

EFFICACY OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING OF READING SKILLS AMONG SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS PUPILS IN OJO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF LAGOS STATE

Adebayo Komolafe, Ph.D

Abstract

Reading problem (Dyslexia) is prevalent in multivariate forms among Nigerian primary pupils. The writer sought solutions and suggested cooperative learning as a remedial measure. To determine the effects of cooperative learning, the writer tested three hypotheses at .05 level of significant difference. The results of the pre and post tests of the cooperative learning treatment were correlated using t-test. The subjects were drawn from selected primary schools from Ojo Local Government Area of Lagos State which were classified into experimental and control groups.

The study revealed that cooperative learning improves pupils' sub-lexical reading skill. It also ascertains that cooperative learning develops pupils' lexical reading skill. Furthermore, the study confirms that cooperative learning enhances pupils' speed reading skill. The paper concluded that cooperative learning among pupils could be effective if properly managed.

Reading is a complex [cognitive process](#) of decoding [symbols](#) for the intention of constructing or deriving meaning ([reading comprehension](#)). It is the mastery of basic cognitive processes to the point where they are automatic so that attention is freed for the analysis of meaning (Borowsky, Esopenko, Cummine, and Sarty 2007).

Reading is a means of [language acquisition](#), of communication, and of sharing [information](#) and ideas. Like all language, it is a complex interaction between the text and the

reader which is shaped by the reader's prior knowledge, experiences, attitude, and language community which is culturally and socially situated. The reading process requires continuous practices, development, and refinement (Borowsky, Esopenko, Cummine, and Sarty 2007).

Readers use a variety of reading strategies to assist with decoding (to translate symbols into sounds or visual representations of [speech](#)) and comprehension. Readers may use [morpheme](#), [semantics](#), [syntax](#) and context clues to identify the meaning of unknown words. Readers integrate the words they have read into their existing framework of knowledge or schema.

Rayner (1995), however identifies other types of reading which are not speech based [writing systems](#), such as music [notation](#) or [pictograms](#). The common link, according to Rayner (1995), is the interpretation of [symbols](#) to extract the meaning from the visual notations and that currently most reading is either of the printed word from ink or [toner](#) on paper, such as in a logo of a reading book, magazine, newspaper, [leaflet](#), [notebook](#); or of electronic displays, such as [computer displays](#), [television](#), [mobile phones](#) or [e-readers](#).

Often the text relates to the object, such as an address on an envelope, product info on packaging, or text on a [traffic](#) or street sign. A [slogan](#) may be painted on a wall. A text may also be produced by arranging stones of a different

color in a wall or road. Short texts like these are sometimes referred to as environmental print.

Sometimes text or images are in [relief](#), with or without using a colour contrast. Words or images can be carved in stone, wood, or metal; instructions can be printed in relief on the plastic housing of a [home appliance](#), or a myriad of other examples (Rayner 1995).

A requirement for reading is a good [contrast](#) between letters and background, depending on colours of letters and background, any pattern or image in the background, and [lighting](#) and a suitable font size (Rayner 1995).

The field of visual word recognition studies how people read individual words (Johnson and Johnson 1994). A key technique in studying how individuals read text is [eye tracking](#). This has revealed that reading is performed as a series of eye [fixations](#) with [saccades](#) between them. Humans also do not appear to fixate on every word in a text, but instead fixate to some words while apparently filling in the missing information using context. This is possible because human languages show certain linguistic regularities (Johnson and Johnson 1994).

Reading, according to Johnson and Johnson (1994), is typically an individual activity, although on specific occasion, a person will read out loud for the benefit of other listeners, but altogether, reading aloud is done for one's better comprehension.

In Nigeria, though like several other countries in Africa, great reading difficulty is prevalent among all school students. It became a national issue in the country, involving the concerns of all education stakeholders, following mass failure of secondary school students in WAEC exams especially in English in 2009/2010. The problem has been narrowed down to the apparent loss of reading culture among our pupils. Recently, President Goodluck Jonathan has championed reading skill campaign

for the youths, as a panacea to the present decline in the country's standard of education.

