

INNOVATION IN TEACHING AND LEARNING OF BUSINESS STUDIES THROUGH LEARNER-CENTREDNESS IN EKET SENATORIAL DISTRICT AKWA IBOM STATE

Dr. Monica J. Esu

**Akwa Ibom State Secondary Education Board, Uyo,
Akwa Ibom State.**

Abstract

This study determined the relationship between learner-centred teaching methods and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education in Eket Senatorial District Akwa Ibom State. The study achieved four specific objectives; answered four research questions and tested four null hypotheses. Descriptive survey research design was used for the study with a population of 68 Business Studies teachers and 132 Business Studies students. Sample size of 100 respondents, comprising 40 teachers and 60 students of Business Studies was used. The researcher-made questionnaire tagged, Learner-Centred Teaching Methods and Effective Learning Questionnaire (LCTMELQ) validated by three experts generated data for the study. The Linear Regression statistical analysis was used to test all the null hypotheses. Findings are that high positive and significant relationship exists between: creating practice to develop skills (Activity method); students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose; cooperative-based learning and effective learning of business studies is high. Based on the findings made, it is concluded that engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals); creating practice to develop skills (Activity method); students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method); and cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) enhance effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. Recommendations are that: Business studies teachers should engage students in: setting core learning objectives (teaching goals); creating practice to develop skills (Activity method); assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method); and cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method).

Keywords: Innovation, Innovative Teaching, Learner-centredness, Cooperative Learning, Teaching, Learning

The growing demand for skilled and competent graduates to fit into the 21st Century modern work-related demand has placed a high demand for innovativeness in teaching and learning process, especially in a vocational subject as business studies. Innovativeness in this situation should have great impact in the way learners learn and are educated. Thus, learner-centredness or learner-centred teaching method is used in the context of this research as an innovative teaching method. A learner-centred approach clearly places the learner at the centre of their education, by supporting student development and autonomy, and creating a shared-climate for learning (Weimer, 2002). Learner-centredness puts a clear focus on the outcomes of learning and recognizes that

students must be active discoverers and constructors of their own knowledge. Learners are guided by a philosophy of self-efficacy and autonomy, where they develop the knowledge and abilities necessary to embrace learning challenges, to succeed, and to continuously improve.

The teacher has to create a learner-centred environment since it has been the general agreement by stakeholders that learner-centred environments facilitate active, enduring, integrated and authentic experiences that enables the learner to remodel and revise ongoing theories in a manner that makes sense to them. In other words, learner-centred environments provide students with an opportunity to actively engage with and to take ownership of their own learning.

Learners (Students) centred approaches (sometimes referred to as discovery learning, inductive learning, or inquiry learning) place a much stronger emphasis on the learner's role in the learning process. Student-centred approaches to teaching makes the teacher to have much less direct control over what and how students learn. The teacher's primary role is to coach and facilitate students' learning and overall comprehension of materials and to measure student learning through both formal and informal forms of assessment, like group projects, student portfolios, and class participation. In the student-centred classroom, teaching and assessment are connected because student learning is continuously measured during teacher instruction.

Business studies prepare students, youths for vocations and also furnish them with relevant information concerning their lives both as citizens and as individuals. In the first instance, it develops in them certain skills, attitudes and abilities that are relevant to securing jobs in the business world. Secondly, it gives them insight into general business and acquaints them with general business information that will make them efficient and rational purchasers and consumers of business products (goods and services). This study is based on the Child-Centred Theory. The Child-Centred theory states that the learner should be the focus of organizing the elements of the curriculum (Mkpa and Izuagba, 2006). The implication of the above is that rather than organizing the curriculum based on bodies of specialized knowledge grouped according to subject matter, the curriculum should be organized based on the needs and interests of the learners. The child-centred curriculum theorist emphasises self-realisation and using psychological principles as a basis for organizing content and learning experiences.

