

# Use of Audiovisual Materials to Improve Students` Grammatical Skills

## Iya Aliyu Gana<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Ali Mustapha<sup>2</sup> and Mohammed Waziri Bularafa<sup>3</sup>

1,2,3 Department of Education, University of Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria Correspondent e-mail: aliyuganaiya@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

The study concerns with the use of audiovisual materials to improve students' grammatical skills. The objective of the study is to examine effect of audiovisual materials on students' grammatical skills. The study used a Quasi-experimental design to examine the effectiveness of the audiovisual materials in improving students` grammatical skills. The target population comprised SS II students in selected senior Secondary Schools. At the time of compiling this report, there were 1205 SS II students in the school. A sample of 293 (160males and 133 females) were selected using stratified random sampling and simple random sampling techniques. Intact classes were used for the experimental and the control groups. The instrument titled: English Language Grammar Performance Test (ELGPT) were drawn from the Senior Secondary II English language syllabus. The reliability index of the instrument was found to be 0.76. The scores that serve as data were collected through pretest conduct before the commencement and posttest after the treatment. The data collected were analyzed using an independent sample t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings revealed that teaching grammar using audiovisual material has a significant effect on students' performance. Students' performance in Grammar does not vary concerning gender and school type. The study concluded that audiovisual materials effectively teach Grammar in the English language in senior secondary schools. Hence, it was recommended that federal, states, and local governments provide more grammar teaching materials in all schools, and teachers should also employ more grammar teaching materials during lessons.

Keywords: - English Language, Audio-visual Materials, English Grammar

### Introduction

The English language is regarded as the backbone of all other subjects taught in schools. This is because it is the medium of instruction in most secondary and higher learning institutions in Nigeria. The English language is one of the few core subjects recommended for secondary schools as stipulated in the National Policy on Education (FRN 2011). It is, therefore, an essential pre-requite for further education. The English language has typically four basic skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. It is a medium of instruction in our schools and compulsory school subject that must be passed at all education levels in Nigeria (Danladi, 2008).

Audiovisual materials are essential and significant instructional materials needed for teaching and learning school subjects to promote teachers' efficiency and improve students' performance. They make learning more engaging, practical, realistic and appealing. They also enable both the teachers and students to participate actively and effectively in lesson sessions.

They give room for the acquisition of skills and knowledge and the development of self-confidence and self-actualization. Ikerionwu (2000) saw audiovisual materials as objects or devices that help the teacher present a lesson to the learners logically. Fadeiye (2005) saw audiovisual materials as visual and audiovisual aids, concrete or non-concrete, to improve teaching and learning activities. Eniayewu (2005) posited that it is essential to use instructional aid for instructional delivery to acquire more knowledge and promote the academic standard. Mannan (2005) points out that instructional materials' help the teacher clarify, establish, correlate and coordinate accurate concepts, interpretations and appreciations, and enable him to make learning more concrete, compelling, engaging, inspirational, meaningful and vivid'.

Slavin (2010) suggested a catalogue of functional visual instructional materials that are good for teaching the English language like textbooks, pictures, diagrams, flashcards, maps, posters, film strips, chalkboards and two-dimensional materials. He further said that selecting appropriate materials related to the primary content of a course or a lesson promotes better understanding of the students, arresting their attention and thus motivating them to learn. Vikoo (2003) observes that the most suitable instructional materials for effective teaching and learning of the English language at this information age are audiovisual materials. He describes the audiovisual materials as the instructional system, which uses the scientific and technological equipment's operations, combining visual projectors and sound productions to provide tangible experiences to learners. Some of such materials are computer-assisted instructions, videotaped instructions, film shows, tape-recorders and tapes. According to specialists in audiovisual materials, Oyeshika and Ashiru (2003) agreed that teaching materials, particularly over-head projectors with transparencies, televisions and videos, with recorded video cassettes including films and slides are effective in teaching and learning situations.

Another variable considered in this study is gender. There are conflicting reports on whether gender plays a significant role in language achievement. Some researchers like Offorma (2004) and Umo (2001) claim that females perform better than males in language. However, other researchers like Ngonebu (2000), Opara (2003) and Uzoegwu (2004) found that males perform better than females in language. However, others such as Akabogu (2002), Oluikpe (2004), Igbokwe (2007), Agada (2008), Omeje (2008) and Torty (2010) did not establish any significant difference in the achievement of male and female students in the language. Based on the disparity of findings on which gender performs better in language, it seems that the exact influence of gender on language achievement is not apparent.