This empirical study therefore, investigated how the adoption of cooperative learning would reduce, if not eradicate, dyslexia in particular and other associated reading skill acquisition disorders among Nigerian primary school pupils in general.

However, it is expedient to foremost, review reading, cooperative learning and dyslexia.

Reading

The history of reading dates back to the [invention of writing](#) during the 4th millennium BC. Although reading [print](#) text is now an important way for the general population to access information, this has not always been the case. With [some exceptions](#), only a small percentage of the population in many countries was considered [literate](#) before the [Industrial Revolution](#). Some of the pre-modern societies with generally high literacy rates included [classical Athens](#) and the Islamic [Caliphate](#). In the latter case, the widespread adoption of [paper](#) and the emergence of the [Maktab](#) and [Madrasah](#) educational institutions played a fundamental role.

Citing [Alhazen](#) (1021)'s work 'Book of optics', Borowsky, Esopenko, Cummine, and Sarty (2007) state the earliest description of the two ways in which we perceive the written word:

For when a literate person glances at the form [abjad](#) written on a piece of paper, he will immediately perceive it to be abjad (a word denoting the [Arabic alphabet](#)) because of his recognition of the form. Thus from his perception that the 'a' comes first and the 'd' last, or from his perception of the configuration of the total form, he perceives that it is abjad. Similarly, when he sees the written name of Allah, be He exalted, he perceives by recognition, at the moment of glancing at it, that it is Allah's name. And it is so with all well-known written words which have

appeared many times before the eye: a literate person immediately perceives what the word is by recognition, without the need to inspect the letters in it one by one. The case is different when a literate person notices a strange word which he has not come upon beforehand or the like of which he has not already read. For he will perceive such a word only after inspecting its letters one by one and discerning their meanings; then he will perceive the meaning of the word.

Different Techniques of Reading

Explicating different ways of reading, Sanabria, Torres, and Iglesias (2009) assert that sight word reading involves reading words of increasing difficulty until they become unable to read or understand the words presented to them. Difficulty is manipulated by using words that have more letters or syllables, are less common and have more complicated spelling-sound relationships.

Nonword reading concerns reading lists of pronounceable nonsense words out loud. The difficulty is increased by using longer words, and also by using words with more complex spelling or sound sequences.

Reading comprehension occurs when a passage is presented to the reader, which they must read either silently or out loud. Then a series of questions are presented that test the reader's comprehension of this passage.

Reading fluency, however, is about the rate with which individuals can name words while reading accuracy centres on the ability to correctly name a word on a page.

Some tests incorporate several of the above components at once. For instance, the [Nelson-Denny Reading Test](#) scores readers both on the speed with which they can read a passage, and also their ability to accurately answer questions about this passage (Sanabria, Torres, and Iglesias 2009).

The need to put necessary conditions to facilitate reading skill cannot be over

emphasised. Reading from paper and from some screens requires more [lighting](#) than many other activities. Therefore, the possibility of doing this comfortably in [cafés](#), [restaurants](#), [buses](#), at [bus stops](#) or in [parks](#) greatly varies depending on available lighting and time of day. Starting in the 1950s, many offices and classrooms were [over-illuminated](#). Since about 1990, there has been a movement to create reading environments with appropriate lighting levels (approximately 600 to 800 [lux](#)).

Reading from screens which produce their own light is less dependent on external light, except that this may be easier with little external light. For controlling what is on the screen ([scrolling](#), turning the page, etc.), a [touch screen](#) or [keyboard illumination](#) further reduces the dependency on external light (Sanabria, Torres, and Iglesias 2009).

Assessment of Reading Rate

Carver (1990) affirms that rates of reading include reading for memorization (fewer than 100 [words per minute](#) [wpm]); reading for learning (100–200 wpm); reading for comprehension (200–400 wpm); and [skimming](#) (400–700 wpm). Reading for comprehension is the essence of the daily reading of most people. Skimming is for superficially processing large quantities of text at a low level of comprehension (below 50%).

Advice for choosing the appropriate reading-rate, offered Carver (1990), includes reading flexibly, slowing when concepts are closely presented and when the material is new, and increasing when the material is familiar and of thin concept. [Speed reading](#) courses and books often encourage the reader to continually accelerate; comprehension tests lead the reader to believe his or her comprehension is continually improving; yet, competence-in-reading requires knowing that skimming is dangerous, as a default [habit](#).

