

Impact of Activity-Oriented Teaching on Students' Academic Performance in Physics at College Level - Additional Follow-up Study

Majid Khan, PhD Scholar

School of Physical Science and Technology, Soochow University, Suzhou
Jiangsu, 215006 China
mk6218701@gmail.com

Kiramat Shah, PhD Scholar

School of Education, Soochow University, Suzhou, China
Kiramatshah2u@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research article was to investigate the impact of activity-oriented teaching on the students' performance in Physics at college level. An earlier study by Majid Khan, et. 2020, ten chapters from high school physics textbook were used. A sample of 60 students participated in that study. In the present study twenty (20) lessons were selected from 11th class Physics for the present study. All the science students at colleges of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, studying Physics at the 11th grade, constituted the population. A sample of 80 students was randomly selected from Govt. College Peshawar, Mardan, Kohat and Malakand. Pre-test- Post-test Control Group Design of experimental research was selected for this research study. Three MCQs type achievement tests were used as research tools for the data collection. Experimental group was taught with the help of activities whereas the control group was taught the same lessons through traditional method of teaching for the period of six (4) weeks. T-test was used to analyze the data. The results showed that the activity-based teaching is more effective for the development of higher order skills in the students.

Keywords: Colleges of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, study of physics, Activity based learning, Academic performance, cognitive skill.

Introduction

Activity-based learning (ABL) as defined by Prince (2004) is a learning method in which students are engaged in the learning processes. In Activity-based learning (ABL)

teaching method, in the words of Hartfield, Davies, Hede, Panko Kenley (2007) “students actively participate in the learning experience rather than sit as passive listeners”. Learning activities if based on “real life experience” help learners to transform knowledge or information into their personal knowledge which they can apply in different situations (Edward, 2001). Harfield, Davies, Hede, Panko and Kenley (2007) by quoting Prince (2004) say that active learning method is different from traditional method of teaching on two points. First, active role of students and second, collaboration among students. Suydam, Marilyn and Higgins (1977) define activity –based learning as the learning process in which “student is actively involved in doing or in seeing something done.” According to them Activity –Based teaching (ABT) method “frequently involves the use of manipulative materials”. Meaningful learning, according as Churchill (2003) quotes Jonassen and Churchill (2003) engages activity. According to Churchill (2003), ABL helps learners to “construct mental models that allow for ‘higher-order’ performance such as applied problem solving and transfer of information and skills”.

Science education actually describes and explains the ability of students to identify scientific issues, explains scientific phenomenon using scientific evidence and observation, deduces, analyses, solves and makes decisions about all the life situations involving science and technology, “such that an individual in order to participate fully in today’s global economy, needs to be able to solve scientific ideas, scientific experiment, clearly and persuasively” (Shah. K. 2015).

According to PISA 2015, scientific literacy is divided into three domains. First domain is the ability of an individual to study and explain a natural and technological phenomenon scientifically and evaluating explanations for these phenomena. Second one is to study and design a scientific enquiry that is evaluating and finding scientific investigations and raises questions scientifically on the understudy phenomenon. The third and last domain is to study and construct the data and all suggestions scientifically, that is, analyzing and evaluating data and then deriving appropriate scientific results (OECD, 2013, p. 7).

According to DeBoer (1991, p. 240), science education produces in an individual independence, self-activity, question creativity, and empowers the ability in an individual to think and to act, observe and create new ideas, to produce the investigative skills that contribute

to self-regulation, self-esteem, personal satisfaction, and social responsibility in a society, interconnected experimental and theoretical knowledge, and the internal ability and skills due to which an individual works with what is known, and cognizance of the contexts due to which that knowledge and those skills apply.

Shah. K. (2015) to develop the science education, the National Science Foundation stressed that science education should be given more emphasis as compared to other subjects and rethought with more interest. According to it more and more concentration and emphasize may be given on science and technology education

To enhance science education there is an approach of “Science for All”. This approach stresses that there is a need that all students should be scientifically literate for a socially sound society. So, this approach is important for an individual or society to adopt science education so that they will face the future challenges and issues. (Shah. K.2017)

According to European Commission, scientific literacy provided by science education does not mean that each and every one is expert in science education and literacy. But it is important.