Another thing, the school type and environment in which school is located is without doubt one of the factors determine not only students` aspiration, achievement but also educational outcome in general. There are several studies conducted to examine effects of school type on academic performance since 1980s but the amalgamated results have been far from conclusive. In a landmark study, James Coleman and his colleagues found that students in private schools outperform students in public schools (Harry, 2016). Sabitu, Babatunde & Oluwole (2012) investigated the influence of school types and facilities on students' academic performance in Ondo State. Proportionate random sampling technique was used to select 50 schools in Ondo state. The study revealed a significant difference in facilities available in public and private schools in Ondo State. It however revealed no significant difference in academic performance of students in the two types of secondary schools. Hence there is a need to examine the influence of the Audiovisual materials on students' academic by comparing the performance on the basis of school type and gender.



#### **Statement of the Problem**

Secondary school students' poor performance in the English language in both local and standardized examinations has been one of the significant problems facing Nigeria's educational sector. Afolabi (2009) observed that students usually fail in examinations owing to improper teaching methods and lack of essential teaching aids for instructional delivery. It is observed that the poor utilization of instructional materials, lack of proficiency, lack of laboratories, and technological apparatus such as tape recorders, projectors and film equipment, untrained and unqualified teachers into the teaching profession hampers effective teaching of the English language in secondary schools. Therefore, there is a need to investigate audiovisual materials' effect on students' performance in the English language among senior secondary schools in Maiduguri Metropolis, Borno State, Nigeria.

### **Research Questions**

- 1. What is the effect of teaching the English language using audiovisual materials on students' performance in Grammar?
- 2. What is the effect of teaching the English language using audiovisual materials on students' performance in Grammar by gender?
- 3. What is the effect of teaching the English language using audiovisual materials on students' performance in Grammar by school type?

### **Research Hypotheses**

- HO<sub>1:</sub> Teaching of English language using audiovisual materials does not have a significant effect on students' performance in Grammar
- HO<sub>2</sub>: Effect of audiovisual materials on students' performance in English Grammar does not significantly vary by gender.
- HO<sub>3:</sub> Effect of audiovisual materials on students' performance in English Grammar does not significantly vary by school type

### Methodology

The study was based on mediation and socio-cultural theory developed by Vygotsky (1978), which advocates that learning, including second language learning (L2) acquisition, as a semiotic process where participation in socially mediated activities is essential. It regards instruction as crucial to second language development and should be geared to the zone of proximal development (ZPD) that is beyond the learners' actual development level. It believes that learning in a second language context should be a collaborative achievement and not an isolated individual's effort where the learner works unassisted and unmediated for elementary natural processes to develop. The study used the quasi-experimental design of pretest and posttest design. A sample of 293 students (160 males and 133 females) out of the three sampled schools were selected through the stratified random sampling technique used, as shown in the table below. Intact classes were used and randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups through simple random sampling. The instrument titled English Language Grammar Performance Test (ELGPT) was used in the study. The instrument was divided into sections A and B. Section A consisted of demographic information of the respondents, while section B consisted of thirty (30) multiple-

choice items drawn from the scope of the English language SSII syllabus. Some experts from the field of curriculum validated the instrument to obtain a reliability coefficient of 0.76. The data collected were analyzed using an independent t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test the study's null hypotheses. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007), the t-test is used to discover whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means of two group using parametric data drawn from random samples with a normal distribution. It is used to compare two groups randomly assigned, for example, on a pretest and posttest in an experiment. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to analyze the differences among group means. According to Kothari (2012), variance analysis is essentially a procedure for testing difference among different groups of data for homogeneity.

