



EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIES USED IN TEACHING HISTORY ON ACHIEVEMENT AND INTEREST IN HISTORY AT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL.

ANITA NITIN SANAP

Department of Education
University of Mumbai M. Abdul Kalam Azad Bhavan, Vidyanagari,
Sataacruz (E), Mumbai

Abstract:

Concurrent with the process of globalization, the pendulum in education is swaying towards interactive ways of learning / teaching. Education, in the past decades, has experienced a shifting paradigm from text based pedagogy to context-focused andragogy. And some modern approaches like cooperative learning; collaborative learning or contributive learning is rapidly evolving by virtue of the demand of such a context. Collaborative learning intends to recalibrate teachers attention and concentration towards the significance of some factors of critical importance to effective learning such as 'affective filter', 'exposure', 'pushed output', 'purposeful communication' 'attention' and some other crucial significant context variables like 'motivation' and 'active engagement' of all learners in the process of learning in a semi-authentically analytical and suggestive feedback (S. M. H. Hosseini, 2007). All these pivotal factors are to a large extent neglected by the outdated instructional models like our traditional teacher -fronted chalk- and- talk system which would no longer be effective. This research makes an attempt to highlight the significance of collaborative learning as the need of the hour in today's world especially in the context of globalization.

KEY WORDS:

Effectiveness , achievement , collaborative , History , strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Cooperative and collaborative learning is founded in constructivist epistemology. Johnson and Smith (1991) have summarized these principles in their definition of a new paradigm of teaching “first, knowledge is constructed, discovered and transformed by students. Faculty create the conditions within which student can construct meaning from the material studied by processing it through existing cognitive structures and then retaining it in long-term memory where it remains open to further processing the possible reconstruction. Second, students actively construct their own knowledge. Students do not passively accept knowledge from the teacher or curriculum. Students do activities of their own existing cognitive structures or construct new ones to subsume the new input. Third, faculty effort is aimed at developing student's competencies and talent. Fourth, education is a personal transaction among students and between the faculty and students as they work together. Fifth, all of the above can only take place within a collaborative context. Sixth, teaching is assumed to be a complex application of theory and research that

Title : EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIES USED IN TEACHING HISTORY ON ACHIEVEMENT AND INTEREST IN HISTORY AT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL. Source:Golden Research Thoughts [2231-5063] ANITA NITIN SANAP yr:2013 vol:2 iss:11

requires considerable teacher training and continuous refinement of skills and procedures”.

School is a small society where a child learns to make friends, work in cooperation with each other. In school a child comes across various subjects where in s/he develops likes and dislikes for certain subject out of the entire varied subject in school. But a number of students are not Interested in learning a subject namely History. They think History is a subject which is giving information about period, civilization, languages etc. Every person has a different outlook or perception towards History. Some see it as only a boring subject, just giving information about earlier period. That is the main reason for researcher selecting the History subject. Whenever school gives a particular time to teaching of History by the student himself allowing him to come up with his own ideas, share and collect ideas from the peers, collaborative group etc. It is possible to change the whole perception and outlook of a student towards teaching of History through the use of various innovative Collaborative strategies of teaching and learning History.

NEED OF THE STUDY

History is being taught in classroom by lecture or textbook method and hence the main impact behind History teaching does not get stirred up fully, thus leading to frustration to students. It is only when ideas are constructed by the student gradually in their own pace using the resources or materials given that retention would be better. The teacher as a facilitator should enable the students to explore more and more about different civilization, their culture, life, administration etc. by creating the right environment.

It was observed as per the review that a very few researches are conducted in the area of collaborative strategies in relation to pedagogical aspects of the subject of History. The researcher strongly feels that teacher should hence adopt the collaborative strategies to teaching some History concepts. This is not only a valid and effective ways of learning for both the student and teacher but also encourages them to be less dependent on the teacher.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

To study and compare the pretest History Achievement scores of the students in the experimental and control group before going through the intervention programme.

To study and compare the posttest History Achievement scores of the student in the experimental and control group after going through the intervention programme.

To study and compare the pretest Interest in History scores of the student in the experimental and control group before going through the intervention programme.

To study and compare the posttest Interest in History scores of the student in the experimental and control group after going through the intervention programme.

To study the effectiveness of the intervention programme based on collaborative strategies.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The researcher has formulated the following null hypothesis.

1. There is no significant difference in pretest History Achievement scores of the student in the experimental and control group before going through the intervention programme.

2. There is no significant difference in the posttest History Achievement scores of the student in the experimental and control group after going through the intervention programme.

3. There is no significant difference in the pretest Interest in History scores of the student in the experimental and control group before going through the intervention programme.

4. There is no significant difference in the posttest Interest in History scores of the student in the experimental and control group after going through the intervention programme.

SAMPLE

Eighty students of ninth class in the English medium school of Chembur in Mumbai were included in the sample of the study. Among them 44 were boys and 36 were girls out of these 40 students were taken for experimental group and test of the 40 students were taken for control group. Each experimental and control group consisted of 22 boys and 18 girls.