Let us consider the major factors of reading difficulty in Nigeria.

Major Causes of Reading Difficulty in Nigeria

As contained in the report by the Nigeria Millennium Development Goals (2005), the total delivery of education in Nigeria has suffered from years of neglect, compounded by inadequate attention to policy frameworks within the sector, attesting to the poor state of education in Nigeria. The national literacy rate is currently 57 percent. Some 49 percent of the teaching force is unqualified while dyslexia is prevalent among the school pupils. There are acute shortages of infrastructure and facilities at all levels. Access to basic education is inhibited by gender issues and socio-cultural beliefs and practices, among other factors. Wide disparities persist in educational standards and learning achievements. The system emphasizes theoretical knowledge at the expense of technical, vocational, and entrepreneurial education. School curricula need urgent review to make them relevant and practice oriented. By the scope of this paper, the writer has been limited to giving attention to the problems relating to reading difficulty. Hence, the interest of the paper in dyslexia.

Dyslexia

Dyslexia refers to a cognitive difficulty with reading and writing associated with children and young people in schools and colleges. The word comes from the Greek meaning 'difficulty with words'. A dyslexic child or adult may have problems spelling, reading, putting things in order, following instructions, and may confuse left and right and reverse letters and numbers. The term dyslexia can refer to two disorders: [developmental dyslexia](#) which is a [learning disability](#); and [alexia](#) or acquired dyslexia refers to reading difficulties that occur following [brain damage](#).

And because of our limited knowledge in medicine, we considered in this work the adoption of cooperative learning to treat the problem of developmental dyslexia.

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is an approach to organizing classroom activities into academic and social learning experiences. Students must work in groups to complete tasks collectively. Unlike individual learning, students learning cooperatively capitalize on one another's resources and skills (asking one another for information, evaluating one another's ideas, monitoring one another's work, etc.). Everyone succeeds when the group succeeds (Sharan 2010).

Prior to World War II, social theorists such as Allport, Watson, Shaw, and Mead began establishing cooperative learning theory after finding that group work was more effective and efficient in quantity, quality, and overall productivity when compared to working alone (Gilles & Adrian 2003). However, it wasn't until 1937 when researchers May and Doob found that people who cooperate and work together to achieve shared goals, were more successful in attaining outcomes, than those who strived independently to complete the same goals. Furthermore, they found that independent achievers had a greater likelihood of displaying competitive behaviours. Philosophers and psychologists in the 1930s and 40's such as John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Morton Deutsch also influenced the cooperative learning theory practised today. Dewey believed it was important that students develop knowledge and social skills that could be used outside of the classroom, and in the democratic society. This theory portrayed students as active recipients of knowledge by discussing information and answers in groups, engaging in the learning process together rather than being passive receivers of information (e.g. teacher talking, students listening). Lewin's

contributions to cooperative learning were based on the ideas of establishing relationships between group members in order to successfully carry out and achieve the learning goal. Deutsh's contribution to cooperative learning was positive social interdependence, the idea that the student is responsible for contributing to group knowledge. Since then, David and Roger Johnson have been actively contributing to the cooperative learning theory. In 1975, they identified that cooperative learning promoted mutual liking, better communication, high acceptance and support, as well as demonstrated an increase in a variety of thinking strategies among individuals in the group. Students who showed to be more competitive lacked in their interaction and trust with others, as well as in their emotional involvement with other students. In 1994 Johnson and Johnson published the five (5) elements (positive interdependence, individual accountability, face-to-face interaction, social skills, and processing) essential for effective group learning, achievement, and higher-order social, personal and cognitive skills (e.g., problem solving, reasoning, decision-making, planning, organizing, and reflecting).

