

## **CHAPTER - 5**

### **INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION**



## 5.1 Interpretation

The present study was in two parts :

- \* Part I of the study was concerned with the analysis of the students' oral reading miscues (errors).
- \* Part II of the study was concerned with the comprehension of the students under two modes of text presentation i.e. aural and normal (reading)

### PART : I

The research questions concerning part I of the study were :

1. Does reliance on the different available cue system differ with the students of different gender (Boys and Girls) ?
2. Does reliance on the different available cue system differ with the students of different grades (III, IV and V) ?

To answer the research question 1 data was collected with the help of a tool developed for this purpose by the researcher. After scoring and tabulating the results obtained. It has been presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows different types of miscues as committed by different genders (boys/girls). Each miscue is further classified on the basis of different grades (i.e. positive, intermediate and negative) to give a clear cut picture about the grades of miscues. In table 2, the boys have got mean of 11.03 of substitution miscues with 8.05 SD. Whereas girls got 9.56 mean of substitution miscues with 6.78 SD. The mean score of insertion miscues committed by the boys is 1.56 with 1.52 SD and by the girls it is 1.96 with 2.47 SD. The mean score of omission miscues committed by the boys is 2.63 with 1.29 SD and by the girls. It is 2.90 with 3.43 SD.

The boys have scored mean of 0.06 of reversal miscues with 0.25 SD; whereas the girls got 0.10 mean score of reversal miscues with 0.30 SD. The mean score of self-correction miscues committed by the boys is 1.43 with 1.59 SD and by the girls it is 1.63 with 1.49 SD. The mean score of refusal miscues committed by the boys is 1.16 with 2.40 SD and by the girls is 0.86 with 2.04 SD. The boys have scored mean of 17.83 of total miscues with 10.20 SD. Whereas the girls got mean of 16.96 with 11.49 SD.

The boys have scored mean of 1.30 of hesitation miscues with 1.39 SD whereas the girls got 1.56 mean score of hesitation miscues with 1.69 SD. The mean score of repetition miscues committed by the boys is 6.80 with 7.00 SD and by the girls it is 4.89 with 3.79 SD.

From Table 2 it is visible that the pattern of grades of substitution miscues is different between boys and girls. The boys have committed maximum intermediate substitution miscues and minimum positive substitution miscues whereas girls have committed maximum intermediate substitution miscues and minimum negative substitution miscues. The pattern of grades of insertion, omission, self correction miscues is same between boys and girls. Both have committed maximum positive, miscues and minimum negative miscues. The patterns of grades of reversal miscues is same between boys and girls. Both have committed maximum positive reversal miscues and minimum intermediate miscues. The pattern of refusal miscues is also same between the boys and girls. The boys and girls have committed maximum negative and minimum positive refusal miscues.

The pattern of grades of the total miscues is also same between boys and girls. Both have committed maximum negative miscues and minimum positive miscues.

Table 3 shows different types of miscues as committed by the boys and girls of grade III. Each miscue is further classified on the basis of different grades (i.e. positive, negative and intermediate). In Table 3 the boys of grade III have scored mean of 11.80 of substitution miscues with 6.46 SD whereas girls got mean of 14.5 of substitution miscue with 7.77 SD.

The mean score of insertion miscues committed by the boys is 1.6 with 1.26 SD and by the girls, it is 1.9 with 2.33 SD. The mean score of omission miscues committed by the boys is 3.3 with 1.33 SD and by the girls it is 5.2 with 4.84 SD. The mean score of reversal miscues committed by the boys of grade III is 0.00 and by the girls it is 0.10 with 0.31 SD. The mean score of self correction miscues committed by the boys of grade III is 1.4 with 1.07 SD and by the girls it is 1.20 with 1.31 SD. The mean score of refusal miscues committed by the boys of grade III is 2.3 with 3.59 SD and by the girls it is 1.6 with 3.13 SD. The mean share of the total miscues committed by the boys of grade III is 20.2 with 8.59 SD and by the girls it is 24.6 with 13.98 SD.