#### **Results**

The results of the findings are presented and interpreted as in the following:

Table 1. Comparison of the mean score of the experimental and control group in Grammar

|          | Group        | N   | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|--------------|-----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Pretest  | Control      | 141 | 13.50 | 4.818          | .406            |
|          | Experimental | 152 | 13.50 | 4.769          | .387            |
| Posttest | Control      | 141 | 17.44 | 4.096          | .345            |
|          | Experimental | 152 | 20.96 | 3.164          | .257            |

Table 1 presented descriptive statistics on the performance of students in Grammar. The table compared the mean score of students based on the experimental and control group. The result indicated that M=13.50 is the control group, whereas M=13.50 is for the experimental. Hence, there was no significant difference in the performance of students in the pretest. The posttest result indicated that the mean score of control group is M=17.44 and experimental group M=20.96. Thus, the experimental group performance is higher than the control group.

**Table 2: Independent t-test** 

|                            |                         |     | Lever<br>Test<br>Equal<br>Varia | for lity of | t-test fo   | or Equa     | lity of Mea     | ns                     |                                 |                                      |                                     |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                            |                         |     | F                               | Sig.        | t           | Df          | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean<br>Differen<br>ce | Std.<br>Error<br>Differen<br>ce | 95%<br>Interval<br>Differen<br>Lower | Confidence<br>of the<br>ce<br>Upper |
| Grammar<br>(Pre-test)      | Equal variances assumed |     | .017                            | .896        | .006        | 291         | .995            | .004                   | .560                            | -1.099-                              | 1.106                               |
|                            | Equal variances assumed | not |                                 |             | .006        | 288.<br>886 | .995            | .004                   | .561                            | -1.100-                              | 1.107                               |
| Grammar<br>(Post-<br>test) | Equal variances assumed |     | 8.72<br>2                       | .003        | -<br>8.267- | 291         | .000            | -3.521-                | .426                            | -4.359-                              | -2.683-                             |
| ,<br>                      | Equal variances assumed | not |                                 |             | -<br>8.189- | 263.<br>140 | .000            | -3.521-                | .430                            | -4.367-                              | -2.674-                             |



Table 2 presented the calculated mean score of M=13.50 for the experimental group and M=13.50) for the control group. The result indicated that there was a significant difference in the performance of the students in Grammar. On the other hand, the calculated mean score M=20.96 for the experimental group and M=17.44 for the posttest control group was at the significant P<0.001. Therefore, the result showed that the students` performance in Grammar varied. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis was adapted.

Table 3: Comparison of the mean score of the participants by gender

|          | Gender of | N   | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|-----------|-----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
|          | the       |     |       |                |                 |
|          | participa |     |       |                |                 |
|          | nts       |     |       |                |                 |
| Pretest  | Male      | 160 | 13.49 | 5.151          | .407            |
|          | female    | 133 | 13.52 | 4.322          | .375            |
| Posttest | Male      | 160 | 18.88 | 4.540          | .359            |
|          | Female    | 133 | 19.73 | 3.301          | .286            |

Table 4.3 presented descriptive statistics on students` performance in Grammar by gender. The pretest result indicated no significant difference in the performance of male and female students by gender. In the posttest, the results showed no significant difference in students' performance in Grammar by gender.

**Table 4: Independent t-test** 

|                        |                             | Levene's<br>Test for<br>Equality of<br>Variances |      | t-test for | t-test for Equality of Means |                        |                        |                                 |         |                                    |  |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------|------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|--|
|                        |                             |  |      |            |                              |                        |                        |                                 |         |                                    |  |
|                        |                             | F  | Sig. | T          | Df                           | Sig.<br>(2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Differe<br>nce | Std.<br>Error<br>Differe<br>nce |         | onfidence<br>of the<br>ce<br>Upper |  |
| Grammar<br>(Pretest)   | Equal variances assumed     | 2.392  | .123 | 056-       | 291                          | .956                   | 031-                   | .562                            | -1.138- | 1.075                              |  |
|                        | Equal variances not assumed |  |      | 057-       | 290.9<br>71                  | .955                   | 031-                   | .553                            | -1.120- | 1.058                              |  |
| Grammar<br>(Post-test) | Equal variances assumed     | 18.09<br>0                                       | .000 | -1.796-    | 291                          | .074                   | 848-                   | .472                            | -1.778- | .082                               |  |
|                        | Equal variances not assumed |  |      | -1.847-    | 286.1<br>46                  | .066                   | 848-                   | .459                            | -1.752- | .055                               |  |

Table 4 indicated that the students' calculated mean score was not different at the significant P>0.97, as indicated in the pretest result in the independent t-test. Relatively, the students' calculated mean score in the posttest showed no statistically significant difference in the performance of the participants by gender at a significant P-value of P>0.07. Thus, the null hypothesis was firmly rejected at the significant P>0.05.