Types of Cooperative Learning

Johnson and Johnson (1975) identify two major types of cooperative learning: Formal cooperative learning is structured, facilitated, and monitored by the educator over time and it is used to achieve group goals in task work (e.g. completing a unit). Any course material or assignment can be adapted to this type of learning, and groups can vary from 2-6 people with discussions lasting from a few minutes up to a period. Types of formal cooperative learning strategies include jigsaw, assignments that involve group problem solving and decision making, laboratory or experiment assignments, and peer review work (e.g. editing writing assignments). Having experience and

developing skill with this type of learning often facilitates informal and base learning.

Informal cooperative learning incorporates group learning with passive teaching by drawing attention to material through small groups throughout the lesson or by discussion at the end of a lesson, involving two students (e.g. turn-to-your-partner discussions). These groups are often temporary and can change from lesson to lesson (very much unlike formal learning where two (2) students may be lab partners throughout the entire semester, contributing to one another's knowledge of science). Discussions typically have four components that include formulating a response to questions asked by the educator, sharing responses to the questions asked with a partner, listening to a partner's responses to the same question, and creating a new well-developed answer. This type of learning enables the student to process, consolidate, and retain more information learned (Johnson and Johnson 1975).

In group-based cooperative learning, these peer groups gather together over the long term (e.g. over the course of a year, or several years such as in high school or post-secondary studies) to develop and contribute to one another's knowledge mastery on a topic by regularly discussing material, encouraging one another, and supporting the academic and personal success of group members. Base group learning is effective for learning complex subject matter over the course or semester and it establishes caring, supportive peer relationships, which in turn motivates and strengthens the student's commitment to the group's education while increasing self-esteem and self worth. Base group approaches also make the students accountable to educating their peer group in the event that a member was absent for a lesson. This is effective both for individual learning, as well as social support (Johnson and Johnson 1994).

Objectives

This study examined the efficacy of cooperative learning at eradicating reading disorders among primary school pupils in Ojo Local Government Area of Lagos State.

Scope

The study was limited to the effect of cooperative learning on primary school pupils' reading disorders. Thus, attention was directed at developmental dyslexia, leaving alexia to those in the medical field to handle.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were used as reference points for this study:

1. There is no significant relationship between cooperative learning and sub-lexical reading.
2. There is no significant relationship between cooperative learning and lexical reading.
3. There is no significant relationship between cooperative learning and speed reading.

Method

After conducting a reading skill test, all the sixty four (64) males and females Primary 4 pupils from Fazil Omar Ahmadiyya Primary School 2, Pako-Okoko; Anglican Primary School, Ile Oba bus stop, Ijanikin; Ajangbadi Primary School, Ajangbadi; Ilogbo Primary School, Ilogbo; and Local Army Primary School, Iyana-Isashi, that failed the test were divided into experimental group and control group with thirty two (32) pupils a piece. There was no discrimination against gender. After the first test which contained the same items for both groups, the experimental group was treated to a specific reading course using cooperative learning method for six weeks while the controlled group was taught the same specific reading course, but using the conventional “ a teacher talking to learners” technique. Both groups were tested again with the same instrument and the results analyzed.

Decision Rule

The teaching method that would enhance pupils' greater mean difference between their pre- test scores and post- test scores would be the better method of teaching.

Data analysis

Descriptive Statistics (mean, standard deviation) and t-test were used to analyze the data.

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Experimental Group's Scores in Reading Test Before Running the Programme.

Variables	Boys		Girls	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Sub-lexical reading	28.8	5.37	25.9	5.08
Lexical reading	26.9	5.19	23.8	4.88
Speed reading	29.1	5.39	26.2	5.12

Sources: Field work 2011

From the scores in table 1, the performance of the experimental group in reading test before running the programme revealed the following:

For sub-lexical reading, the mean was 28.8 and the standard deviation was 5.36 for boys while the girls had the mean 25.9 and standard deviation 5.08. The mean showed that the pupils' sub- lexical reading skill levels were low, giving room for possibility of improvement while the SD was also an indication that the pupils were very similar in sub-lexical reading skill.

Results

The same analysis goes for the pupils' scores in both lexical reading and speed reading skills. For lexical, the table showed the mean of 26.9 and standard deviation of 5.19 for boys while the girls had 23.8 as the mean and 4.88 as

the standard deviation while for Speed reading, the boys had the mean of 29.1 and standard deviation of 5.39 while the girls had the mean of 26.2 and the standard deviation of 5.12. They were thus suitable for this exercise.