This theory has great significance to the current theory. Its emphasis on the curriculum being learner-centred implies that the method of teaching adopted by the teacher should equally be learner-centred. This implies that Child-Centred teaching methods when effectively handled by the teacher will enhance students' understanding of the learning concepts through their active participation in the learning process, hence, makes for effective learning of Business Studies. Setting objectives is the process of establishing a direction to guide learning (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008; Brookhart, 2008; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008). A study by McREL's (2010) indicates that the strategies of setting objectives and providing feedback have positive impacts on students achievement. Studies related to setting objectives emphasize the importance of supporting students as they self-select learning targets, self-monitor their progress, and self-assess their development (Glaser & Brunstein, 2007; Mooney, Ryan, Uhing, Reid, & Epstein, 2005). For example, a study by Kramarski and Zeichner (2001) investigated the use of meta-cognitive feedback versus results feedback in a 6th grade mathematics class as a way to help students know what to

do to improve their performance. Park (2003) noted that students who actively engage with what they are studying tend to understand more, learn more, remember more, enjoy it more and be more able to appreciate the relevance of what they have learned, than students who passively receive what we teach them. Interest has grown in recent years in what is sometimes referred to as the Learning-Centred Paradigm (McManus, 2001), because it situates learners at the centre of the experience, empowers and motivates them to assume responsibility for their own learning, and adopts teaching and learning strategies designed to encourage students to see themselves as active thinkers and problem-solvers.

Activity method is a technique adopted by a teacher with emphasis on practice through learners' involvement and active participation in the teaching and learning process, especially in the class. In the activity method of teaching, activities related to the topic under consideration are assigned to learners in which they participate rigorously and provide solutions thereby bringing about efficient learning experiences. It promotes learning by doing, which is the focal point of the learning of vocational skills. Learning by doing develops the memory and helps in the retention of what is being learnt for a long time if not permanently, hence, it is observed that the more the senses are stimulated, the more a person learns and the longer he/she retains. In an activity-based teaching, learners willingly with enthusiasm internalize and implement concepts relevant to their needs.

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 Harfield, Davies, Hede, Panko and 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 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.

Meaningful learning helps learners to construct mental models that allow for 'higher-order' performance such as applied problem solving and transfer of information and skills. A study conducted by Khan, Muhammad, Ahmed, Saeed and Khan (2012) investigated the impact of activity-based teaching on the students' achievement in Physics at secondary level. The results showed that the activity-based teaching is more effective for the development of higher order skills in the students.

Activity-based learning (ABL) theory is a cognitive-learning theory which is basically a "constructivist" learning theory (Stößlein, 2009). This theory asserts that learning takes place when psychological environment of an individual interacts with a structure. For construction students it is imperative to have variety of activities in an active classroom (Abdelhamid, 2003; Murray, Donohoe & Goodhew, (2004). Active classrooms are basic requirements for construction education (Panko et al, 2005).

Traditional teaching methods are not suitable for tactile learning because tactile learning needs direct experience and involve manipulation of materials. 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 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. In an active-learning classroom students are active learners not the passive receivers. According to Stöblein (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. 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 (Stöblein, 2009). Students' motivation is high if these activities are personally relevant to the students, (Krajcik & Marx, 2005,). There is research evidence which shows that students will retain limited knowledge if they are involved passively in teaching-learning process.

In a study conducted by Fernandez-Alonso, Alvarez-Diaz, Saurez-Alvarez and Muniz (2017), it is noted that the optimum time students should spend on homework has been widely researched although the results are far from unanimous. For instance, Sreeremya, (2016) stated that in classrooms where homework is always assigned there are gains. Background Empirical evidence Hsiung (2012) suggests that students studying cooperatively exhibit significantly better academic achievement. Herrmann emphasised the importance of cooperative learning and noted that undergraduates attend weekly tutorials to complement their lectures (Anderson, 2005). However, lack of student engagement is a widespread problem (Fritschner, 2000,) even in the tutorial setting (Biggs, 2003;). Race (2005) argues that 'doing' is one of the five pivotal factors underpinning successful learning, and from this perspective, the widespread passivity and disengagement is unfortunate. Student-centred teaching is one way of promoting student engagement, and cooperative learning is another. Many student-centred instructional methods are gaining popularity within the last decade (Baeten, 2010; Lea, 2003). Machemer and Crawford (2007) stated that 'while active learning is doing, cooperative learning is doing with others.