In ABL, the learner examines learning requirements and thinks how to solve a problem in hand. The students do not learn about the content. Rather they learn about the process to solve the problem. As they go towards the solution of the problem, they also learn about the content (Churchill 2003). Effective teaching –learning process is not possible without students’ motivation. Hake (1998) argues that students’ motivation by engaging them in interactive-activities is an effective and useful method for teaching complex concepts. He highlights the importance of different activities related to the concepts being presented.

Activity-based learning (ABL) theory is a cognitive-learning theory which is basically a “constructivist” learning theory (Hein, 1991, Stöbblein 2009). According to constructivist view of learning each person „constructs” their own knowledge and learning process based on previous experience. This theory asserts that learning takes place when psychological environment of an individual interacts with a particular structure. For construction students it is imperative to have variety of activities in an active classroom (Abdelhamid, 2003, Murray,

Donohoe and Goodhew, 2004). Active classrooms are basic requirements for construction education (Betts and Liow ,1993, Panko et al,2005). Traditional teaching methods are not suitable for tactile learning because tactile learning needs direct experience and involve manipulation of materials (Kolb, 1984). According to constructivism, teachers cannot transfer their knowledge to the students (Domin 2007). For meaningful learning to be taken place, learners require to experience an event. (Shah. K. 2020) noted correctly that

“The majority of students in our schools are unable to make connections between what they are learning and how that knowledge will be used”.

One of the reasons is that we do not contextualize our teaching/learning process. ABL is helpful to contextualize the students learning. In an “active-learning classroom” students are active learners not the passive receivers. According to Stößlein (2009) this approach provides a way to integrate learning within students’ knowledge, and, by exposing them to a variety of activities, helps them learn how to learn. He describes ABL as a “successful teaching model” in the field of science. These activities, if carried out in an effective manner, develop skills like Team-working, Communication, Design, Leadership, Project management, Research, Problem-solving, Reflection and Life-long learning in the learners. These activities, if based on the real-life experiences, can help students to apply the same in their practical life and hence prepare students for future life. In activity –based teaching /learning environment, the teacher is a facilitator, motivator, guide, and a coach not a sage on the stage (Stolen 2009)). There is a famous saying of Confucius about the success of the students’ learning that is given below. “Tell me, and I will forget, Show me, and I may remember, Involve me, and I will understand.” According to Chickering & Gamson (1987) “students must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, and apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves”. Students’ motivation is high if these activities are personally relevant to the students (Harel and Papert 1991, Kafai and Resnick 1996, Hug, Krajcik, and Marx 2005). There is research evidence which shows that students will retain limited knowledge if they are involved passively in teaching- learning process ((Shah. K. 2019)). The same is indicated in the 'Dale’s cone of experience' developed by Shah. K (2016) shown below.

Learning activities provides opportunities for experiential learning which involves links between the thinking and the doing. It is assumed that students who handle the learning activities successfully have learnt the concept to perform that particular activity.

Hake (1998) found that ABL significantly improves conceptual understanding of the students in a physics class. Magno, et al. (2005) reached on the conclusion that “the classes receiving the PBL activity on memory had significantly higher performance accuracy in the test and had higher attitude as compared with the other classes who received instruction through traditional method”. While conducting research on teaching experimental economics for high schools, Brock and Lopus (2004) concluded that “ABL do a good job of satisfying the conditions sufficient for economic experiments”. Teo & Wong (2000) view that traditional teaching approaches do not encourage learners to associate with previously acquired knowledge. On the other hand, Boud & Feletti (1999) remarked that activities -based learning encourage students to “learn how to learn” through different activities and real-life problems.

