

LANGUAGE, PEDAGOGY & SOCIAL DISCOURSE

In honour of Professor Tunde Ajiboye at 70

Editors:

Isaiah Bariki
Yetunde Oluwafisan
Domwin D. Kuupole
Augustin Ainamon
Kolman Essowé Essizewa
Léonard Koussouhon
Fidèle K. Nubukpo

Vol. I

LANGUAGE, PEDAGOGY & SOCIAL DISCOURSE

Published by:

Department of French,

University of Ilorin,

Ilorin-Nigeria

© 2019 Department of French, University of Ilorin

Ilorin-Nigeria

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically or otherwise, without written prior permission of the author who is the copyright owner.

Printed and Produced by:

University of Ilorin Press

Ilorin-Nigeria

Edited by:

Isaiah Bariki

Yetunde Oluwafisan

Domwin D. Kuupole

Augustin Ainamon

Kolman Essowé Essizewa

Léonard Koussouhon

Fidèle K. Nubukpo

CHAPTER ONE

When 'Worlds' Collide: A linguistic Re-reading of Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* through the Eyes of Everett
Prof. MEDUBI, Oyinkan

1

CHAPTER TWO

Sociolinguistic Study of Insults and Curses among Yorùbá-Speaking Children in Nigeria
FRIDAY-OTUN, Joseph Omoniyi (Ph.D)

16

CHAPTER THREE

Cohesion in Poetic Discourse: A Study of Olafioye's *The Parliament of Idiots* and Launko's *Pain Remembers, Love Rekindles*
ALABI, Taofiq Adedayo (Ph.D)

32

CHAPTER FOUR

Tackling Issues Arising From the Translation of English Hymns into Yoruba
OLUWAFISAN, Yetunde (Ph.D).....

45

CHAPTER FIVE

The Nigeria French Language Village's Postgraduate Diploma in Translation and Interpretation Program: Context, Content and Comments
AFOLABI, Segun (Ph.D).....

61

CHAPTER SIX

Translation Studies and Globalisation
Prof. ESTELLE, Minaflinou & SERVAIS, Akpaca (Ph.D)

84

CHAPTER SEVEN

La théorie ethnolinguistique : Quelques démonstrations tirées de l'apprentissage du français au Nigeria
GBADAMOSI, Babatunde Alani

98

CHAPTER EIGHT

Codes et comportements liés à la corruption sur des axes routiers du Bénin et du Nigeria
IBRAHIM, Abdul-Rahman Burour & ATCHADE, Chambi Julien

109

CHAPTER NINE

Lumière sur l'interprétation des gestes yoruba en français à travers la notion de logique de C.S Peirce
AFOLABI, Temitope (Ph.D)

116

CHAPTER TEN

La dynamique de l'interprétation stylistique des proses à

cas de <i>Tebonse</i> de Boubé Saley TIJANI, Yunus Oladejo (Ph.D).....	127
---	-----

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Les législations linguistiques: Quelques témoignages du français au Nigeria ISA, Bayo.....	136
---	-----

CHAPTER TWELVE

A Contrastive Study of Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba Consonants ADEKEYE, Bolanle (Ph.D), NA'ALLAH, Abdullahi & AMAECHI, Mary...	148
---	-----

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Informativity as a Stylistic Element: Discourse in <i>Ifá</i> Corpus and Yorùbá Proverbs OKEWANDE, Oluwole Tewogboye (Ph.D).....	161
---	-----

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

La traduction pédagogique face à la faible compétence linguistique des apprenants en contexte universitaire nigérian Prof. TIJANI, M. A.	174
---	-----

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

The Role of Costume in Characters Building: An Example of Toyin Abiodun's <i>The Marriage of Arike</i> ADEGBITE, Adesina.....	184
---	-----

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Analysis of Strategies for Translating Culture-Specific Expressions in Soyinka's <i>In the Forest of Olódùmarè</i> ABUBAKRE, Samiat Olubunmi and Prof. ABDUSSALAM, A.....	194
---	-----

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

Can Advanced Learners of French Do without Interference from English as a Second Language in their Online Production? A Case Study of Year Abroad Students' Discourse in French AGYAKWA, Abena N. (Ph.D). & DE-SOUZA, Anthony Y. M (Ph.D).....	214
---	-----