**Table 5 Descriptive Statistics** 

|          | School Type   | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|---------------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Pretest  | Male School   | 96 | 13.42 | 5.311          | .542            |
|          | Female School | 99 | 13.23 | 4.088          | .411            |
| Posttest | Male School   | 96 | 18.89 | 4.766          | .486            |
|          | Female School | 99 | 19.68 | 3.377          | .339            |

Table 5 presented the descriptive statistics on the students` performance in Grammar by school type. The pretest and posttest results showed no statistically significant difference in students' performance in Grammar-based on boys' and girls' school.

**Table 6: ANOVA** 

| ANOVA                |                   |                |     |                |      |      |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|------|------|
|                      |                   | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean<br>Square | F    | Sig. |
| Grammar<br>(Pretest) | Between<br>Groups | 20.259         | 2   | 10.130         | .441 | .644 |
|                      | Within<br>Groups  | 6662.990       | 290 | 22.976         |      |      |
|                      | Total             | 6683.249       | 292 |                |      |      |
| Grammar (Posttest)   | Between<br>Groups | 30.778         | 2   | 15.389         | .942 | .391 |
|                      | Within<br>Groups  | 4736.457       | 290 | 16.333         |      |      |
|                      | Total             | 4767.235       | 292 |                |      |      |

Table 6 indicated that audiovisual materials on students` performance in English Grammar do not significantly vary by school type. Based on that, the null hypothesis was retained.

### **Discussion**

The findings of the study concerning hypotheses were tested; the study revealed that teaching the English language using audiovisual materials has a significant effect on students' performance in English Grammar. The experimental and control group's mean score was compared and was found highly significant in favour of the experimental group. The finding of this study was similar to the findings of Olibie (2010), Alipanahi and Jafari (2014) and Oribabor (2014) that revealed a statistically significant difference between the posttest scores of the experimental and control group. The finding of Basoz and Cubukeu (2014) contradicted the study's finding, which revealed that there was no significant difference between the experimental and control group when taught using audiovisual materials.



On gender difference, the result indicated that the performance of the students in Grammar varies by gender. Mean scores of both groups were compared and found statistically different in their performance. The study's finding agrees with Bani Hani (2014), which revealed a statistically significant difference between male and female students' posttest scores favouring female students. Oyinloye and Ajayi (2011) reaffirmed the finding of Bani Hani (2014) that revealed that female students perform better than male students in suprasegmental features, and the female students develop a positive attitude to the acquisition of speech work by willing to imitate native speaker's model. Furthermore, the result revealed a significant difference between gender and school type as the mean of posttest scores of female school was 19.68, male school was 18.89 and mixed school was 19.27. The difference was, therefore, in favour of a female school. The study results are in line with that of Anaso and Anaso (2000) that there was a significant difference in the performance of students due to school type. The finding of Ajayi (2005) contradicts the study's findings that there was no significant difference in the performance of students due to school type.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the findings, it was concluded that the study provided empirical evidence of the efficacy of the audiovisual materials in enhancing students' performance in English Grammar. This implies that students exposed to audiovisual materials performed significantly better than those not exposed to audiovisual materials. It was also concluded that there was no significant effect of audiovisual materials on students' performance in English Grammar concerning gender and school type.

### Recommendations

- 1. Students should be exposed to the use of audiovisual materials in the English language to improve their English grammar performance.
- 2. The federal and States government should provide adequate grammar teaching materials in all schools, and teachers should employ more grammar teaching material in the English language during lessons.