Effectiveness of ABL to facilitate self-directed learning and problem-solving skills is well documented in medical education (Barrows and Tamblyn, 1980; Schmidt, 1983), in higher education and K–12 education settings (Barrows, 2000; Dochy, et al., 2003; Gallagher, et al., 1992; Hmelo-Silver, 2004; Hmelo, et al., 2000; Torp and Sage, 2002; Williams and Hmelo, 1998). Hussain, et al. (2011) reached on the conclusion about the effect of activity-based learning (ABL) that ABL is more effective to teach physics at secondary level as compared to traditional method of teaching. However, Lieux (2001) and Zumbach, et al. (2004) found no significant difference in knowledge acquisition between students who learned through ABL method and who learned through traditional method of teaching. Doucet et al. (1998) and Blake, et al. (2000) found that students who were taught through ABL performed significantly better on both basic and clinical sciences. Verhoeven, et al.’s (1998) partially, while Dochy, et al. (2003) completely, agreed with their findings. Berkson (1993) and Colliver (2000) could not find any evidence to maintain the superiority of ABL method over traditional method of teaching. Gallagher and (Shah. K.2018) found no significant difference on “short-term retention” assessment between students of ABL and traditional students. Norman and Schmidt (1992) cited Dochy, et al., (2003) and Mårtenson, et al. (1985) that, on “long-term retention assessments” students of ABL performed better than traditional students. Hung, Jonassen, and Liu (2008) referred Eisensteadt, et al. (1990) that traditional students retained more than ABL

students in the recall test conducted immediately. However, retention rate of traditional student declined fast as compared to ABL students. In higher order thinking skills, ABL students performed significantly better than traditional students in one of the studies conducted by Polanco et al. (2004) to investigate the impact of ABL on “students’ academic achievement” in mechanics. Shelton and Smith (1998) conducted a research study on biomedical students and found better performance of the biomedical students of ABL in the achievement test than their counterparts. In a study, Gallagher et al. (1992) noted remarkable improvement in the results of ABL students than their counterparts and viewed that ABL is an effective method of developing “problem-solving processes and skills”. Hung, Jonassen and Liu (2008) mentioned that ABL has “positive impact on students’ abilities to apply basic science knowledge and transfer problem-solving skills in real-world professional or personal situations”. Suydam, Marilyn and Higgins (1977) and Shepherd (1998) reported same kind of results. Coulson and Osborne (1984), Blumberg and (Shah. K.2017). Norman and Schmidt (1992), Ryan (1993), Dwyer (1993), Dolmans and Schmidt (1994), Woods (1993), van den Hurk, et al. (1999) Schmidt and van der Molen (2001) and Schmidt et al.(2006) reached on the similar conclusion about the impact of ABL. Kaufman and Mann, (1996) noted students believe about ABL to be more effective to „enhancing of information management skills“, Caplow, et al. (1997) to enrich their “learning of basic science information”, Martin, et al. (1998) to promote their learning to “deal with complex situations”, Dean (1999) to enhance their confidence in “judging alternatives for solving problems”, Lieux (2001) to “develop thinking and problem-solving skills”, Schmidt and van der Molen (2001) and Schmidt, et al. (2006) to “improving interpersonal and professional skills, and advancing self-directed learning, higher level thinking”. Thornton (2001) remarks in ‘Teaching Physics Concepts with Activity-based Learning “that activity-based learning, greatly improves students”’ learning and understanding of scientific concepts. (Shah. K. 2016) noted the positive impact of ABL approach on the students as well as teachers in a vocational institution.

Research Methodology

Population of the Study All the science students at government colleges of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, studying Physics at the 11th grade, constituted the population.

Sample of the Study

Govt. colleges Peshawar, Mardan, Kohat and Swat was selected as sample colleges. 80 science students were randomly selected as sample for this study. Control and experimental groups were randomly formed from the sample (forty students in each group).

Content of the Study

Force and Motion (ch3), Work, Power & Energy (ch4), Simple Harmonic Motion (ch7), Heat and Thermodynamics (10) were selected for treatment.