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

A New Criticism of Gabriel Garcia Marquez's "No One Writes to the Colonel" DUNMADE, Femi (Ph.D).....	231
---	-----

CHAPTER NINETEEN

Discours littéraire et enjeu politique dans <i>Le roman de Pauline</i> de Calixthe Beyala	
---	--

DONGMO, Adelaïde Keudem (Ph.D); ABDULMALIK, Ismail and OGONYE, Lois.....	251
CHAPTER TWENTY	
“Ruin the Body”: A Discourse on Death and Annihilation in Rūmī’s <i>Mathnawī</i>	
FAHM, Olawale Abdulgafar (Ph.D)	261
CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE	
A Slose Security of Language and Identity in Junot Diaz’s <i>This is How You Lose Her</i>	
TRAORÉ, Moussa (Ph.D).....	274
CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO	
Le fonctionnement de l’absurde dans le nouveau roman africain: Une analyse de <i>Rue Felix-Faure</i> de Ken Bugul	
COFFIE, Dennis (Ph.D) & KODAH, Mawuloe Koffi (Ph.D).....	292
CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE	
Democratic Illiteracy: A Threat to Sustainable Democracy and Peace in Ghana	
KODAH, Mawuloe Koffi.....	312
CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR	
Multisensory and Metacognitive Instructional Approaches as Determinants of Underachieving Nigerian Secondary School Students’ Achievement in English Vocabulary	
ADENIYI, Folakemi Oyeyemi (Ph.D); Prof. LAWAL, Raheem Adebayo & MURAINA, Yusuf (Ph.D).....	325
CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE	
Mapping Research Reports with Tables, Charts and Figures	
SANNI-SULEIMAN, Afsat (Ph.D).....	338

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

Confronting the Challenge of Academic Research Report
Writing in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria

LAWAL, Faridah Oluwatoyin (Ph.D) 347

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

Higher Education Literary Criticism Teaching Approaches:
Nigeria Colleges of Education Lecturer's Assessment

ADENIYI, F. Oyeyemi (Ph.D) & ADEKANYE, F. Oyinlade..... 355

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

An Artistic Approach to Postcolonial Discourse in Africa: A Case
Study of Some Found Object Sculptures

BARIKI, Moses 367

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

An Overview of the Importance of French Language for an
International Researcher: An Outsider's Perspective

ADEBAYO, Peter (Ph.D) 385

CHAPTER THIRTY

L'intégration des DVD audiovisuels dans la formation des
enseignants des écoles normales au Ghana : L'implication pédagogique

Prof. KUUPOLE, D. Domwin & KOKROKO, Evans (Ph.D)..... 396

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

A Systemic Framework for Quality Assurance in Teacher Education

Prof. LAWAL, Adebayo..... 408

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

Freewill and Determinism in Modern Philosophy, Human
Psychology and Bible Doctrine of Choice and Responsibility.

SIWOKU-AWI, O. F. (Ph.D) 421

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 and its Relevance to
Redeemed Christian Church of God Women in Nigeria

OYETADE, Michael Oyebowale..... 434

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

An Appraisal of the Influence of Yoruba Language on African
Christianity: A Case Study of Samuel Ajayi Crowther

**AJETOMOBI, Olumuyiwa Aduralere &
OLORUNNIMBE, Michael Oladele**..... 446

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

MULTISENSORY AND METACOGNITIVE INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES AS DETERMINANTS OF UNDERACHIEVING NIGERIAN SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH VOCABULARY

ADENIYI, Folakemi Oyeyemi;
Prof. LAWAL, Raheem Adebayo &
MURAINA, Yusuf (Ph.D)
Department of Arts Education,
University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Introduction

English language is the most widely used language by the non native speakers, even though it is not the most widely spoken language. This made the teaching of English as the second language a very important endeavour (Kittao, 2003). The teaching of English to nonnative speaker is refers to as English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as the second language (ESL), depending on the historical context. Quirk and Smirth (1978) assert that English as a foreign language is now generally taken to mean teaching the language as a subject for purposes similar to those for which French and German were taught in USA. English as a second language means teaching English in situations where it serves as a language of wider communication and the medium of instruction in at least part of educational system. Tiffen (1982) observes that the child growing up in English speaking Africa, such as Nigeria, is surrounded by a complex language situation, for besides having to master his own and often a second or even third indigenous language, he also requires a thorough command of the English language, if he is to be educated in the modern sense of it.