### References

- Agada, J. M. (2008). Effect of cloze procedure on secondary school students' achievement in English Grammar. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, *Department of Arts Education*, *University of Nigeria*, *Nsukka*
- Ajayi, L. F. (2005). Students' performance in integrated science as a predictor of achievement in senior secondary school science subjects in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *M.Ed Thesis* (*Unpublished*) *University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*
- Akabogu, J. U. (2002). Effect of secondary school students' exposure to English registers contextual clues on achievement in reading comprehension. *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- Alipanahi, F. & Jafari, M. (2014). Computer-assisted audiovisual activities on English grammar learning and self-esteem among first-grade high school students. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences* 4(4),892-905

- Bani Hani, N. (2014). The effect of using a computer in teaching English grammar to Jordanian University students. *Journal of Educational Psychological Science Yarmouk University*, *Irbid*, *Jordan* 15 (4), 662-680
- Basoz, T. & Cubukeu, F. (2014). The effectiveness of computer-assisted instruction on vocabulary achievement. Mevlana International Journal of Education 4 (1), 44-54 Century". European Scientific Journal: 9 (17), 1-21.
- Cohen, L., Manion, I.& Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. London: Taylor & Francis Groups.
- Danladi, S. S. (2013). "Language Policy: Nigeria and the Role of English Language in the 21<sup>St</sup>
- Eniayewu, J. (2005). Effect of instructional materials on teaching economics in secondary schools in Akoko North-East Local Government Area of Ondo State. *Ikere Journal of Education*, 7, 117-120
- Fadeiye, J.O. (2005). A social studies textbook for colleges and universities. Ibadan: Akin-Johnson Press and Publishers
- Harry, L. (2016). Effects of School Type on Academic Performance-Evidence from the Secondary Entrance Assessment Exam in Trinidad. *New York University Abu Dhabi*.
- Igbokwe, U. L. (2007). Effects of the cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA) on students' achievement in essay writing. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, *Department of Arts Education*, *University of Nigeria*, *Nsukka*.
- Ikerionwu, J.C. (2000). Importance of aids and resources in classroom teaching. In A.M. Oyeneyin (Ed.), *Perspective of classroom teaching*. Abuja: Martmonic Investment Ltd
- Mannan, A. (2005). Modern Education: Audiovisual Aids. New Delhi: Anmol Publications.
- Ngonebu, C. L. (2000). English for specific-oriented research in Nigerian universities: A critical assessment. *Journal of Nigerian Education*, 15 (1), 9 19.
- Offorma, G. C. (2004). Language and gender. *International Journal of Arts and Technology Education*, 3, 62 75.
- Olibie, E. I. (2010). Using computer-assisted language learning to improve students' English language achievement in universal basic education in junior secondary schools in Asaba, Delta State. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology* 1 (1), 66-71
- Oluikpe, E. N. (2004). Effects of English for academic purposes (EAP) method on the achievement of University of Nigeria Education Students in expository writing. *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- Omeje, M. O. (2008). Effect of the communicative method on students' achievement and interest in Igbo letter writing. *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Arts Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*
- Opara, R. N. (2003). Effect of pronunciation drills on secondary students' achievement in reading. Unpublished M.Ed Project Report, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Oribabor, O. A. (2014). Effect of computer use in teaching on the acquisition of English language skills among secondary school students in Ife local government area of Osun State. *Journal of Education and Social Research* 4 (6), 443-446
- Oyeshiku, G. &Ashiru, I. (2003). Communication and information technology in effective teachings trainer workshop for secondary school principals and teachers in Nigeria. Lagos: Loform Educational Consultancy.
- Oyinloye, G.O. & Ajayi, B. B. (2011). Investigating technical college students' achievement in speech work in the English language. *European Journal of Educational Studies* 3 (1),75-83



- Sabitu, A., Babatunde, E. & Oluwole, A. (2012). School Types, Facilities and Academic Performance of Students in Senior Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *International Education Studies. Vol* 5 (3).
- Slavin, R.E. (2010). A Synthesis of Research on Language of Reading Instruction for English Language Learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 247 254.
- Torty, O. U. (2010). Effect of collaborative learning method on secondary students' achievement and interest in English language tenses. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, *Department of Arts Education*, *University of Nigeria*, *Nsukka*
- Umo, U. C. (2001). Effects of games on the achievement and interest of junior secondary school students in Igbo grammar. *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- Uzoegwu, P. N. (2004). Effects of cooperative learning method on students' achievement in English essay writing. *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- Vikoo, B. (2003). Learning theories and instructional processes. Port-Harcourt: Spring Field Publishers
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* M. Cole, V. Johnsteiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (eds). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press