Sampling method

Convenient sampling method was used in selecting sample of the study.

TOOLS TO BE USED

The researcher used three tools for this study.

Achievement test in History

An achievement test was prepared by the researcher based on the content to be taught i.e. 'Egypt Civilization' and 'Greek Civilization' in order to conduct a precise analysis. The test included both objective and subjective type of questions. It had a total of 11 items in it among them 4 were knowledge based questions, 3 were understanding based question, 1 were application based question and 2 questions were based on skills to be developed.

Interest in History

An interest level scale was developed by the researcher to measuring the Interest of Students towards the subject History. The scale had 36 items related to the interest level of students towards History. Among these 19 items were positive and remaining 17 were negative statements. Four point rating scale was used to collect the data.

Collaborative strategies based instructional design

An instructional design was developed, using various collaborative strategies of teaching history in order to increase the student's interest of history and enhance their achievement in history by the researcher.

TECHNIQUES FOR ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Appropriate statistical techniques were used to analyze the data of the study. In the present study two types of analysis were adopted which are given as below

- 1.Descriptive analysis
- 2.Inferential analysis

Descriptive Analysis

The present study is descriptive analyzed by following method.

- 1.Measures of central tendency which includes mean.
- 2.Measures of variability which includes standard deviation.
- 3.Measures of divergence from normality skewness, kurtosis.
- 4.Measure of probability estimation of population parameter.
- 5.The data was then graphically represented using line graph, frequency polygon and pie chart. So as to give a clear comparison of the group.

Inferential analysis

To find out the significant difference between the mean of the pre and post test of achievement as well as Interest in History score of IX standard students in History the 't' test be used. If 't' is significant then 't' estimate were used to interpret the data.

DATA COLLECTION

Data collection was the most important and Interesting phases of the research work. The researcher got an opportunity to interact the different people like principal, management members, teachers and students. This was a great learning experience for the researcher. The researcher personally met the

principal of Sree Narayan Guru High School to seek permission for data collection the principal was very much cooperative and obliged the researcher by giving permission inspired of their busy schedule for data collection the researcher first gave pretest to both experimental and control group which was consisting of Interest in history and Achievement test in History. At the same time, she taught experimental group using collaborative strategy which created Interest in the students finally the researcher gave the same test as posttest to both experimental and control group. While conducting the experimental study a good rapport was build between the researcher and the school members. The researcher at every stage of data collection maintained confidentiality of the data

Major Findings of the Study

The major findings of the present research are as follows:

1. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the pretest Achievement scores of the student in the experimental and control group. The statistical technique used to test this hypothesis was 't' test. The obtained 't' for the pretest Achievement scores of the experimental and control group is 0.17. The value of obtained 't' is lesser than the tabulated 't' i.e. 2.00 at 0.05 level. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus the study reveals that there is no significant difference in the pretest Achievement scores of the experimental and control group.
2. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the posttest Achievement scores of the student in the experimental and control group. The statistical technique used to test this hypothesis was 't' test. The obtained 't' for the posttest Achievement scores of the experimental and control group is 9.5. The value of obtained 't' is greater than the tabulated 't' i.e. 2.65 at 0.01 level the percentage of variance in scores due to Achievement test is 53%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected thus; the study reveals that there is a significant difference in the posttest Achievement scores of the experimental and control group. The mean scores of the experimental group were greater than the mean scores of the control group.
3. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the pretest Interest in History score of the student in the experimental and control group. The statistical technique used to test this hypothesis was 't' test. The obtained 't' for the pretest Interest in History scores of the experimental and control group is 1.82. The value of obtained 't' is lesser than the tabulated 't' i.e. 2.00 at 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the study reveals that there is no significant difference in the pretest Interest in History score of the experimental and control group.
4. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the posttest Interest in History scores of the student in the experimental and control group. The statistical technique used to test this hypothesis was 't' test. The obtained 't' for the posttest Interest in History scores of the experimental and control group is 3.5%. The value of obtained is greater than tabulated 't' i.e. 2.65 at 0.01 level the percentage of variance in scores due to Interest in History test is 12.40%. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected thus the study reveals that there is a significant difference in the posttest Interest in History of the experimental and control group. The mean scores of the experimental group were greater than the mean scores of the control group.

CONCLUSIONS

From the major findings of the study the researcher comes to conclusion that there were no group discrepancies regarding both Interests in History and Achievement test for both the groups. Next finding was this that there was increase in both groups posttest scores of Interest in History and Achievement test after exposure to their respective treatment i.e. traditional treatment to control group and collaborative strategy treatment to experimental group. Last and the main finding of the study was this that there was increase in the posttest scores of Interest in History and Achievement test of experimental group in comparison to control group.

In the case of first finding, no group discrepancies found regarding both Interest in History and Achievement test for both groups because both the groups were exposed to the same treatment respectively. There was no bias treatment given for both group.