The core of a language involves the sound system, the syntactic structure and the vocabulary (Unoh, 1987). But of prime importance among these is the vocabulary (Kruse, 1929 as cited in Adeniyi, 2006). The reader must know the meaning of enough of sentence. Kim Seoh (1996) asserts that lexical competence implies more than just knowing what a word means. It subsumes a number of other kinds of knowledge including knowing what a word means, what differentiates one word from the other words that appear to mean the same. Others include what other meanings a word might have. What links it has with other items in the lexicon, how it behaves syntactically and just as importantly, its limitation of use according to situation and function. This means that vocabulary instruction should go beyond just helping the learner to internalize dictionary meaning. A central purpose in teaching should be to encourage and help the learner to become more aware of how native speakers and other proficient speakers use the target language, and to be more sensitive to differences in nuances and shades of meaning.

This important teaching purpose is possible with average students who have no record of serious second language learning difficulty. For the under achievers on the other hand, English language teachers would need an explicit and distinctive approach to teach them. Gefen (1980) as cited in Adeniyi and Lawal 2016) classified learners in a typical English language class into two types. They are able (achievers) and less able (underachievers). The able students according to him learn according to the agreed syllabus and progress satisfactorily in all four skills. The less able students (underachievers) are still capable of learning, but they have difficulties and, all too often

fail, they give up easily and soon become disillusioned. Much teaching efforts needed to be directed towards this set of students.

Several reasons have been identified as the causes of underachievement in language learning. Thorne (2008) identifies slow maturation, fearfulness and anxiety, illness and bodily defects, aptitude and so on. Nelson (2006) identifies poor teaching strategy and poor instructional materials as the most important factors causing underachievement in ESL class. Yusuf (2001) defines instructional materials as different forms of information carriers, which are used to record, store, preserve, transmit, or retrieve information for the purpose of teaching and discussions. The importance of vocabulary in learning a new language is not in doubt. The causes of underachievement in English language have also been underscored, especially as they relate to the significant role which instructional materials and method play in ESL class, and the need to assist and motivate underachieving learners to experience achievement and progress.

Statement of the Problem

For a number of years, second language teachers have faced the perplexing issue of how to assist students who struggle to learn a second language. Poor teaching strategies and poor instructional materials are identified as the most important factors of underachievement in learning English language (Nelson, 1976). This is because most teachers do not know the appropriate teaching strategies and methodology to adopt in teaching specific aspects of English language. In addition there has been increasing awareness about the special needs of learning difficulties from areas in which cultural expectations includes the use of more languages as is the situation in Nigeria. As a result of this, there is a need for appropriate instructional approach that will help both the teachers and the students. Moreover most teachers have failed to see the importance of using teaching aids, which can be used for presentation, practice, revision, and testing in the ESL classroom. Students' interest is killed because they are bored with the traditional 'talk and board' teaching approach. Therefore there is a need to re-emphasize the use of learner-centered approaches that involve different teaching materials and several linguistic levels of vocabulary. An investigation into the comparative effects of such instructional approaches as the Multisensory and Metacognitive approaches on the vocabulary achievement of underachieving secondary school students thus becomes highly desirable, so as to ascertain the approaches that can best assist and motivate underachievers to experience achievement and progress.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims at finding the comparative effects of Multisensory, Metacognitive and the combination of Multisensory and Metacognitive Instructional Approaches on English vocabulary learning of underachieving secondary school students in Ilorin Nigeria. Specifically, this study intends to investigate;

- i. The effects of Multisensory Instructional Approach (MSIA) on underachieving secondary school students' achievement in pronunciation spelling, morphology, lexico-syntax and lexico-semantics).
- ii The effects of Metacognitive Instructional Approach (MCIA) on underachieving secondary school students' achievement in pronunciation spelling, morphology, lexico-syntax and lexico-semantics).
- iii The effects of the combination of Multisensory, and Metacognitive Instructional Approaches on underachieving secondary school students' achievement in pronunciation, spelling, morphology, lexico-syntax and lexico-semantics.