Design of the Study

The researchers used Pre-test - Post-test Control Group Design for this study which involves two groups, experimental and control. In this design both randomly formed groups (control & experimental) are pretested and after treatment, post tested. Pre-test and post-test are same for both the groups. It is a strong experimental design in which all sources of internal invalidity are controlled due to random assignment, pre-test, and the presence of control group.

Instrument

MCQs type written tests were developed for the collection of data. Pre-test was developed from the first five chapters of 11th grade Physics of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa keeping Bloom's taxonomy in view. Out of 60 questions, ten (20) of knowledge, ten (10) of comprehension, ten (10) of application, ten (10) of analysis, and ten (10) questions of synthesis were constructed. Post-test was constructed from the last chapters of the same textbook whereas the distribution of the questions remained same for each domain as in the pre-test. Test items were finalized after item analysis. Item difficulty and item discrimination index were calculated, and test items of mixed difficulty were selected finally. Content validity of the tools was established by discussing them with two different subject specialists and an educationist in the field of science education. Reliability of the Pre-test and post-test was estimated at 0.78 and 0.9 by using split-half reliability method.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Data

To find the significant difference between the mean scores, "independent samples t-test" was applied at the significant level of 0.05. Different null hypotheses were developed to test the significant difference between the control and experimental group. H₀₁. There is no significant difference in the achievement scores of the students of control group and experimental group in the pre-test.

H₀₁. There is no significant difference in the achievement scores of the students of control group and experimental group in the pre-test.

Table 1: Achievement Scores of the students of control group and experimental group on pre-test

Domain	Group	N	Mean	df	t-value	P (0.05)
Knowledge	Experimental	25	5.24		0.67	0.67<1.02
	Control	25	5.04			
Comprehension	Experimental	25	5.08		-0.75	-0.75<2.01
	Control	25	5.28			
Application	Experimental	25	5.28	48	0.95	0.95<2.01
	Control	25	5.08			
Analysis	Experimental	25	4.80		1.17	1.17<2.01
	Control	25	4.52			
Synthesis	Experimental	25	5.24		0.68	0.68<2.01
	Control	25	5.08			

The calculated t-values are less than the table values. It is clear from the results shown above in the Table 1. That there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control group in the cognitive domains of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, and synthesis. Hence, It is concluded that both the experimental and control groups were the same in the cognitive skills before the treatment.

H₀₂.: There is no significant difference in the achievement scores of the students of control group and experimental group on post-test in the domain of knowledge.

Table 2: Achievement Scores of control group and experimental group on post-test t in the domain of knowledge.

Group	N	Mean	df	t-value	P (0.05)
Experimental group	25	5.75	48	1.00	1.00<2.01
Control group	25	5.48			

The calculated t-value is less than the table value (calculated t=1.00 and table value=2.01). Hence, it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the achievement of the students of experimental group and control group in the domain of knowledge.

H₀₃. There is no significant difference in the achievement scores of the students of control group and experimental group in the post-test in the domain of comprehension.

Table 3: Achievement Scores of control group and experimental group on post-test in the domain of Comprehension

Group	N	Mean	df	t-value	P (0.05)
Experimental group	25	5.72	48	1.11	1.09<2.01
Control group	25	5.05			

As the calculated t-value is less than the table value (calculated $t=1.09$ and table value= 2.01), there is no significant difference in the achievement of the students of experimental group and control group in the domain of comprehension.

H₀₄.: There is no significant difference in the achievement scores of the students of control group and experimental group in the post-test in the domain of application.

Table 4: Achievement Scores of control group and experimental group on post-test in the domain of application

Group	N	Mean	df	t-value	P (0.05)
Experimental group	25	5.8	48	3.60	$3.60 > 2.01$
Control group	25	4.92			

The calculated t-value is greater than the table value (calculated $t=3.60$ and table value= 2.01). It is clear from the result shown above in the Table 4. That there is significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control group which means that there is significant difference in the achievement of the students of experimental group and control group in the domain of application. Hence, It is concluded that activity-based teaching method is more effective than the traditional method of teaching to develop higher order thinking skill (application).