The boys have scored mean of 1.00 of hesitation miscues with 1.05 SD whereas the girls got 1.60 mean score of hesitation miscues with 2.36 SD. The mean score of repetition miscues committed by the boys is 6.10 with 6.96 SD and by the girls it is 6.80 with 4.59



Table 3 indicates that the pattern of grades of substitution miscues is different between boys and girls of grade III. The boys have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues whereas the girls have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues. The patterns of grades of insertion, omission and self correction miscues are same between the boys and girls of grade III. Both have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues. The pattern of grades of reversal miscues is different. The boys have not committed miscues whereas the girls have committed only negative miscues. The pattern of refusal miscues is same. The boys have committed maximum negative miscues and minimum positive miscues. The pattern of the total miscues committed by the boys and girls of grade III is same. Both have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues.

Table 4 shows different types of miscues committed by the boys and girls of grade IV. Each miscue is further classified on the basis of different grades (i.e. positive, intermediate and negative). The mean score of substitution miscues committed by the boys of grade IV is 13.00 with 10.9 SD and by the girls it is 9.20 with 4.13 SD. The mean score of insertion miscues committed by the boys of grade IV is 1.60 with 1.89 SD and by the girls it is 2.10 with 1.66 SD.

The mean score of omission miscues committed by the boys is 2.30 with 1.41 SD and by the girls it is 2.20 with 1.31 SD. The mean scores of reversal miscues committed by the boys is 0 and by the girls it is 0.10 with 0.31 SD. The mean score of self correction miscue committed by the boys is 1.10 with 1.10 SD and by the girls it is 1.10 with 0.99 SD. The mean score of refusal miscues committed by the boys is 1.10 with 1.72 SD and by the girls it is 0.90 with 1.52 SD. The mean scores of the total miscues committed by the boys of grade IV is 19.10 with 13.80 SD and by the girls it is 15.60 with 6.11 SD.

The boys have scored mean of 0.90 of hesitation miscues with 0.73 SD whereas the girls got 0.80 mean score of hesitation miscues with 1.03 SD. The mean score of repetition miscues committed by the boys is 8.80 with 9.42 SD and by the girls it is 5.40 with 3.16 SD.

Table 4 reveals that the pattern of grades of substitution miscues is same between the boys and girls of grade IV. Both have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues. The patterns of grades of insertion, omission, reversal and self correction miscues are same between the boys and girls of grade IV. Both have

committed maximum positive and minimum negative miscues.

The pattern of grades of refusal miscues is different between the boys and girls of grade IV. The boys have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues.

The pattern of the grades of the total miscues is same between the boys and girls of grade IV. Both have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues.

Table 5 indicates different types of miscues committed by the boys and girls of grade V. The mean score of substitution miscues committed by the boys of grade V is 8.30 with 5.77 SD and by the girls it is 5.00 with 4.52 SD. The mean scores of insertion error committed by the boys of grade V is 1.50 with 1.50 SD and by the girls it is 1.90 with 3.38 SD. The mean score of omission miscues committed by the boys of grade V is 2.30 with 0.94 SD and by the girls it is 1.30 with 1.88 SD.

The mean score of reversal miscues committed by the boys of grade V is 0.20 with 0.42 SD and by the girls of grade V it is 0.10 with 0.31 SD. The mean score of self correction miscues committed by the boys of grade V is 1.80 with 2.34 SD and by the girls of grade V it is 2.60 with 1.71 SD. The mean score of refusal miscues committed by the boys and the girls of grade V is same i.e. 0.10 with 0.31 SD.

The mean score of the total miscues committed by the boys of grade V is 14.2 with 7.34 SD and by the girls of grade V it is 10.70 with 9.09 SD.

The boys of grade V scored mean of 2.00 of hesitation miscues with 1.94 SD whereas the girls got 2.30 mean score of hesitation miscues with 1.15 SD. The mean score of repetition miscues committed by the boys is 5.50 with 3.74 Sd and by the girls it is 3.20 with 3.45 SD.