Research Questions

- i. Will there be any difference in the effects of multisensory, metacognitive, the combination of MSIA and MCIA, and the Conventional Instructional Approaches on vocabulary achievement of the underachievers?
- ii. Will there be any difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the pronunciation achievement of the underachieving students
- iii. Will there be any difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the spelling achievement of the underachieving students.
- iv. Will there be any difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the morphological achievement of the underachieving students.
- v. Will there be any difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the lexico-syntax achievement of the underachieving students
- vi. Will there be any significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the lexico-semantics achievement of the underachieving students.

Research Hypotheses

- Ho₁: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, the combination of MSIA and MCIA Instructional Approaches and the Conventional Instructional Approach on the vocabulary achievement of the underachieving students
- Ho₂: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the pronunciation achievement of the underachieving students.
- Ho₃: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the spelling achievement of the underachieving students.
- Ho₄: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the morphology achievement of the underachieving students.

- Ho₅: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the lexico-syntax achievement of the underachieving students.
- Ho₆: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the lexico-semantics achievement of the underachieving students.

Research Design

This study adopted a quasi-experimental design of pretest-post-test, control group only. Therefore, a four by two by five factorial designs was employed. Four levels of independent variables (treatment and control) and five levels of vocabulary dimensions were investigated in the study. This design permits the establishment of causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The interactive effects of the four instructional approaches on the vocabulary achievement of the underachievers were determined. The four instructional approaches are the independent variables and the five levels of vocabulary dimension are the dependent variables. Gains from these variables were measured in terms of the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores.

Population, Sample and Sampling Technique

All underachieving secondary school one students (SS1) in Ilorin metropolis are the target population for this study. However, based on quasi experimental design, which involves four groups, the stratified random sampling technique based on gender, school location, type of school, funding pattern, year of establishment, and teacher-student ratio were employed to select schools required for the study. There after four schools which are comparable in terms of the listed criteria were finally selected for the study and SS1 Arts students who consistently scored below 40% in English language were selected for the study.

Instrumentation

The following research instruments were designed by the researcher and used to gather data for the study component of the experimental treatment as well as the control group. These manuals guided the teachers in their systematic teaching procedures.

- 1b. The instructional manual prepared for the students which feature all the selected lexical items that could be found in the SSS English curriculum. All these lexical items have multisensory appeal.
2. The vocabulary achievement test (VAT) for the students. This contains the JSS3 Examination past questions that have multisensory appeal.

Procedure for Data Collection

This contains three stages. Stage one is the pretest and stage two is the administration of the test. All the 120 subjects selected for the study are divided into the three experimental and one control group, they all took part in the two tests. The test consisted of one hundred questions (twenty questions for each vocabulary dimension). Each of the experimental teachers was attached to a particular group of underachievers. Stage three is the posttest. At the end of the teaching activity, the posttest was administered on all the four groups involved in the study. The same teachers who taught the students also administered on all the four groups involved in the study. The same teachers who taught the students also administered the tests, while the researcher coordinated the exercise.

Data Analysis Techniques

After the treatment had been administered for a period of six weeks to the three experimental and control groups, a posttest was carried out on all the four groups. The ANCOVA {Analysis of covariance} statistic was used to determine whether there were any significant difference among the post-test scores with the pre-test score serving as covariates. This statistical method was preferred because it is robust enough to cater for this kind of study, which is quasi-experimental. Where significant difference existed, the Duncan Multiple Range test was used to confirm which pairs of the variables were significantly different.

Presentation of Results

H₀₁: No significant difference in the effects of Multisensory Instructional Approach (MSIA), Metacognitive Instructional Approach (MCIA), the combination of MSIA and MCIA and the Conventional Instructional Approach on the vocabulary achievement of the underachieving students.

Table1: Summary of Analysis of Covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students Vocabulary Achievement Scores

Source	Type III sum of Squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig	Partial Eta
Model	.5914.996b	4	1478.749	63.958	.000	.690
Coveriate	.2044.129	1	2044.129		.000	.435
INSAPP(Treatment)	.337.131	3	1112.377		.000	.557
Residual	.2658.871	115	23.121			
Corrected Total	.8573.867	119				

Table 1 shows that the calculated f-value which is 48.11 was significant at $p > 0.05$, the hypothesis is rejected. This result indicates that the instructional approaches had significant effects on students' vocabulary achievement. From the table also, the treatment produced a significant difference from the post-test scores of the students when pre-test scores were used as covariates. Therefore, hypothesis one was rejected. A follow up of Duncan Multiple Range Test was conducted to determine the actual source of difference in the effectiveness of the variables investigated.