H₀₅. There is no significant difference in the achievement score of the students of control group and experimental group in the post-test in the domain of analysis.

Table 5: Achievement Scores of control group and experimental group on post-test in the domain of analysis

Group	N	Mean	df	t-value	P (0.05)
Experimental group	25	5.52	48	3.06	$3.60 > 2.01$
Control group	25	4.76			

The calculated t-value is greater than the table value (calculated $t=3.06$ and table value= 2.01). Hence, it is concluded that activity-based teaching method is more effective than the traditional method of teaching in developing analyzing ability in students.

H₀₆. There is no significant difference in the achievement score of the students of control group and experimental group in the post-test in the domain of Synthesis.

Table 6: Achievement Scores of control group and experimental group on post-test in the domain of Synthesis.

Group	N	Mean	df	t-value	P (0.05)
Experimental group	25	4.84	48	4.18	4.18>2.01
Control group	25	3.76			

The calculated t-value is greater than the table value (calculated $t=4.18$ and table value= 2.01). It is clear from the result shown above in the Table 6. that there is significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control group. Hence, It is concluded that activity-based teaching method is more effective than the traditional method of teaching to develop Synthesizing ability.

Conclusion

From the results shown above it was concluded that there was a positive impact of activity- based teaching in developing cognitive skills in the students of physics at secondary level. ABL method of teaching is more effective for the development of higher order thinking skills in the students. These results are supported by the findings of Hung, Jonassen and Liu(2008) , Suydam, Marilyn and Higgins (1977), Coulson and Osborne (1984), Blumberg and Michael (1992), Gallagher, et al. (1992), Norman and Schmidt (1992), Ryan (1993), Dwyer (1993), Dolmans and Schmidt (1994), Woods (1993), Shepherd (1998), van den Hurk, et al. (1999) Schmidt and van der Molen (2001) and Schmidt, et al. (2006), Martin, et al. (1998), Dean (1999), Lieux (2001), Thornton (2001), Schmidt and van der Molen (2001) and Schmidt et al. (2006). Although the mean scores of Experimental Group, in the domain of knowledge and comprehension, is greater than control group, there is no significant difference found between the mean scores of both the groups which means that ABL is more effective for higher order thinking skills (application, synthesis and analysis) than lower order thinking skills (knowledge, comprehension). Gallagher and Stepien, (1996), Lieux, (2001) and Zumbach, et al. (2004) reached on the same conclusion regarding the effectiveness of ABL.

Recommendations

Following recommendations are made on the basis of the results obtained from the analysis of the data:

1. The role of Activity- Based Learning (ABL) is well acknowledged in the literature to develop higher order thinking skills. As this study is consistent with past findings, it is therefore, recommended that ABT should be adopted at secondary level to teach Physics in Pakistan.
2. The study should be replicated in all science disciplines.

3. The study should be replicated to compare the ABT with other methods of teaching to find out the relative effectiveness of the different methods with ABT.
4. The study should be replicated in all grades from elementary to university level.

References

Abdelhamid, T. S. (2003). Evaluation of teacher-student learning style disparity in construction management education. *Journal of Construction Education*. Vol. 8(3) 124-145.

Abu Bakar THE EFFECT OF COMMUNICATION BARRIERS ON DISTANCE LEARNERS' ACHIEVEMENTS: *Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica* 2020, Vol. XXIX, N°5, 248-264 DOI: 10.24205/03276716.2020.1027

Barrows, H. S. (2000). *Problem-Based Learning Applied to Medical Education*. Springfield, IL: Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.

Barrows, H. S., & Tamblyn, R. M. (1980). *Problem-based learning: An approach to medical education*. New York: Springer.

Betts, M. and Liow, S.R. (1993). The relationship between teaching methods and educational objectives in building education, *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 11, 131-141.