Interaction, in turn, is expected to lead to higher academic achievement (Johnson and Johnson, 2009). Negative interdependence, on the contrary, exists when the efforts of others are detrimental to the students learning outcome (e.g. in a competitive learning environment), and an individualistic situation exists when the efforts of students are unrelated (Johnson and Johnson, 2009). Cooperative learning is concerned with framing student interaction in ways that are likely to raise positive interdependence and interaction. Jigsaw and think-pair-share (Johnson et al., 2000) are some examples of cooperative learning structures; however, any form of peer interaction can be cooperative if it adheres to two basic principles: positive interdependence and individual accountability. Positive interdependence means that group members should perceive that the collective effort of the group is essential in order for the individual learners to achieve their goals (Johnson and Johnson, 2009). Comprehensive meta-analyses have demonstrated that cooperative learning structures are related to higher academic achievement than competitive and individualistic structures (Roseth et al., 2008). However, the vast majority of studies about cooperative learning are with children in primary and secondary schools. In recent years, the scholarly interest in cooperative learning has increased in higher education research (Cavanagh, 2011; Hammond, 2010; Hillyard, 2010), but findings have been ambiguous and contradictory.

Nevertheless, the same studies also reflect a number of problems related to cooperative learning such as free riding, resentment towards being dependent on peers, conflicts arising over varying levels of ambition, and distrust towards peers (Finlay and

Faulkner, 2005; Hassanien, 2007; Kelly and Fetherston, 2008; Onwuegbuzie and DaRos-Voseles, 2001; Waite and Davis, 2006). Machermer and Crawford (2007) found that cooperative learning activities, unless they were perceived to relate to examinations, were valued less than lectures or other forms of active learning. Hillyard (2010) found that students' attitudes towards working in groups were related to their perception of the value of peer interaction, their previous experiences with working in groups, and, most importantly, the individual teacher's clarity in explaining the purpose of group work. Hammond (2010) reported that students valued the social aspects of working with peers, but that they were less likely to agree that cooperation helped them achieve better in assessed tasks. While Vreven and McFadden (2007) found that students did not benefit from cooperative learning activities in lectures, students in a study by Cavanagh (2011) greatly valued opportunities for engaging in lectures by means of cooperative learning activities. Kelly and Fetherston (2008) interpreted resistance towards cooperative learning as reflecting a transmission model of teaching and learning in which the teacher is considered the sole expert. Phipps (2001) reported how students associated the lecture with proper teaching at the university level and perceived their own role to be passive note takers.

Active learning is concerned with motivating students to engage meaningfully in their courses and in their classes. Engagement, or activity, however, is an ambiguous concept (Trowler, 2010). The first construct, approaches to learning, offers a qualitative description of the students' motives and strategies that are strongly related to high-quality learning outcomes (Biggs and Tang, 2011). The concept of approaches to learning is firmly established within the educational research literature (Entwistle and McCune, 2004). The surface approach stems from an intention to pass the course with minimal effort and is accompanied by a strategy that focuses on facts and rote learning. The deep approach is based on personal interest in the subject matter and involves a strategy in which the student seeks to understand and uncover the meaning of course material (Biggs and Tang, 2011; Entwistle and McCune, 2004; Marton and Säljö, 2005). Although the two approaches are not 'good' or 'bad' per se, a deep approach is advocated to be in line with general intended learning outcomes in higher education (Biggs and Tang, 2011) and especially when the intended outcome is understanding (Hounsell, 2005; Marton and Säljö, 2005).