Table 2: Duncan Mutiple Range Test of Dimensions of Significant Difference in the Effectiveness among the Variables investigated.

	No of cases	Mean score	Duncan grouping
MSIA	30	55.20	A
MCIA	30	45.73	B
MSIA+MCIA	30	463.7	B
CIA	30	39.23	C

Means with the same letters are not significantly different

Table 2 shows the performance Mean scores for each group as well as the Duncan grouping in order to establish the source of difference. The result indicates that MSIA is the most effective, followed by MCIA and MSIA+MCIA. This means that the three approaches are more effective than the Conventional approach which is labeled 'C'. Therefore, significant difference exists between the three instructional approaches and the Conventional instructional approach.

Ho2: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the pronunciation achievement of the underachieving students.

Table 3. Summary of Analysis of Covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' Pronunciation Achievement Scores

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta squared
Corrected model	394.530	4	98.633	46.022	.000	.616
Intercept	386.146	1	386.146	180.178	.000	.610
PRTESPON	146.372	1	146.372	68.298	.000	.373
INSAPP	172.851	3	57.617	26.884	.000	.412
Error	246.461	115	2.143			
Total	15139.000	120				
Corrected Total	640.992	119				

Table 3 shows that the calculated f-value 26.84 was significant at $p > 0.05$, the hypothesis is rejected. This result indicates that the instructional approaches had significant effects on student vocabulary achievement. From the table also, the treatment produced a significant difference from the post test scores of the student when pre test scores were used as covaries. Therefore, hypothesis one was rejected, a follow up of Duncan multiple range test was conducted to determine the actual source of difference in the effectiveness of the variables investigated.

Table 4. Duncan Multiple Range Test of Dimensions of Significant Difference in the Effectiveness among the Variables investigated.

Variables	No of cases	Mean score	Duncan groupings
MSIA	30	12.733	A
MCIA	30	11.200	B
MSIA+MCIA	30	11.300	B
CIA	30	8.733	C

Means with the same letters are not significantly different

Table 4 shows that MSIA which is rated A is the most effective instructional approach for teaching English pronunciation to underachieving student.

H₀₃: There will be no significant difference in the effectiveness of MSIA, MCIA, the combination of MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the spelling achievement of the underachieving student.

Summary of Analysis of Covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' Spelling Achievement Scores

Table 5. Summary of Analysis of Covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' Spelling Achievement Scores.

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected model	474.881	4	118.720	28.930	.000	.502
Intercept	382.045	1	382.045	93.099	.000	.447
PRETESSP	175.948	1	175.948	42.876	.000	.272
INSAPP	276.898	3	92.299	22.492	.000	.370
Error	471.919	115	4.104			
Total	15204.000	120				
Corrected total	9446.800	119				

Table 5 shows that the calculated f value which is 22.49 was significant at $p > 0.05$. The hypothesis is therefore rejected; this result indicates that the instructional approaches had significant effect on student spelling achievement of the underachieving student. To confirm which variable are significantly different, a Duncan Multiple Range Test was carried out as indicated in table 6.

Table 6: Duncan Multiple Range Test of Dimensions of Significant Difference in the effectiveness among the variables investigated.

Variables	No of cases	Mean score	Duncan grouping
MSIA	30	11.96	A
MCIA	30	12.17	A
MSIA&MCIA	30	11.23	A
CIA	30	8.23	B

The table above indicates that all the three instructional approaches, which are grouped under letter A are more effective in enhancing in spelling ability of the student than the Conventional Instructional Approach grouped under B.

H₀₄: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA and the combination of MSIA and MCIA on the morphological achievement of the underachievers.