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Control Group's Scores in Reading Test Before Running the Programme.

Variables	Boys		Girls	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Sub-lexical reading	28.3	5.32	25.4	5.04
Lexical reading	28.0	5.29	22.5	4.74
Speed reading	27.6	5.25	26.7	5.17

Table 2 showed that in sub-lexical reading test for the control group before running programme, the boys' mean was 28.3 and standard deviation was 5.32 while the girls' mean was 25.4 and standard deviation was 5.04. This, like the experimental group, indicated that the pupils' sub-lexical reading skill levels were low, giving room for possibility of improvement while the SD was also an indication that the pupils were very similar in sub-lexical reading skill.

Similarly, in the lexical reading test, the boys in the control group had the mean of 28.0 and standard deviation of 5.29 while the girls' mean was 22.5 and standard deviation was 4.74, emphasizing the same analysis above which also explained the scores in the speed reading test where the boys in the control group had the mean of 27.6 and standard deviation of 5.25 while the girls' mean was 26.7 and 5.17 as standard deviation.

From tables 1 and 2 above, for Sub-lexical reading test, the experimental and the control

group boys had the mean of 28.8 and 28.3 and standard deviation of 5.37 and 5.32 respectively while for Lexical reading skill test, the experimental and control group boys had the mean of 26.9 and 28.0 and standard deviation of 5.19 and 5.29 respectively and they, in the same order, had the mean of 29.1 and 27.6 and the standard deviation of 5.39 and 5.25 respectively for Speed reading skill. This simply indicated that there was no significance difference in the sub-lexical, lexical and speed reading skills of the boys in both experimental and control group. This was very necessary as it affirmed that no group was given undue advantage. This was also established in the girls' performance in both groups: for sub-lexical reading skill test, the experimental and control group girls had the mean of 25.9 and 25.4 and standard deviation of 5.08 and 5.04 respectively while they respectively had for lexical reading skill, 23.8 mean; SD 4.88 and 22.5 mean; SD-4.74 and for speed reading skill test 26.2 mean; SD-5.12 and 26.7 mean; SD-5.17.

It connoted that the two groups shared similar entry behaviour and thus suitable for the programme.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of Experimental Group's Scores in Reading Test After Exposure to Cooperative Learning Technique.

Variables	Boys		Girls	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Sub-lexical reading	73.3	8.56	72.5	8.51
Lexical reading	72.6	8.52	69.5	8.34
Speed reading	76.4	8.74	79.0	8.89

Table 3 revealed that after teaching the students with cooperative learning technique, the boys had the mean and standard deviation of 73.3 and 8.56 respectively in the sub-lexical reading test performance while the girls similarly had the mean and standard deviation of 72.5 and 8.51 respectively. This showed a remarkable improvement in performance as a result of the cooperative learning technique adopted (far above 50). Similarly, similar feats were recorded in lexical reading test and speed reading test. In lexical reading test, the boys in the experimental group after being taught with cooperative learning technique had the mean of 72.6 and standard deviation of 8.52 while the girls' mean was 69.5 and standard deviation was 8.34

In speed reading test, the boys in the experimental group after being taught with cooperative learning technique had the mean of 76.4 and standard deviation of 8.74 while the girls' mean was 79.0 and standard deviation of 8.89.

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation of Control Group's Scores in Reading Test After Teaching Reading Course with Conventional Teacher/Students Method.

Variables	Boys		Girls	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Sub-lexical reading	47.7	6.91	49.6	7.04
Lexical reading	47.3	6.88	48.1	6.94
Speed reading	51.1	7.15	50.4	7.10

Table 4 showed that in sub-lexical reading test for the control group pupils, after being taught reading course with conventional teacher/students method, the boys' mean was 47.7 and standard deviation was 6.91 while the

girls' mean was 49.6 and standard deviation, 7.04. Although, there too was an improvement but it was very minor (below 50). The same goes for the pupils' lexical reading test where the boys in the control group had the mean of 47.3 and standard deviation of 6.88 while the girls' mean was 48.1 and standard deviation, 6.94. However, in speed reading test, the boys in the control group had the mean of 51.1 and standard deviation of 7.15 while the girls' mean was 50.4 and standard deviation was 7.10. This showed further improvement but still at a low ebb.

