

EFFECT OF MODULAR TEACHING ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

Dr. S.K. Kaushal*

ABSTRACT

Modular teaching is one of the most widespread and recognized teaching learning techniques in United States, Australia and many other Western countries including Asian region. Modular teaching is used in almost all subjects like, natural sciences, especially in social sciences and medical education and even in social sciences as well as in computer education. All kinds of subjects are being taught through modules. Modular approach in teaching is a recent development and may be considered as a modification of an improvement upon the famous concept of programmed instruction. This approach is based upon the well established and universally recognized phenomenon of individual differences among the learners which necessitates the planning for adoption of the most appropriate teaching techniques in order to help the individual growth and develop at her/his own pace.

INTRODUCTION

An experimental study was conducted to examine the effects of modular teaching on the academic achievement of secondary school students in social science. Social science has made revolution in the daily life of the humanities. Hence the social science has been regarded as an essential part of curricula at secondary level throughout the world. Social science, on the learning aspects, involves typical skills and concepts, which require specific teaching learning methodologies. The quest of more favorable teaching technique is equally important for learners as well as for the teachers, education planners, managers and administrators. The objectives of the study included: (1) To determine the role of modular teaching in the academic achievement of students of social science at secondary level. (2) To determine whether the modular teaching is more effective than traditional methods. (3) To examine the effects of modular teaching on the academic achievements of high achievers and low achievers. (4) To develop some sample module from the textbook of social science at secondary level. (5) To recommend for the improvement and promotion of suitable method of teaching social science at secondary level.

The study was conducted in Govt Sr. Sec. School Charkhi Dadri. The students of 10th class section A and B served as the sample of the study. Students were divided into two sections on the basis of pretest (appendix-II). Section B served as the control group and section A served as the experimental group.

Two social science teachers having equal qualification, equal experience and considerably equal teaching potential, were selected to teach the control and the experimental groups. Same lesson plans and worksheets were used along with the direct teaching strategy for the control and the experimental groups. The control group was kept under control condition by providing traditional competitive situation in the class while the experimental group was provided treatment of modular teaching. This experiment lasted for twelve weeks. After the provision of instruction and practice three modules having 13 units covering three chapters, the academic achievement of both groups was examined through a posttest. Six weeks after the First evaluation, the same posttest was administered surprisingly, to test the retention of the students of the both experimental and the control group. Pretest and posttest were used as measuring

*Associate Professor, MLRS College of Education, Charkhi Dadri, Distt. Bhiwani (Haryana)

tools in the experiment. The pretest was for the equal distribution of the students in the control and the experimental groups. The purpose of the posttest was to measure the achievement as well as retention of the students after treatment. Actually posttest was a test parallel to pretest. The equality and similarity of the two tests was determined by using Spearman-Brown's prophecy formula. Reliability of posttest was found to be 0.75.

Applying t-test significance of difference between the mean scores of the experimental and the control groups on the variables of pretest, posttest and retention test, was tested To test the treatment effects for high and low achievers of both the experimental and control groups on posttest and retention tests, the factorial design (2x2) analysis of variance, was applied

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the statistical analysis and the finding of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

On the whole, modular teaching is more effective as teaching learning process for social science as compared to traditional teaching method. Because in modular teaching the students are provided the opportunities of learning at their own pace, according to their ability level and needs.

In spite of the fact that, students in the modular approach outscored the students working in traditional learning mode have no priority over students taught by traditional method in retaining the learnt biological material. But it could not be generalized. May be it have some other reasons like family background are basic knowledge of subject. Overall modular approach is more effective as compared to traditional method.

Low achievers in self-learning style have significant superiority over low achievers learning social science by traditional method. Thus modular approach is very effective method for teaching social science to the low achievers as compared to traditional method of teaching. In self learning style immediate reinforcement

is provided in the form of feedback to practice task, which motivate the student. High achievers when they are taught social science by self-learning mode that is by modular approach retain more. Because the modular approach is considered to create interest among the students as they are free to learn at their own pace.

Low achievers taught social science through modular approach retain for longer time as compared to low achievers taught by traditional method of teaching. Therefore, modular teaching is very effective teaching method for low achievers. In modular approach large contents are divided into small units with predetermined specific objectives, which create interest and motivation as well as novelty and newness in teaching style.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of findings and conclusions of the study, following recommendations were made.

1. This study proved that modular teaching is more effective mode of instruction for social sciences as compared to traditional method of teaching. This method should be applied to others subjects as well as other level of education. Therefore the teachers of social sciences should use modular teaching to improve the academic achievements of the students.
2. Modular teaching is a new technique in classroom setting, social sciences teachers should be provided training in module writing and teaching.
3. The results of single study are insufficient to decide about the maximum use of modular approach in our classroom setting. Thus a series of studies on modular approach in different situations and mixed genders at different levels should be carried out.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, J. C. 1995. Essential of Educational Technology: Teaching Learning Innovation in Education. Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, India, pp. 303-305.

- Biran, G. 1974. Essentials of Learning for Instruction. McGraw Hill Book Company Singapore.p. 39.
- Block, J. 1987. Mastery Learning models. In. M. J. Dunkin (ed.) International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Pergamon Press, New York, USA.pp. 435-450.
- Callahan, F. J. and H. L. Clark 1990. Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools.Collier McMillan Publishing Company, London, UK. pp. 723-738. Calfee, R. C. and D. C. Pointkowski. 1988. The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. New York, USA. pp. 225-232.
- Campbell, D. T. and J. C. Stanley. 1963. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching
- Edline, K. 1989. New Act Test to Stress Higher-Order Thinking Skills. Journal of Research in Teaching; 23(6): 533-542.
- Good, C. V. and W. R. Merkel. 1973. Dictionary of Education, McGraw Hill Book Company, New York, USA. p. 79.
- Iligglelon, H. and J. Seaton 1995. (ed.) Chamber English Dictionary. Chamber Harper Press, London, UK. p. 514.
- Johnson, N. and J. Dalen. 1988. Management and the Psychology of Schooling, ThemFlamer Press London, UK. p.3.
- T. and G. Borich. 1996. Educational Testing and Measurement: Classroom Application and Practice. HarperCollins, New York, USA. pp. 46-57.
- Kulik, J. A. 1988. A Personalized System of Instruction The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Prcgainon Press New York, USA. pp. 306-310.
- Lawry, J. R. 1988. The Winnctka Scheme: The Internationai Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Prcgamon Press New York, USA. pp. 216-217.
- Preedy, M. 1989. Management in Education: Approaches to Curriculum Management. Open University Press, Frost Road, Bristol, USA. pp. 157-161.
- Taneja, R. 1989. Dictionary of Education, Anmol Publication Murare New Dehli, India.p.155.
- Terry, G. P., J. B. Thomas and A. R. Marshal. 1991. International Dictionary of Education. Kogan Page, London, UK. P. 471.
- Zakariya, S. 1987. In. M. J. Dunkin (ed.) International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Pergamon Press, New York, USA. pp. 416-423.