Table 7. Summary of analysis of covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' morphological Achievement scores

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected model	329.154	4	82.289	19398	.000	.403
Intercept	303.774	1	303.774	71.610	.000	.384
PRETESSP	161.396	1	161.396	38.046	.000	.249
INSAPP	147.037	3	49.012	11.554	.000	.232
Error	487.837	115	4.242			
Total	9813.000	120				
Corrected total	816.992	119				

Table 7 shows that the calculated f value which is 11.554 was significant at $p > 0.05$. The hypothesis is therefore rejected; this result indicates that the instructional approaches had significant effect on student morphological achievement. From the table also the treatment produced a significant effect in the post-test scores of the student when pre-test scores were used as covariates. This implies that a significant difference exists among the four groups. A follow up Duncan test was conducted to determine the actual source of difference that exists among the variables.

Table 8: Duncan Multiple Range Test of Dimension of significant Difference in the Effectiveness among the variables investigated.

Variables	No of cases	Mean score	Duncan grouping
MSIA	30	10.67	A
MCIA	30	7.80	B
MSIA&MCIA	30	8.37	B
CIA	30	7.80	B

The table above indicates that all the three instrument approaches, which are grouped under letter B have the same effect on the morphological ability of the students. However, MSIA which is grouped under letter A is still the most effective, having the highest mean score.

Ho5: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the lexico-syntax achievement of the underachievers.

Table 9. Summary of analysis of covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' morphological Achievement scores

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected model	179.095	4	44.774	15.254	.000	.347
Intercept	425.905	1	425.905	145.383	.000	.558
PRTESMOP	80.737	1	80.737	27.560	.000	.193
INSAPP	143.095	3	43.698	16.282	.000	.298
Error	336.896	115	2.930			
Total	665.000	120				
Corrected total	515.992	119				

Table 9 shows that the calculated f value which is 16.282 was significant at $p > 0.05$. The hypothesis therefore rejected this, the result indicates that the instructional approaches had significant effect on the lexico-syntax achievement of the underachieving students. To confirm which variables are significantly different, a Duncan Multiple Range Test was carried out as indicated in table 10

Table 10: Duncan Multiple Range Test of Dimensions of Significant Different in the effectiveness among the variables investigated

Variables	No of cases	Mean score	Duncan grouping
MSIA	30	8.67	A
MCIA	30	6.30	B
MSIA&MCIA	30	7.00	B
CIA	30	6.67	B

The Result in table 10 confirms that significant difference exists in the effectiveness of the four instructional approaches. The MSIA is rated 'A' which indicates that MSIA is the most effective of the four approaches in the lexico-syntax achievement of the students. This is followed by the combination of MSIA+MCIA, MCIA and CIA, which all fall within the same grouping of 'B'. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Ho6: There will be no significant difference in the effects of MSIA, MCIA, MSIA+MCIA and CIA on the lexico-semantic achievement of the underachievers.

Table 11. Summary of analysis of covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' lexico-semantics Achievement scores

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected model	609.816	4	152.454			
Intercept						
PRTESMOP						
INSAPP						
Error						
Total						
Corrected total						

Table 11 shows that the calculated f value which is 20.355 was significant at $p > 0.05$. The hypothesis is therefore rejected; this result indicates that the instructional approaches had significant effect on the lexico-semantics achievement of the underachieving students. To confirm which variables are significantly different, a Duncan Multiple Range Test was carried out as indicated in table 12.

Table 11: Summary of analysis of covariance of Instructional Approaches on Students' lexico-semantics Achievement scores

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected model	609.816	4	152.454			
Intercept						
PRTESMOP						
INSAPP						
Error						
Total						
Corrected total						

The result in table 12 confirms that significant difference exists in the effectiveness of the four instructional approaches. The MSIA is rated 'A' which indicates that MSIA is the most effective of the four instructional approaches. The MSIA is rated 'A' which indicates that MSIA is the most effective of the four approaches in the lexico-semantics achievement of the students. This is followed by the MCIA, the combination of MSIA+MCIA and CIA, which all fall within the same grouping of 'B'. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Summary of the Findings