Research has focused on engagement as in-class participation (Floyd, 2009; Fritschner, 2000; Rocca, 2010; Sidelinger and Booth-Butterfield, 2010; Weaver and Qi, 2005). As this research literature rests primarily on data-driven empirical studies (Rocca, 2010), the concept of participation and its measurement is not as clearly defined and operationalised compared to approaches to learning; however, in general, participation in this literature has come to mean the student's contribution to the discussion or at least the student's willingness to communicate and contribute. In the Rocca (2010) review, participation is operationally defined as making comments, asking questions and signalling a willingness to answer through raising one's hand.

Statement of the Problem

The high demand for graduates from educational institutions, including those at the basic education level with the required skills and knowledge for self-employment is equally placing a demand on teachers to be innovative in teaching. The question that comes to bear is, 'how effective is the teaching and learning of Business Studies in junior

Academic Scholarship

secondary schools in Nigeria and especially in Eket Senatorial District of Akwa Ibom State? Secondly, what are the methods of teaching adopted by Business Studies teachers in junior secondary schools? Do Business Studies teachers adopt learner-centred methods of teaching? How do the methods of teaching bring about effective learning of Business Studies?

Although these questions must have been asked by other researchers, the continued and rising rate of unemployment among youths, including those who have completed their three years Business Students programme at the upper universal basic education constitute a problem, which this study aims to solve? Therefore, this study is apt.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between learner-centred teaching methods and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education in Eket Senatorial District of Akwa Ibom State. Specifically, the study sought to determine the relationship between:

1. Engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.
2. Engagement of students in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.
3. Students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.
4. Cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

Research Questions

This study sought answers to the following research questions.

1. What is the relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?
2. What is the relationship between engagement of students' in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?
3. What is the relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?
4. What is the relationship between cooperative-based learning and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?

Statement of Hypotheses

This study sought to test four null hypotheses. These are:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between engagement of students' in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

H0₃: There is no significant relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

H0₄: There is no significant relationship between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

Research Methods

The descriptive survey research design was used for the study. The descriptive research aims to verify formulated hypotheses that refer to the present situation to elucidate it. It is a type of research that is primarily concerned with describing the nature or conditions and degree in detail of the present situation (Azuka & Agomuo, 2006). The study was conducted in Eket Senatorial Educational Zone of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The population of this study comprised 68 Business Studies teachers and 132 Business Studies students in upper universal education eight (either, JSS two students). The population was obtained from the office of the Executive Secretary of Education in Eket Senatorial District of Akwa Ibom State. The purposive sampling technique was used to get the sample size for the study. This sampling technique is the most suitable owing to the researcher's decision to use a convenient sample size, thereby excluding selection through randomization. This study made use of a sample size of 100 respondents, comprising 40 teachers and 60 students of Business Studies. The researcher-made questionnaire was used for generating data for this study. The questionnaire is tagged, Learner-Centred Teaching Methods and Effective Learning Questionnaire (LCTMELQ) and has 27 items. The questionnaire has four-point rating.

Results

Research Questions

Research Question One

What is the relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?

Table 4.1.1

Descriptive statistics of the nature of relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

S/N	Item	Mean	Remark
1.	Set learning objectives that are specific but not restrictive.	3.48	High Effective Learning
2.	Communicate the learning objectives to students and parents.	3.78	Very High Effective Learning
3.	Connect the learning objectives to previous and future learning.	3.6	Very High Effective Learning
4.	Engage students in setting personal learning objectives.	3.47	High Effective Learning

Academic Scholarship

5.	Students' involvement in setting lesson objectives and their effective learning	3.37	High Effective Learning
6.	Students' involvement in setting lesson goals and their effective learning	3.17	High Effective Learning
7.	Students' involvement in lesson development and their effective learning	3.27	High Effective Learning
8.	Students' involvement in lesson delivery and their effective learning	3.27	High Effective Learning
9.	Students' involvement in lesson conclusion and their effective learning	3.38	High Effective Learning
10.	Accomplishment of set objectives and their effective learning	3.5	Very High Effective Learning
Grand Mean		3.43	high Effective Learning

Table 4.1.1 shows the nature of relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The grand mean of 3.43 indicates that the relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies is high.