Table 5 reveals that the pattern of grades of substitution miscues is different between the boys and girls of grade V. The boys have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues whereas the girls got maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues. The patterns of grade of insertion and omission and self correction miscues are same between the boys and the girls of grade V. Both have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues. The pattern of the grades of reversal miscues is different between the boys and girls of grade V. The boys have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues and



minimum intermediate miscues. The pattern of the grades of refusal miscues is also different between the boys and girls of grade V. The boys have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues whereas the girls got maximum negative miscues and minimum positive miscues. The pattern of the grades of the total miscues is same between the boys and the girls of grade V. The boys have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues.

To answer the research question 2 data was collected with the help of the tool developed for this purpose by the researcher. After scoring and tabulating the scores, the results obtained have been presented in Table 6.

Table 6 shows different types of miscues as committed by different grades (III, IV and V). Each miscue is further classified on the basis of different grades (i.e. positive, intermediate and negative) to give a clear cut picture about the grades of miscues.

Table 6 reveals that the students of grade III, IV and V got mean of 13.15, 11.10 and 6.65 of substitution miscues with 7.09, 8.31 and 5.32 SD respectively.

The mean score of insertion miscues committed by the students of grade III is 1.75 with 1.83 SD, by the students of grade IV it is 1.85 with 1.75 SD and by the students of grade V it is 1.70 with 2.55 SD. The mean score of omission miscues committed by the students of grade III is 4.25 with 3.59 SD, by the students of grade IV it is 2.25 with 1.33 SD and by grade V it is 1.80 with 1.54 SD. The mean score of reversal miscues committed by the students of grade III and IV is same (i.e. 0.05 with 0.22 SD) and by the students of grade V it is 0.15 with 0.36 SD.

The mean score of self correction miscues committed by the students of grade III is 1.30 with 1.17 SD, by the students of grade IV it is 1.10 with 1.02 SD and by the students of grade V it is 2.20 with 2.04 SD. The mean score of refusal miscues committed by the students of grade III is 1.95 with 3.30 SD, by the students of grade IV it is 1.00 with 1.58 SD and by the students of grade V it is 0.10 with 0.30 SD.

The mean score of total miscues committed by the students of grade III is 22.40 with 11.52 SD, by the students of grade IV it is 17.35 with 10.55 SD and by the students of grade V it is 12.45 with 8.24 SD.

The mean score of hesitation miscues committed by the students of grade III is 1.30 with 1.80 SD and by the students of grade IV it is 0.85 with 0.87 SD and by the students of grade V it is 2.15 with 1.56 SD. The mean score of repetition miscues committed by

the students of grade III is 6.45 with 5.74 SD and by the students of grade IV it is 13.63 with 29.0 and by the students of grade V it is 4.35 with 3.70 SD.

From Table 6 it is visible that the pattern of grades of substitution miscues is different among different grades (i.e. III, IV and V). The students of grade III have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues. Whereas the students of grade IV have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues and the students of grade V have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues. The patterns of grades of insertion, omission and self correction miscues are same among different grades. The students of grade III, IV and V have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues.

The pattern of grade of reversal miscues is different among different grades. The students of grade III have committed maximum negative and minimum positive miscues whereas the students of grade IV have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues and the students of grade V have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum intermediate miscues.

The pattern of grade of refusal miscues is also different among different grades. The students of grade III have committed maximum negative miscues and minimum positive miscues whereas the students of grade IV have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues and the students of grade V have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum intermediate miscues.

The pattern of grade of the total miscues is different among different grade (i.e. III, IV and V). The students of grade III have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues whereas the students of grade IV have committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum positive miscues and the students of grade V have committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues.

## **PART : II**

Part II of this study is concerned with the comprehension under two modes of text presentation i.e. aural and reading.

In Table 7 the value of '*t*' obtained for aural comprehension between total boys and total girls is 0.45, the table value of '*t*' for 58 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.00 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H<sub>0</sub> (1) is accepted and H<sub>1</sub> (1) is rejected, which means that there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and the girls on



dependent variable aural comprehension. Thus, the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (1) is accepted.