In the case of next finding, there was increase in both groups' posttest scores of Interest in History and Achievement test after exposure to their respective treatment i.e. traditional treatment to control group and collaborative strategy treatment to experimental groups. This is because when pretest was given to both the groups had minimum knowledge or exposure to the content on which the Achievement test was prepared, but later they were given treatment with respect to that content i.e. traditional treatment to control group and collaborative strategies treatment to experimental group followed by posttest on same content indicating that before appearing for posttest both the groups were having some amount of knowledge or

exposure to the content. This was the reason behind increase in posttest scores of Interest in history and Achievement test.

In the case of last finding, there was increase in the posttest scores of Interest in history and Achievement test of experimental group in comparison to control group. This may be due to the exposure of Active strategy collaborative learning to the students of experimental group. Active learning seemed to foster the development of positive attitude in the students towards History. Involving students irrespective of individual difference and teacher enthuse may have led to better performance. The monotony of regular classroom teaching method was broken down and innovative methods were adopted, this may have led to positive image of History.

The result showed that the pedagogy and transaction technique of the topics played a major role in how well the students learned direct involvement and group learning could have made students pick up and listen which would have affected their subsequent performance probably students need thought provoking activities. Such as number head together, news reporter, think pair share, Jigsaw Activity, three minute review activity, group discussion and many more. All these methods were innovative and interesting for student. Since they are not used by the teacher when teaching in traditional way hence these methods created Interest in student about history and gave motivation to study deeper and on their own students started constructing their own knowledge and finding truths on their own.

A student learns new content through a process of active construction. The teachers help students make connection between new and existing knowledge and give them opportunities to use new learning. Students elaborate on and question what they are learning; they examine what they are learning. In relation to what they already know and build new knowledge structures. It is easier for students to learn when they can relate the new content to what they already know. It helps students develop expectations about what they are learning. They identify important elements fill the gaps and expand their learning.

Learning serves an adaptive function its role is to help the individual operate within his or her personal world, thus learning is not the storage of 'truths' but of useful personal knowledge constructive learning experiences and appropriate classroom practices include reflective thinking and productivity authentic activities, including student collaboration and consideration of multiple perspective. Hence in the History classroom students should be exposed maximally to the collaborative strategies for this collaborative strategies teacher preparation programme should be designed and student should be constantly given opportunities to make new connection in a setting focusing on personal empowerment and critical reflection. This will challenge both students and teachers to more toward self-directed life- long learning.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

After conducting a statistical analysis on the test scores, it was found that students who participated in collaborative learning had performed significantly better on Interest in History and Achievement test than students who studied lecture method. It was also found that collaborative learning group was better to traditional learning group on Interest in History and Achievement test. This result is in agreement with the learning theories proposed by proponents of collaborative learning.

According to Vygotsky (1948), students are capable and performing at higher intellectual levels when asked to work in collaborative situation than when asked to work individually. Group diversity in terms of knowledge and experiences contributes positively to the learning process. Bruner (1985) contents that the cooperative learning methods improve problem solving Strategies because the students are confronted with different interpretation of the given situation. The peer support system makes it possible for the learner to internalize both external knowledge participatory learning skills and to convert them into tools for intellectual functioning.

In the present study, the collaborative learning medium provided students with opportunities to analyze synthesize and evaluate ideas cooperatively. The informal setting facilitated discussion and interaction. This group interaction helped students to learn from each other scholarship Skills and experiences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aggarwal, J.C. (2003) *Educational Research an Introduction*, New Delhi; Arya Book Depot.
 Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. *Research in Education*, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India, 2006.
 Garret, H.G. and Woodworth, R.S. *Statistics in Psychology and Education*, Bombay Vakils, Feller and Simons Pvt. Ltd, 2005.
 Kangan, S. (1994) *Co-operative Learning and an Element*, California Kagan Publishing.

Kothari, C.R. *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques*, New Delhi, Vishwa Parkashan, 1987.
Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society : The development of higher psychological processes*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

JOURNALS AND ARTICLES

Anuradha A. Gokhale (1995) "Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking", *Journal of Technology Education*, Volume 7, No. 1.
Oxford R. (1997) "Co-operative learning, collaborative learning and interaction" *The modern Language Journal*, 81 (4), 443-445.
Rau, W & Heyl, B.S. (1990), *Humanizing the college, classroom: Collaborative learning and society organization among students*, *Teaching Sociology*, 18, 141-155.
Slavin, R.E. (1989), *Research on Collaborative learning. An international prospective* *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 33 (4), 231-243.

ENCYCLOPEDIAS AND DICTIONARIES

Good, C.V. (1959) *Dictionary of Education*, New York; Mc Graw Hill Book Company.
Buch M.B. (Ed) *Forth Survey of Research in Education Vol-I (1983-88)*, New Delhi, NCERT, 1991.
Buch M.B. (Ed) *Forth Survey of Research in Education Vol-II (1983-88)*, New Delhi, NCERT, 1991.

Websites

<http://www.studygs.net/groupprojects.html>