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between engagement of students' in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?

Table 4.1.2

Descriptive statistics of the nature of relationship between engagement of students in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

S/N	Item	Mean	Remark
11.	Involvement of learners in class activity	3.5	Very High Effective Learning
12.	Assignment of topics to learners to proffer Solutions	3.08	High Effective Learning
13.	Stimulation for creative action	2.88	High Effective Learning
14.	Stimulation for performance	3.2	High Effective Learning
15.	Opportunity for practical activities	2.92	High Effective Learning
16.	The use of manipulative materials to illicit mastery	3.1	High Effective Learning
Grand Mean		3.11	High Effective Learning

Table 4.1.2 shows the nature of relationship between creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The grand mean of 3.11 indicates that the relationship between creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies is high.

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?

Table 4.1.3

Descriptive statistics of the nature of relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

S/N	Item	Mean	Remark
17.	Assignment on what is yet to be taught	3.73	Very High Effective Learning
18.	Assignment of unaccomplished objectives in class	3.32	High Effective Learning
19.	Assignment on real life experience	3.18	High Effective Learning
20.	Assignment on work-based business concept that requires field work	3.28	High Effective Learning
21.	Assignment of practical projects	3.17	High Effective Learning
Grand Mean		3.34	High Effective Learning

Table 4.1.3 shows the nature of relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The grand mean of 3.34 indicates that the relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose and effective learning of business studies is high.

Research Questions Four

What is the relationship between cooperative-based learning and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education?

Table 4.1.4

Descriptive statistics of the nature of relationship between cooperative-based learning and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

S/N	Item	Mean	Remark
22.	Students' participation in small groups	3.28	High Effective Learning
23.	Cooperative learning in class	3.47	High Effective Learning
24.	Cooperative learning outside the normal classroom	3.2	High Effective Learning
25.	Creating models based on cooperation	2.85	High Effective Learning
26.	Teacher – students' collaboration	2.98	High Effective Learning
27.	Student – students' collaboration	2.78	High Effective Learning
Grand Mean		3.09	High Effective Learning

Table 4.1.4 shows the nature of relationship between cooperative-based learning and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The grand mean of 3.09 indicates that the relationship between cooperative-based learning and effective learning of business studies is high.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis one

H0₁ There is no significant relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Table 4.2.1

Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between setting core learning objectives and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Variable	SE	R	R ²
Setting core learning objectives	2.29967	.866	.751

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Level
Regression (X)	1441.500	1	1441.500	295.229	.05
Residual (Y)	478.500	88	4.883		
Total	1920.00	99			

Table 4.2.1 shows the Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The calculated F – value of 295.229 is by far greater than the critical F – value of 3.92. Based on this revelation, the null hypothesis, “there is no significant relationship between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of

business studies in upper universal basic education” is rejected and the alternate hypothesis stated. This implies that significant relationship exists between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

Hypothesis two

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between engagement of students’ in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Table 4.2.2

Result of Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between engagement of students’ in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Variable	SE	R	R ²		
Creating practice	2.258	96.981	.963		
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Level
Regression (X)	13066.667	1	13066.667	2560.640	.05
Residual (Y)	500.083	88	5.103		
Total	13566.750	99			

N = 100; Critical F = 3.92

Table 4.2.2 shows the Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between engagement of students’ in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The calculated F – value of 2560.640 is by far greater than the critical F – value of 3.92. Based on this revelation, the null hypothesis, “there is no significant relationship between engagement of students’ in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education” is rejected and the alternate hypothesis stated. This implies that significant relationship exists between engagement of students’ in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