The value of ' $t$ ' obtained for reading comprehension between total boys and total girls is 0.25, the table value of ' $t$ ' for 58 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.00 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of ' $t$ ' obtained is not significant. Hence  $H_0$  (2) is accepted and  $H_1$  (2) is rejected which means that there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and the girls on dependent variable reading comprehension.

Thus the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (2) is accepted.

In Table 8 the value of ' $t$ ' obtained for aural comprehension between grade III and IV is 0.24, the Table value of ' $t$ ' for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of ' $t$ ' obtained is not significant. Hence  $H_0$  (3) is accepted and  $H_1$  (3) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade III and IV on aural comprehension.

Thus the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (3) is accepted.

The value of ' $t$ ' obtained for reading comprehension between the students of grade III and IV is 0.20, the table value of ' $t$ ' for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of ' $t$ ' obtained is not significant. Hence  $H_0$  (4) is accepted and  $H_1$  (4) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade III and IV on reading comprehension.

Thus the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (4) is accepted.

In Table 9, the value of ' $t$ ' obtained for aural comprehension between the students of grade III and V is 2.82, the table value of ' $t$ ' for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is less than the calculated value. This shows that the value of ' $t$ ' obtained is significant. Hence  $H_0$  (5) is rejected and  $H_1$  (5) is accepted which means there is a real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade III a real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade IV and V on aural comprehension. Thus the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  (5) is accepted.

The value of ' $t$ ' obtained for reading comprehension between the students of grade III and V is 1.75, the table value of ' $t$ ' for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02



which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is non-significant. Hence H0 (6) is accepted and H1 (6) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the grade III and V on reading comprehension.

Thus, the null hypothesis H0 (6) is accepted.

In Table 10, the value of '*t*' obtained for aural comprehension between the students of grade IV and V is 3.45, the table value of '*t*' for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is less than calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is significant. Hence H0 (7) is rejected and H1 (7) is accepted which means there is a real difference between the mean scores of the students of grade IV and V on aural comprehension. Thus the alternative hypothesis H1 (7) is accepted.

The value of '*t*' obtained for reading comprehension between the students of grade IV and V is 1.68, the table value of '*t*' for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is more than calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is non significant. Hence H0 (8) is accepted and H1 (8) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by grade IV and V on reading comprehension.

Thus the null hypothesis H0 (8) is accepted.

In Table 11, the value of '*t*' obtained for aural comprehension between the boys and girls of grade III is 0.45, the table value of '*t*' for 18 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.10 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H0 (9) is accepted and H1 (9) is rejected which means that there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and girls of grade III on aural comprehension.

Thus the null hypothesis H0 (9) is accepted.

The value of '*t*' obtained for reading comprehension between the boys and girls of grade III is 1.86, the table value of '*t*' for 18 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.10 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H0 (10) is accepted and H1 (10) is rejected which means that there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and girls of grade III on reading comprehension.

Thus the null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> (10) is accepted.

In Table 12, the value of '*t*' obtained for aural comprehension between the boys and girls of grade IV is 1.41, the table value of '*t*' for 18 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.10 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H<sub>0</sub> (11) is accepted and H<sub>1</sub> (11) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and girls of grade IV on aural comprehension.

Thus null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> (11) is accepted.

The value of '*t*' obtained for reading comprehension between the boys and girls of grade IV is 0.65, the table value of '*t*' for 18 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.10 which is more than calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H<sub>0</sub> (12) is accepted and H<sub>1</sub> (11) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and girls of grade IV on reading comprehension.

Thus null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> (12) is accepted.

In Table 13, the value of '*t*' obtained for aural comprehension between the boys and girls of grade V is 0.53, the table value of '*t*' for 18 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.10 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H<sub>0</sub> (13) is accepted and H<sub>1</sub> (13) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and girls of grade IV on aural comprehension.

Thus null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> (13) is accepted.