Blake, R. L., Hosokawa, M. C., and Riley, S. L. (2000). Student performances on step 1 and step 2 of the United States Medical Licensing Examination following implementation of a problem-based learning curriculum. *Acad. Med.* 75, 66–70.

Caplow, J. H., Donaldson, J. F., Kardash, C. A., and Hosokawa, M. (1997). Learning in a problem based medical curriculum: students' conceptions. *Med. Educ.* 31, 1–8.

Carey, S., & Smith, C. (1993). On understanding the nature of scientific knowledge. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(3), 235-251.

Chickering, A. W. & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *The Wingspread Journal*, 9(2), See also AAHE Bulletin, March 1987.

Choo, C.B. (2007). Activity based Approach to Authentic Learning in a Vocational Institute *Educational Media International*, Volume 44, Issue 3, 2007.

Dale, E. (1969). *Audiovisual methods in teaching*, third edition. New York: The Dryden Press; Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Dean, C. D. (1999). Problem-Based Learning in Teacher Education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, April 19–23, Montreal, Quebec (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 431 771).

Domin 2007. Comparison of the MPhil/PhD Programmes in Public and Private Universities in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. (International Review of Social Sciences Vol. 5 March Issue.3, 2007).

Hmelo, C. E., Holton, D. L., and Kolodner, J. L. (2000). Designing to learning about complex systems. *J. Learn. Sci.*, 9,247–298.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: what and how do students learn? *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, 16(3), 235–266.

Hug, B., Krajcik, J.S. & Marx, R.W. (2005). Using Innovative Learning Technologies to Promote Learning and Engagement in an Urban Science Classroom. *Urban Education*, 40(4), 446-472.

Kiramat. S. A study of maternal role in students learning at primary school level in Peshawar (*Academic Research International* Vol. 7(2) March 2016).

Khan. N. A survey of the factors affecting female college student's English language learning in district Mardan (*Educational Research International* Vol. 5(2) May 2016).

Majid. K. The Effect of Activity-Based Teaching on Students' Academic Achievements in Physics At College Level. *Language in India* www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 20:12 December 2020.

Nasrullah Khan. A study of the worries of Master students (M.Ed.) towards researches in private sector universities, KPK, Pakistan (*Language in India* www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 16:1 January 2016).

Nasrullah. K. Non-Verbal Communication and Its effect on students at secondary level in District Buner, Pakistan (*Language in India* www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 16:2 February 2016).

Nazir, K. A Comparison of the Efficacy of Concept Formation Teaching Methods and Traditional Teaching Methods in Science Subject at Secondary Level. *Language in India* www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 20:9 September 2020.

Ryan (1993), Need of mentoring to enhance the teaching skills of newly inducted teachers at primary level in district Swat (*Educational Research International* Vol. 5(1) February 1993).

=====
Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 **21:11 November 2021**

Majid Khan, PhD Scholar and Kiramat Shah, PhD Scholar

Impact of Activity-Oriented Teaching on Students' Academic Performance in Physics at College Level

Shah. K. A Case Study of Concept Formation vs Traditional Teaching Methods in Physics at School Level. Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 20:12 December 2020

Shah. K. A study of the factors enhancing science education learning upon BS Students in District Peshawar, Pakistan. Educational Research International (ERInt.) Vol.8 (4) November 2019.

Shah. K. Perception of high schools' principals about the weak English-speaking skill of teachers in district Peshawar (Asian Journal of Social Science & Humanities Vol. 5(2) May 2016).

Shah. K. A survey of the factors affecting female college student's English language learning in district Mardan. (Educational Research International Vol. 5(2) June 2016).

Kiramata Sha, 2019. Analysis of National Education Policies: Issues and Challenges in Pakistan and Development of Science Education. Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 19:11 November 2019.

Younas. M. Using 5e's Instructional Model to Study the Concept of Magnetic Hysteresis Curve in Physics. Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 19:10 October 2019.

=====