4.2.3 Hypothesis three

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between students’ involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Table 4.2.3

Result of Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Variable	SE	R	R ²		
Involvement in assignment	2.349	20.770	.593		
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Level
Regression (X)	788.907	1	788.907	142.938	.05
Residual (Y)	540.883	88	5.519		
Total	1329.790	99			

N = 100; Critical F = 3.92

Table 4.2.3 shows the linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The calculated F – value of 142.938 is by far greater than the critical F – value of 3.92. Based on this revelation, the null hypothesis, “there is no significant relationship between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education” is rejected and the alternate hypothesis stated. This implies that significant relationship exists between students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

Hypothesis four

H0₄: There is no significant relationship between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Table 4.2.4

Result of Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education

Variable	SE	R	R ²		
Cooperative learning	2.588	50.824	.680		
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significant Level
Regression (X)	1392.327	1	1392.327	207.799	.05
Residual (Y)	656.633	98	6.700		
Total	2048.960	99			

N = 100; Critical F = 3.92

Table 4.2.4 shows the Linear regression analysis of no significant relationship between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The calculated F – value of 207.799

is by far greater than the critical F – value of 3.92. Based on this revelation, the null hypothesis, “there is no significant relationship between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education” is rejected and the alternate hypothesis stated. This implies that significant relationship exists between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

Discussion of Findings

The finding from the analysis of this objective is that significant relationship exists between engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. This finding goes a long way to strengthen the findings and views of other authors. Pintrich and Schunk (2002) had earlier observed that setting objectives is the process of establishing a direction to guide learning. When teachers communicate objectives for student learning, students can see more easily the connections between what they are doing in class and what they are supposed to learn. Studies related to setting objectives emphasize the importance of supporting students as they self-select learning targets, self-monitor their progress and self-assess their development (Glaser & Brunstein, 2007; Mooney, Ryan, Uhing, Reid, & Epstein, 2005).

Also, Park (2003) noted that students who actively engage with what they are studying tend to understand more, learn more, remember more, enjoy it more and be more able to appreciate the relevance of what they have learned, than students who passively receive what we teach them. Park (2003) posited that in conventional teaching–learning situations too often we pressure students to defend their knowledge rather than exhibit their thinking.

The analysis indicates that there is significant relationship between engagement of students’ in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education. The finding is not different from the findings of most authors earlier reviewed. For instance, Prince (2004) noted that activity method of learning makes students to engage in the learning processes. In Activity-based learning (ABL) teaching method, in the words of Harfield, Davies, Hede, Panko and 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. Harfield, Davies, Hede, Panko and Kenley (2007).

Meaningful learning helps learners to construct mental models that allow for 'higher-order' performance such as applied problem solving and transfer of information and skills. 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. Effective teaching –learning process is not possible without students motivation. 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.

The volume or amount of homework (mean homework time for the group) and the frequency of homework assignment have positive effects on achievement

(Fernandez-Alonso, Alvarez-Diaz, Saurez-Alvarez and Muniz, 2017). Significant relationship exists between cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) and effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education Background Empirical evidence Hsiung (2012) suggests that students studying cooperatively exhibit significantly better academic achievement.

Conclusions

Based on the findings made in this study, it is concluded among others that engagement of students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals); engagement of students' in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method); students' involvement in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method); and cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method) enhance effective learning of business studies in upper universal basic education.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn the following recommendations are made:

1. Business studies teachers should engage students in setting core learning objectives (teaching goals).
2. Business studies teachers should engage students in creating practice to develop skills (Activity method).
3. Business studies teachers should engage students in assignment for formative purpose (Assignment method).
4. Business studies teachers should engage students in cooperative-based learning (Cooperative method).