The results showed that there was significant difference in the overall achievement in English vocabulary of the underachieving students taught using the four instructional approaches. Each of the three experimental groups performed significantly better than the control group, with the Multisensory Instructional Approach group performing best. Also the results from tables two to twelve revealed that there is significant difference in the effects of the three approaches on all the vocabulary dimensions (i.e. pronunciation, spelling, morphology, lexico-syntax and lexico-semantics). However, Multisensory Instructional Approach (MSIA) is the most effective Approach to teach vocabulary dimension to the underachieving secondary students. Government should supply schools with adequately trained teachers and multisensory instructional materials that provide concrete experience.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Findings from this study have established the importance and relevance of MSIA to the teaching of English vocabulary to the under achievers. The findings from this study also indicate that MSIA is the best approach for teaching all the five dimensions of vocabulary: i.e. pronunciation, spelling, morphology, lexico-syntax, and lexico-semantics. This is in line with Sarka's (1978) finding that selected multisensory materials could help encourage students to put their feelings and thoughts into words in a more vivid and lucid manner which is after all what vocabulary acquisition and good reading and writing in L2 is all about.

This study also corroborates Singleton's (1999) findings that the availability of a mental ability emerges as a possible aid in the fixing of words in memory. The pedagogical implications of this is that teachers can put knowledge of these findings to good effect by making use of visual aids that bring real concept to students especially the underachievers. In line with the above findings, it is recommended that L2 teachers should consider the interest of the underachieving students and give them special attention by employing the MSIA or the combination of MSIA+MCIA to teach them. This would greatly help the underachievers in acquiring both receptive and productive vocabulary skills. Above all it is recommended that teacher training programmes should be student-centered. Government should supply schools with adequately trained teachers and multisensory instructional materials that provide concrete experience that contribute to the efficiency, depth, and variety of learning.

References

- Abimbola, A. (2002). Learning and instructional materials. In I. O. Abimbola (Eds.), *Fundamental principles and practice of instruction*. (pp. 35-42). Ilorin: Curriculum Studies and Educational Technology Department, University of Ilorin, Ilorin.
- Adeniyi, F. O. & Lawal, R.A. (2016). Learning English vocabulary from concept to instruction. *The IAFOR Journal of language learning*. Dubai UAE.
- Adeniyi, F.O. (2009). *The English structure*. Ilorin: Haytee Press.
- Agun, I. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational technology*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Adejumobi, T. (2007). *Applied linguistics*. Ibadan: Joytal printing press.
- Azikwe, U. (1998). *Language teaching and learning*. Onitsha: Africana Fep. Publisher Limited.
- Ganshow. (1998). *Difficulty in learning second language*. New York: Macmillan.
- Genfen, R. (1980). *Teaching English to less able learners*. *ELT Journal*. 35 (1), 45-58.
- Kimseoh, O. (1976). *Vocabulary teaching: looking behind the word*. *ELT Journal*. 1 (50), 58-69.
- Kruse, A. F. (2000). *Vocabulary in Contexts*. *ELT Journal*. 33 (3), 121-150.
- Lawal, R. A. (1990). English communicative skills and methods for teachers. Unpublished mimeograph. Institute of Education: University of Ilorin.
- Lawal, R. A. (1991). "A diagnostic study of the reading performance of some nigerian school pupils". In S. O. Unoh (Eds.), *Literature and reading in Nigeria*. MERDC, (pp. 101-110). Ilorin: Curriculum Studies and Educational Technology Department, University of Ilorin.
- Lawal, R. A. (2001). "Approaches, methods. Techniques and their interrelationships". In I. O. Abimbola (Eds.), *Fundamental principles and practice of instruction*. (pp. 72-85). Ilorin: Curriculum Studies and Educational Technology Department, University of Ilorin.
- Nelson, D. (2006). "Contrastive semantics in vocabulary instruction". *TESOL Quarterly*. 10(1), 123-130.
- Osuji, R.O. (2008). *Teaching and learning vocabulary in secondary schools*. Ilorin: Haytee press.
- Sarka, S. (1978). *Teaching meaning out of context*. London: Longman.
- Smirth, S. (1978). *English English language vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Thorne, F. (2008). *Underachievement in English language*. New York: Macmillan.
- Tiffen, B. (1982). *A Language in common*. London: Longman.
- Yusuf, M. O. (2009). "Learning and instructional resources/materials 11: motion pictures, film strip and slides". In I. O. Abimbola (Eds.), *Fundamental principles and practice of instruction*. (pp. 95-11). Ilorin: Curriculum Studies and Educational Technology Department, University of Ilorin.