



Samir D. Ajmeri
Principal
Rahatalav Primary School,
Rahatalav

The Effects of Teams-Games-Tournaments on Achievement and Retention of Economics Learning of Students

Introduction:

In recent years, India has experienced an important paradigm shift in education: a teacher-centred approach has been replaced by a learner-centered approach. Put differently, the emphasis is now on an Outcomes-Based Education approach as the key underlying principle of the National Curriculum Framework

Within the NCF curriculum, but specifically in Economics, it is of critical importance that learners learn how to gather relevant information and to transform such information into marketable knowledge; in other words, the learner has to be enabled to identify problems and find solutions to these challenges by means of creative and innovative thinking in real-life situations.

To ensure that the outcomes of Economics teaching are achieved, Economics teachers are compelled to consider different teaching strategies and methods. By pursuing these new strategies and methods, Economics teachers will be enabled to initiate teaching and learning effectively so that knowledge, skills and positive attitudes may be optimised among learners in their response to the economic environment.

Excellent and effective teaching demands a host of devices, techniques and strategies not only to achieve cross critical outcomes, but because variety, itself, is a desideratum. The cooperative learning technique of Teams- Games-Tournaments (TGT).

Statement of The Problem:

The Effects of Teams-Games-Tournaments on Achievement and Retention of Economics Learning of Students

Hypotheses :

The following hypothesis is developed:

Ho1 There will be no significant difference between post test mean scores of Traditional group

and Experimental group (TGT) on achievement test.

Ho2 There will be no significant difference between post test mean scores of Traditional group

and Experimental group (TGT) on retention.

Methodology:Research design:

A quasi-experimental research, with partially matched TGT-experimental and traditional lecture method groups, was constructed because of its resistance to common threats to internal validity (Mouton, 2001 & Gray, 2004).

Sampling:

Students of standard XI were identified for the investigation. Only 112 students who were registered for module. In the present study the random sampling method has been adapted. The experimental group consisted of 56 students and the control group of 56 students. Both groups were taught by the researcher over a 6 week period of two contact sessions of 40 minutes per week for the first semester.

Research instrument:

The Test of Economic Literacy Level which is a created by researcher test of economics content. The researcher used Economic Literacy Test for the post test for both groups.

The Economic Literacy Test composed of fifty multiple-choice items which was structured and aligned on the content of Economics. Achievement and Retention instruments were also used in this study to obtain data. All students concerned were informed that results of information will only use for research purposes. This gave the researcher an indication on which angle to present the TGT during the contact sessions.

Procedure:

The experimental group received training and demonstrations in using TGT during their contact sessions. After 6 weeks, all participants (N=112) were retested with the Achievement and Retention instruments. The researcher calculated the standardized mean difference of percentiles to determine impact on students' economic literacy levels. First Internal exam's marks in economics were used as covariate measures. In order to control for the "teacher quality" variable, both groups were taught by the regular economics teacher. Both groups were taught the module on economics using the same content outline, but students in the cooperative learning group completed learning activities in small heterogeneous groups, while the students in the control group completed activities individually. The two chapter module was taught to both groups over a six-week period. The test was administered to both groups at the end of the instructional unit. Three weeks later, the test was administered again to the students to determine retention of information.

Results and Discussion:

Test scores and average marks in economics showed that students who were exposed to the TGT strategy compared to those in the lecture method were significantly different (see Table 1). Student achievement was measured by the number of correct responses on the 70-item achievement test developed by the researchers. The test of retention was administered three weeks following the achievement test (see Table 2).

Table 1: Difference between post test mean scores of Traditional group and Experimental group (TGT) on achievement test

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Remarks
Post -Test	Control group	56	40.25	8.005	2.191	Significant at 0.05 level
	Experimental group(TGT)	56	38.43	8.577		

Table 2: Difference between post test mean scores of Traditional group and Experimental group (TGT) on retention

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Remarks
Post -Test	Control group	56	40.43	8.577	2.34	Significant at 0.05 level
	Experimental group(TGT)	56	41.09	7.922		

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The TGT technique is more effective than the lecture method with regard to economics student achievement or student retention of information.
2. The TGT technique is more effective than the lecture method with regard to economics students' attitudes toward the method of instruction.

Conclusion:

The results of this study are encouraging and add to the work of other research studies. Cooperative learning was found to be more effective than lecture method with respect to economics students' achievement and retention in this study, the literature suggests there may be additional reasons to use cooperative learning. Certainly, the ability to work with others within a group and to develop interpersonal skills may be justification for using cooperative learning strategies. This study has shown that cooperative learning methods were more effective than lecture method with regard to achievement and retention, so concerns about the effectiveness of cooperative learning methods in these areas have been addressed. Students taught by cooperative methods should perform equally as well as students taught by lecture method.

References :

- Allen, W.H. & Van Sickle, R.L. (1984). Learning teams and low achievers. *Social Education*, 48, 60-64.
- Hays, W.L. (1973). *Statistics for the social sciences*. New York: Holt Rinehart, and Winston.<http://listserve.uga.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0605&L=spsx-1&P=29372>
Retrieved: 30 August 2008
- Johnson, D.W. & Ahlgren, A. (1976). Relationship between student attitudes about cooperation and competition and attitudes toward schooling. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68(1), 92-102.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1989). *Leading the cooperative school*. Edina, MN: Interaction.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1990). Social skills for successful group work. *Educational Leadership*, 47(4), 29-33.
- Johnson, DW; Johnson, RT & Stanne, MB. 2000. Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis [Online].www.cooperation.org/pages/cl-methods.html. Retrieved: 6 May 2008
- Slavin, R.E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Wodarski, L.A., Adelson, C.L., Todd, M.T., & Wodarski, J.S. (1980). Teaching nutrition by teams-games tournaments. *Journal of Nutrition Education*, 12(2), 61-65.

Paper Received : 18th May, 2015

Paper Reviewed : 25th May, 2015

Paper Revised Received : 15th June, 2015

Paper Published : 1st July, 2015

A large, semi-transparent pink watermark of the letters 'CTE' is centered on the page. The letters are in a bold, serif font. The 'C' is on the left, the 'T' is in the middle, and the 'E' is on the right. The watermark is overlaid on a light purple background that features a faint, larger-scale version of the 'CTE' logo.