References

- Abdelhamid, T. S. (2003). Evaluation of teacher-student learning style disparity in construction Management education. *Journal of Construction Education*; 8(3), 124-145.
- Anderson, C. (2005). Enabling and shaping understanding through tutorials. In: F. Marton; D. Hounsell and N. Entwistle(Eds).*The Experience of Learning: Implications for Teaching and Studying in Higher Education*, 3rd Internet edition. Edinburgh: Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment, University of Edinburgh, pp. 187–97.
- Azuka, E. B. &Agomuo, E. E. (2006). *Research Techniques for Tertiary Institutions*. Oko: Cheston Books.
- Baeten, M. (2010) Using student-centered learning environments to stimulate deep approaches to learning: Factors encouraging or discouraging their effectiveness. *Educational Research Review* 5(3), 243–60.
- Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2011).*Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*, 4th ed. The Society for Research into Higher Education. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

- Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*, 2nd ed. The Society for Research into Higher Education. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Cavanagh, M. (2011). Students' experiences of active engagement through cooperative learning activities in lectures. *Active Learning in Higher Education* 12(1), 23–33.
- Dominm, D. S. (2007). Students' perceptions of when conceptual development occurs during laboratory instruction Chemistry. *Education Research and Practice*; 8 (2), 140-152.
- Entwistle, N. and McCune, V. (2004). The conceptual bases of study strategy inventories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4): 325–45.
- Fernandez-Alonso, R.; Alvarez-Diaz, M.; Suarez-Alvarez, J and Muniz, J. et al. (2017). Students' Achievement and Homework Assignment Strategies. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00286>
- Finlay, S. J. and Faulkner, G. (2005) Tête-à-Tête: Reading groups and peer learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 6(1): 32–45.
- Floyd, K. S. (2009). The effect of engagement and perceived Coursevalue on deep and surface learning strategies. Informing Science: *The International Journal of an Emerging Trans-discipline* 12. Available at: <http://www.inform.nu/Articles/Vol12/ISJv12p181-190Floyd530.pdf>
- Fritschner, L. M. (2000). Inside the undergraduate college classroom: Faculty and students differ on the meaning of student participation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 342–62.
- Glaser, C. & Brunstein, J. C. (2007). Improving fourth grade students' composition skills. Available at: <https://www.bing.com/search?q=Glaser+%26+Brunstein%2C+2007&form=EDNTH&mkt=en-gb&httpsmsn=1&msnews=1&plvar=0&refig=ab39b87cd11c47c9fb737008>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112
- Hammond, J. A. (2010). A first-year experience of student-directed peer-assisted learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(3), 201–12.
- Hassanien A (2007) A qualitative student evaluation of group learning in higher education. *Higher Education in Europe*, 32(2), 135–50.

- Harfield, T. Davies K., Hede J, et al. (2007). Activity-based teaching for Unitec New Zealand construction students. *Emirates Journal for Engineering Research*; 12 (1), 57-63
- Hillyard, C. (2010). University students' attitudes about learning in small groups after frequent participation. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(1), 9–20.
- Hounsell, D. (2005). Understanding teaching and teaching for understanding. In: F. Marton; F. Hounsell; and N. Entwistle (Eds).*The Experience of Learning: Implications for Teaching and Studying in Higher Education*, 3rd Internet edition. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment, pp. 238–57.
- Hsiung, C. (2012). The effectiveness of cooperative learning. *Journal of Engineering Education*,101(1), 10 – 18
- Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–79.
- Khan, M; Muhammad, N.; Ahmed, M.; et al. (2012). Activity-Based Teaching on Students Academic Achievements in Physics at Secondary Level. *Academic Research International*, 3(1): 1 – 19. Available at: [http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.3\(1\)/2012\(3.1-19\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.3(1)/2012(3.1-19).pdf). Accessed June 2018
- Kelly, R. and Fetherston, B. (2008). Productive contradictions: Dissonance, resistance and change in an experiment with cooperative learning. *Journal of Peace Education*, 5(1), 97–111.
- Kramarski, B. & Zeichner, O. (2001). Using technology to enhance mathematical reasoning: Effects of feedback and self-regulation learning. *Educational Media International*, 38(2), 77 – 82. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ63130> . Accessed: December, 2019.
- Krajcik, J. S & Marx, R. W. (2005). Learning and Engagement in an Urban Science Classroom. *Urban Education*. Available at: www.personal.umich.edu/~krajcik/JournalPublication.htm. Accessed: December 2019.
- Lea, S. J.; Stephenson, D. and Troy, J. (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student-centered learning: Beyond 'educational bulimia'? *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3): 321–34.
- Machemer, P. L. and Crawford, P. (2007). Student perceptions of active learning in a large cross-disciplinary classroom. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 8(1), 9–30.