The value of '*t*' obtained for reading comprehension between the boys and girls of grade V is 1.65, the table value of '*t*' for 18 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.10 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of '*t*' obtained is not significant. Hence H<sub>0</sub> (14) is accepted and H<sub>1</sub> (14) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys and girls of grade V on reading comprehension.

Thus null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> (14) is accepted.



In Table 14 the value of  $t$  between the aural and reading comprehension is 3.01 for boys. The table value of  $t$  for 58 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.00 which is less than the calculated value. This shows that the value of  $t$  obtained is significant. Hence  $H_0$  (15) is rejected and  $H_1$  (15) is accepted which means there is a real difference between the mean scores obtained by the boys on aural and reading comprehension. Thus the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  (15) is accepted.

The value of  $t$  between the aural and reading comprehension is 1.61 for girls, the table value of  $t$  for 58 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.00 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of  $t$  obtained is not significant. Hence  $H_0$  (16) is accepted and  $H_1$  (16) is rejected which means there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the girls on aural and reading comprehension. Thus the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (16) is accepted.

In Table 15 the value of  $t$  between the aural and reading comprehension is 1.42 for the students of grade III. The Table value of  $t$  for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of  $t$  obtained is not significant. Hence  $H_0$  (17) is accepted and  $H_1$  (17) is rejected which means that there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade III on aural and reading comprehension. Thus the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (17) is accepted.

The value of  $t$  between the aural and reading comprehension is 1.53 for the students of grade IV. The Table value of  $t$  for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is more than the calculated value. This shows that the value of  $t$  obtained is not significant. Hence  $H_0$  (18) is accepted and  $H_1$  (18) is rejected which means that there is no real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade IV on aural and reading comprehension. Thus the null hypothesis  $H_0$  (18) is accepted.

The value of  $t$  between the aural and reading comprehension is 3.30 for the students of grade V. The Table value of  $t$  for 38 df at 0.05 level of significance is 2.02 which is less than the calculated value. This shows that the value of  $t$  obtained is significant. Hence  $H_0$  (19) is rejected and  $H_1$  (19) is accepted which means that there is a real difference between the mean scores obtained by the students of grade V on aural and reading comprehension. Thus the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  (19) is accepted.

## 5.2 Discussion

It was found in the present study that there was no difference when gender (boys and girls) was taken into consideration on reading accuracy scores. The patterns of grade (i.e. positive, intermediate and negative) of the total miscues were same between boys and girls. Both had committed maximum negative and minimum positive miscues. The findings of Pumfrey and Fletcher (1989) also support to the findings of the present study that no significant differences were found on different miscues scores (graphophonic, semantic and syntactic) of boys and girls even after taking into consideration.

Read and Pumfrey (1992) also found no significant difference in the scores, when compared the reading accuracy and reading comprehension of forty-eight 8-11 year old boys and girls.

There was a real difference among different grades (i.e. III, IV and V) on reading accuracy. The patterns of grades (i.e. positive, intermediate and negative) of the miscues were found different among different grades (i.e. III, IV and V). The students of grade III had committed maximum intermediate miscues and minimum negative miscues whereas the students of grade IV committed maximum positive miscues whereas the students of grade V committed maximum positive miscues and minimum negative miscues.

No significant gender difference between aural and reading comprehension scores were found. This finding supports to the findings of Gaur (1982), Hoglebe et.al. (1985) and Read and Pumfrey (1992).

On aural comprehension there was no significant difference between the students of grade III and V whereas there was significant difference between the students of grade IV and V. The performance of the students of grade V was better than the students of grade III and grade IV.

In the present study, it was found that there was no significant difference between the reading comprehension of the students of different grades (i.e. III and IV, III and V, IV and V) on reading comprehension. Read and Pumfrey (1992) had reported similar results.

The mean aural comprehension score of the boys was found better than their reading comprehension whereas there was no significant difference between the reading and



aural comprehension of the girls was found. Curtis (1980) and Wilkinson (1980) also found that the listening comprehension of the children was significantly superior to their reading comprehension.

It was found that there was no significant difference between the aural and reading comprehension of the students of grade III and IV, whereas the aural comprehension of the students grade V was found better than their reading comprehension.