Hypothesis 1

Ho: There is no significant relationship between cooperative learning technique and pupils' sub-lexical reading skill.

Table 5: Cooperative Learning Technique and Pupils' Sub-Lexical Reading Skill

Groups	Gender	Xi	Xii	t crit
Experimental Group	Boys	Pre-28.8 Post-73.3	44.5	2.29
	Girls	Pre-25.9 Post-72.5	46.6	2.11
Control Group	Boys	Pre-28.3 Post-47.7	19.4	3.92
	Girls	Pre-25.4 Post-49.6	24.2	3.10

As could be seen in table 5 above, the mean difference of the experimental group for both boys and girls (44.5 and 46.6 respectively) for sub-lexical reading skill were far greater than those of their counterparts in the control group (19.4 and 24.2). As could be rightly observed from the above figures, it was an indication that the adoption of cooperative learning technique was twice better than conventional method to enhance pupils' sub-lexical reading skill.

Therefore, since cooperative learning technique had enhanced the greater mean difference between the pupils' pre and post scores in sub-lexical skill test, cooperative learning technique became the better teaching method and thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between cooperative learning technique and pupils' sub-lexical reading was rejected.

Hypothesis two

Ho: There is no significant relationship between cooperative learning technique and pupils' lexical reading skill.

Table 6 : Cooperative Learning Technique and Pupils' Lexical Reading Skill

Groups		Xi	Xii	t crit
Experimental Group	Boys	Pre-26.9 Post-72.6	45.7	2.18
	Girls	Pre-23.8 Post-69.5	45.7	2.04
Control Group	Boys	Pre-28.0 Post-47.3	19.3	3.90
	Girls	Pre-22.5 Post-48.1	25.6	2.76

Table 6 showed that the mean difference of the experimental group for both boys and girls (45.7 and 45.7 respectively) for lexical reading skill was greater than that of their counterparts in the control group (19.3 and 25.6). As far as pupils' lexical reading skill was concerned, the improvement recorded as a result of the adoption of cooperative learning technique, as could be directly seen from the figures above, almost doubled that of the conventional method.

Therefore, since cooperative learning technique had enhanced the greater mean difference between the pupils' pre and post scores in lexical reading skill test, cooperative

learning technique became the better teaching method and thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between cooperative learning technique and pupils' lexical reading was rejected.

Hypothesis three

Ho: There is no significant relationship between cooperative learning technique and pupils' Speed reading.

Table 7 : Cooperative Learning Technique and Pupils' Speed Reading Skill

Groups		Xi	Xii	t crit
Experimental Group	Boys	Pre-29.1 Post-76.4	47.3	2.23
	Girls	Pre-26.2 Post-79.0	52.8	1.99
Control Group	Boys	Pre-27.6 Post-51.1	23.5	3.35
	Girls	Pre-26.7 Post-50.4	23.7	3.25

As could be seen in table 3, the mean difference of the experimental group for both boys and girls (47.3 and 52.8 respectively) for speed reading skill was greater than that of their counterparts in the control group (23.5 and 23.7).

As far as pupils' speed reading skill was concerned, the improvement recorded as a result of the adoption of cooperative learning technique, as could be directly seen from the figures above, doubled that of the conventional method.

Therefore, since cooperative learning technique had enhanced the greater mean difference between the pupils' pre and post scores in speed reading skill test, cooperative learning technique became the better teaching method and thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between cooperative learning technique and pupils' lexical reading was rejected.

Discussions

The pupils in both experimental and control group shared great similarity in entry behaviour qualities: their ability was at par at the beginning of the experiment, thus emphasizing their suitability for this study.

The greater mean differences achieved through the use of cooperative learning technique, over and above the conventional teacher/students' teaching method, simply affirms that cooperative learning technique is far better than conventional teaching method.