- Marton, F. and Säljö, R. (2005). Approaches to learning. In: F. Marton;D. Hounsell and N. Entwistle (Eds.). *The Experience of Learning: Implications for Teaching and Studying in Higher Education*, 3rd Internet edition. Edinburgh: Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment, University of Edinburgh, pp. 39–58.
- Mkpa, M. A. &Izuagba (2006). *Curriculum Studies and Innovation*. Owerri: Versatile Publishers
- Mooney, P.; Ryan, J. B.; Uhing, B. M.; Reid, R. & Epstein, M. H. (2005). A review of self-management interventions targeting academic outcome for students with emotional and behavioural disorders. *Journal of Behavioural Education*. Available at: <https://www.scirp.org/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=2122147> . Accessed, October, 2019.
- Murray, P.; Donohoe, S., & Goodhew, S. (2004). Flexible learning in construction education: a building pathology case study. *Structural Survey*; 22(5), 242-250.
- Nunn, C. E. (1996). Discussion in the college classroom: Triangulating observational and survey results. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(3): 243–266.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. and DaRos-Voseles, D. A. (2001). The role of cooperative learning in research methodology courses: A mixed-methods analysis. *Research in the Schools*, 8(1), 61–75.
- Panko, M.; Kenley, R.; Davies, K.; et al (2005). Learning styles of those in the building and construction sector. Report for Building Research New Zealand, Inc. Unitec New Zealand, Auckland.
- Park, C. (2003). Engaging Students in the Learning Process: *The learning journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27(2), 183–199
- Pintrich, P. & Schunk, D. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? a review of the research. Available at: http://ctl.jhsph.edu/resources/views/content/files/150/Does_Active_Learning_Work.pdf. Accessed 2019.
- Phipps, M. (2001). University students' perceptions of cooperative learning: Implications for administrators and instructors. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 24(1): 14–21.
- Race, P. (2005). *Making learning happen: A guide for post-compulsory education*, 1st ed. London: Thousand Oaks.

Academic Scholarship

- Rocca, K. A. (2010). Student participation in the college classroom: An extended multidisciplinary literature review. *Communication Education*, 59(2), 185–213.
- Roseth, C. J. (2008). Promoting early adolescents' achievement and peer relationships: The effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 223–46.
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153 – 189.
- Stößlein, M. (2009). Activity-based Learning Experiences in Quantitative Research Methodology for (Time-Constrained) Young Scholars - Course Design and Effectiveness. POMS 20th Annual \Conference, Orlando, Florida, U.S.A.
- Sreeremya, S. (2016). *Assignment method of teaching*. PU: School of Education Press
- Trowler, V. (2010). *Student Engagement*. York: Higher Education Academy.
- Vreven, D. and McFadden, S. (2007). An empirical assessment of cooperative groups in large, time-compressed, introductory courses. *Innovative Higher Education*, 32(2), 85–92.
- Waite, S. and Davis, B. (2006). Developing undergraduate research skills in a faculty of education: Motivation through collaboration. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 25(4): 403–19.
- Weaver, R. R. and Qi, J. (2005). Classroom organization and participation: College students' perceptions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 570–601.
- Weimer, M. 2002. *Learner-Centered Teaching*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.