Centre for Modern Languages & Human Sciences, Universiti Malaysia Pahang. Her research expertise helped to complete this article. Special thanks to Mr. Curtis Diggs as my university colleague who proof read and helped the writer to complete this article.

It is a great honor for me to acknowledge the support of Miss. Huma Safdar who helped me for collection of data from a private university of Southern Punjab and also, she took part in the English proof reading of this article. Really it was not possible for me while my stay at Universiti Malaysia Pahang to collect data from Pakistan but she made it possible and the article was completed well in time during my stay in Malaysia during summer holidays.

Special thanks to Syed Faisal Hasan Kazmi, the librarian at College of Applied Medical Sciences, King Saud Bin Abdul Aziz University for Health Sciences who provided access to the reading research books, Saudi Digital Library and College online library which made the researcher able to complete this research article with updated referencing and citations. Also, credit goes to him for providing latest SPSS version, with which the writer analysed the data.

I am using this opportunity to express my gratitude to Noor Azura Omar, the Librarian In charge of Universiti Malaysia, Pahang at Gambang Campus who supported me throughout the course of this research project for using UMP Library. I am thankful for her aspiring guidance, and friendly advice during this research project work stay in UMP Hostel. On her request I was given full support from the library staff and I would like to thank the all UMP library specialists for their support who supported my work and helped me get results of better quality.

About the Author(s)

Muhammad Khalid Mehmood Sajid is a PhD scholar at Universiti Malaysia Pahang at Centre for Modern Languages & Human Sciences. He has 20 years of English teaching experience in Pakistani and Saudi Arabian Universities. He also taught in UAE and Sultanate of Oman. He had been a lecturer in Qassim University. He also worked as faculty member in King Faisal University. He was an Academic Coordinator in Army College Rawalpindi and a lecturer in Pakistan Airforce College, Islamabad. Presently, he is working as English Language Lecturer in College of Applied Medical Sciences, King Saud Bin Abdul Aziz University for Health Sciences, Saudi Arabia. His research papers were published in UAE, Malaysia, India, USA & Europe.

References

- Alharbi, M.A. (2015). Reading strategies, learning styles and reading comprehension: A correlation study. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6(6), 1257-1268.
- Amer, A.A. (1997). The effect of the teacher's reading aloud on the reading comprehension of EFL students. ELT Journal, 51(1), 43-47.
- Gibson, S. (2008). Reading aloud: a useful learning tool? ELT Journal, 62(1), 29-36.
- Gray, W.S. (1924). The importance of intelligent silent reading. The Elementary School Journal, 24(5), 348-356.
- Güler, C.Y. (2013). Is Teacher's Reading Aloud an Effective Strategy or not? ELT Research Journal, 2(4), 167-175.
- Hadfield, Jill & Charles. (2008) Introduction to teaching English. Oxford University Press. Eigal S. A. Portugal.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007) How to teach English. Pearson Education Limited. Essex, England
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007) The Practice of English Language Teaching. Pearson Education Limited. Essex, England.
- Hasbrouck, J., & Tindal, G.A. (2006). Oral reading fluency norms: A valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. The Reading Teacher, 59(7), 636-644.
- Hazzard, K. (2016). The Effects of read aloud on student comprehension.
- Hornby, A S. (2005) Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford University Press. China

- Iqbal, M.J., & Ahmad, M. (2010). Enhancing the quality of education through elearning: the case study of Allama Iqbal Open University. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 11(1).
- Jafari, M. (2013). A comparison between reading aloud and silent reading among Iranian EFL learners. Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ).
- McCallum, R.S., Sharp, S., Bell, S. M., & George, T. (2004). Silent versus oral reading comprehension and efficiency. Psychology in the Schools, 41(2), 241-246.
- Miller, S.D., & Smith, D. E. (1985). Differences in literal and inferential comprehension after reading orally and silently. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(3), 341.
- Mork, T.A. (1972). Sustained silent reading in the classroom. The Reading Teacher, 25(5), 438-441.
- Rasheed, S., Saleem, A., Bukhsh, Q., & Rasul, S. (2011). Identification of Reading Difficulties in the Subject of English at Secondary Level: A Case Study of Federal Govt. Schools. International Journal of Social Sciences & Education, 1(4).
- Rosseau, A.S. (2012). Effects of silent reading on intermediate students reading growth. Schimmel, N., & Ness, M. (2017). The effects of oral and silent reading on reading comprehension. Reading Psychology, 38(4), 390-416.
- Tsang, W.-K. (1996). Comparing the effects of reading and writing on writing performance. Applied Linguistics, 17(2), 210-233.
- Ur, Penny. (1996) A Course in Language Teaching, Practice and Theory. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
- Yoon, J.-C. (2002). The effectiveness of sustained silent reading on reading attitude and reading comprehension of fourth-grade Korean students.

Muhammad Khalid Mehmood Sajid, Hafizoah Kassim COMPARISON OF READING ALOUD STRATEGIES VERSUS SILENT READING STRATEGIES USED ON PAKISTANI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' READING COMPARISON FOR READING PROFICIENCY & LITERAL READING SKILLS

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a <u>Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)</u>.