The findings in this study confirms the position of Brady & Tsay (2010) who report that students who fully participated in group activities, exhibited collaborative behaviours, provided constructive feedback and cooperated with their group had a higher likelihood of receiving higher test scores and course grades at the end of the semester. Results from Brady & Tsay's (2010:85) study support the notion that cooperative learning is an active pedagogy that fosters higher academic achievement.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, there was no gender difference in the performance of the boys compared to the girls. It was discovered that primary school pupils' sub-lexical reading skill is positively influenced by the adoption of cooperative learning technique. Furthermore, it was ascertained that adoption of cooperative learning technique improves primary school pupils' lexical reading skill. It was equally discovered that adoption of cooperative learning technique enhances primary school pupils' speed reading skill.

Recommendations

Cooperative learning technique is strongly recommended as teaching method for reading course in primary four.

Proper training especially for the primary school teachers on the use and maintenance of the

objectives of cooperative learning technique should be organized in form of seminars and workshops to achieve fully the objectives of cooperative learning.

Suggestions for Further Studies

In pursuance of the objectives of the study, it is pertinent to note that there is a need to discover further the use of cooperative learning technique to solve the learning difficulty in various other primary schools' subjects. This becomes a challenge to all education stakeholders in Nigeria.

References

- Aldrich, H. & Shimazoe, J. (2010). Group work can be gratifying: Understanding and overcoming resistance to cooperative learning. *College Teaching*, 58(2), 52-57.
- Baker, T. & Clark, J. (2010). Cooperative learning- a double edged sword: A cooperative learning model for use with diverse student groups. *Intercultural Education*, 21(3), 257-268.
- Borowsky, R; Esopenko, C; Cummine, J. & Sarty, G. (2007). Neural representations of visual words and objects: a functional MRI study on the modularity of reading and object processing. *Brain Topogr* 20 (2), 89-96.
- Borowsky, R; Cummine, J; Owen, W.J; Friesen, C.K; Shih, F; & Sarty, G.E (2006). "fMRI of ventral and dorsal processing streams in basic reading processes: insular sensitivity to phonology. *Brain Topogr* 18 (4), 233-9.
- Carver, R.P (1990). *Reading rate: a review of research and theory*. Boston: Academic Press.

- Feitelson, D. (1988). *Facts and fads in beginning reading: A cross-language perspective*. Norwood, New Jersey, United States: Ablex.
- Gilles, R.M. & Adrian, F. (2003). *Cooperative Learning: The social and intellectual Outcomes of Learning in Groups*. London: Farmer Press.
- Hughes, D. & Stainthorp, R (1999). *Learning from children who read at an early age*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1975). *Learning together and alone, cooperation, competition, and individualization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1994). *Learning together and alone, cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Prentice-Hall.
- Johnson, D., Johnson, R. & Holubec, E. (1988). *Advanced cooperative learning*. Edin, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Kose, S.; Sahin, A.; Ergu, A. & Gezer, K. (2010). The effects of cooperative learning experience on eight grade students' achievement and attitude toward science. *Education*, 131 (1), 169-180.
- Legge, G.E; Mansfield, J.S. & Chung, S.T. (2001). Psychophysics of reading. Linking letter recognition to reading speed in central and peripheral vision. *Vision Research* 41 (6), 725-43.
- Powell, D.; Stainthorp, R.; Stuart, M.; Garwood, H. & Quinlan, P. (2007). An experimental comparison between rival theories of rapid automatized naming performance and its relationship to reading. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 98 (1), 46-68.
- Rayner, K. (1995). *The psychology of reading*. Alexander. London: Routledge.
- Sanabria, D.G; Torres, M.R. & Iglesias, J. (2009). Changes in reading strategies in school-age children. *Span J. Psychol* 12 (2), 441-53.
- Sharan, Y (2010). Cooperative learning for academic and social gains: Valued pedagogy, problematic practice. *European Journal of Education* 45(2), 300-313.
- Tsay, M. & Brady, M. (2010). A case study of cooperative learning and communication pedagogy: Does working in teams make a difference? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10(2), 78 – 89.

Adebayo Komolafe, Ph.D
Department of Educational Psychology,
Guidance and Counselling,
Adeniran Ogunsanya College of Education,
Otto/Ijanikin.