



## The Effects of using an Interactive Whiteboard on Postgraduate Students' Academic Achievement in a Nigerian University

Peter Ayoola Ajelabi

Faculty of Education, Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano, Nigeria.

Received 18th August 2018, Accepted 1st October 2018

### Abstract

*This study examined the effects of the use of an interactive whiteboard on the academic achievement of Nigerian postgraduate students, after a 10-week exposure to a post graduate course (Educational Broadcasting) in Educational Technology. 24 students participated in the study. One major null hypothesis was formulated and tested. The research was designed as a pre-test, post-test control group quasi-experimental study. T-test was employed for the data analysis and the findings showed that there was no significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) between the pre-test mean scores of both groups. In addition, there was no significant difference in the academic achievement of the students in the experimental group who were taught using the conventional lecture method combined with the interactive whiteboard, and the control group who had same lessons using the conventional lecture method only. Although, the use of interactive whiteboard had not significantly affected students' achievement, it was realised that students become more engaged, committed, received significant attention and interacted more with their peers and lecturer. Based on the findings, appropriate recommendations were made.*

**Keywords:** Interactive whiteboard, Postgraduate students, Academic Achievement.

© Copy Right, IJRRAS, 2018. All Rights Reserved.

### Introduction

The world is witnessing digital revolution. It has been noticed that different nations and societies are experiencing the pervasive use of technologies (Beeland, 2001) such as the internet, social networking tools, cell phones, video games and e-mails to mention but a few, not only for communication purposes, but to make life easier. The computer in particular has led to the applications of educational games, multimedia and simulations in enhancing learning. These changes had affected the social, cultural and educational lives of people.

With reference to education, it has been observed that there is a wider application of computers to instruction. As a result of this, information and communications technology has altered the traditional classroom environment and instructional methods. This is noted mostly with simulations and games, e-books, virtual environment and multimedia utilisation. The use of multimedia in particular has made lesson presentations to become more interesting and lively. The latest technology in vogue, starting from the middle of the 1990s (spanning over 20 years) that has replaced the traditional black or white boards is the interactive whiteboard.

Interactive whiteboards which are a set of connections of a computer, a projector and a touch screen electronic whiteboard were originally developed for office settings and are a relatively new addition to education (Smith, Higgins, Wall and Miller, 2005). Students and teachers can use the touch screen whiteboard to experiment, solve, write and erase applications such as visuals, animations and graphics. The user can control and manipulate this projected image through the software installed on the computer. Depending on the software programmes used by these whiteboards, videos, multimedia materials, or the internet can be used. For effective use, the interactive whiteboard must be oriented. This served as a means of providing solutions to the inadequacies of using the computers and multimedia applications only for teaching and learning

### Literature Review

Interactive whiteboards are being integrated into many classrooms, a majority of which are found in Great Britain and the United States (Digregorio and Sobel-Lojeski, 2010). Schroeder (2007) stated that much of the research on interactive whiteboards comes from Great Britain as the technology is part of a \$27 billion initiative to update all primary and secondary schools by 2015. Most researches on the use of interactive whiteboard were carried out, using mostly primary and secondary school students. Also, research attention on the use of interactive whiteboard was paid to the teaching of Maths and Science. Very few studies were

### Correspondence

Peter Ayoola Ajelabi

Faculty of Education, Nigeria.

researched into with tertiary education level students, particularly in the developing countries.

Digregorio and Sobel-Lojeski (2010) carried out an extensive literature review on common themes on interactive whiteboard. These include attention, behaviour, level of interaction between students, teacher and interactive whiteboard as well as achievement. Higgins et al. (2007) carried out a 2-year longitudinal study on the effect of interactive whiteboard on achievement. No significant difference was found in the test scores between schools using interactive whiteboards and schools not using them. Similarly, Schuck and Kearney (2007) revealed in their findings that little or no difference was found on national test scores in Mathematics and Science in U.K. primary schools when comparing interactive and non-interactive whiteboard classrooms. Martin (2007) and Solvie (2007) also presented supporting reports. However, result of the study conducted by Smith et.al. (2006) involving 97 primary schools in 172 classrooms, revealed that students from classes with interactive whiteboards were five months ahead of their peers in Mathematics, two and a half months in literacy and seven and a half months in science. In essence, the use of interactive whiteboards does enhance teaching and learning.

Hall and Higgins (2005) highlighted the advantages of interactive whiteboard for students to include: ease of learning, enhanced motivation and improved participation. Miller et.al. (2005) listed effectiveness in media use, diversity of resources and support for lesson plans as some of the benefits of the use of interactive whiteboards.

Notwithstanding the above, Thomson and Flecknoe (2003) pointed out that there was significant gain using the ready made using the interactive whiteboard program called *Easiteach Maths*. In the study conducted by Lewin et.al. (2008), they realised that students had positive gains in literacy, mathematics and science for children aged 7-11. This was due to the length of time that students had been taught using the interactive whiteboard.

## Objectives

In recent years, the Management and Board of Governors/ Governing Council of some Universities and Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria has deemed it fit to purchase and install interactive whiteboards in lecture theatres and classrooms for instruction. Consequently, training sessions were carried out, regarding the classroom utilisation. The major purpose for installing them was to enhance learning.

As a result, this study was carried out to;

- (a) Examine if the use of the interactive whiteboard would improve post graduate students academic achievement after a 10-week exposure to a course;
- (b) Find out if the use of interactive whiteboard would motivate them to learn , and participate more in class activities, compared with when

they are exposed to the traditional classroom environment.

## Research Methodology

### Hypothesis

There will be no statistical difference in the achievement of students taught using the interactive whiteboard and those taught using the conventional lecture method.

### Design

The study adopted a pre-test, post test control group quasi-experimental design. In other words, the subjects were measured with respect to the dependent variable both before and after the experimental study. The interactive whiteboard is the independent variable, whereby the effects on learning were examined. The control group were taught using the conventional lecture method, while the experimental group were taught through the conventional lecture method, but also using the interactive whiteboard. The academic achievement is the dependent variable of the study. This was measured in both groups with a pre and post tests. However, the experimental group also had an open-ended six-item questionnaire, which sought their views on the use of interactive whiteboard for learning.

### Subject

The study was conducted using post graduate students who registered for a course (Educational Broadcasting) in the field of Master in Educational Technology in the Faculty of Education in a Nigerian University. A total number of 24 students enrolled for the course during the session. This was made up of 10 females and 14 males.

### Instruments

The first instrument for this study was an academic achievement test on educational broadcasting constructed by the researcher. Two equivalent forms were prepared for the pre-tests and the post-tests. There were 25 questions in each test. In preparing the questions, the researcher took into account the Bloom's taxonomy. The questions were given to two faculty colleagues for content validity. Based on their comments, the researcher had to re-frame some of the items. The reliability co-efficient obtained was 0.84

In addition, a questionnaire titled 'Students attitude towards the use of interactive whiteboard for learning' was prepared and given to the experimental group. The instrument was content validated by experts in Tests and Measurement. After proper scrutiny, some of the items were re-framed. The instrument was further subjected to a reliability test, and the reliability co-efficient was found to be 0.70. This was found to be high enough.

### Procedure

The experimental and control groups were

given the academic achievement test (pre-test) before the treatment. The treatment lasted for 10 weeks. This involved the teaching of each group of students same topics, adopting different techniques. At the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> week, there was the second application of the post-test. Immediately after this, the experimental group were given the attitude questionnaire to complete.

## Results

This section presents an analysis of the data gathered. The table below shows the academic achievement pre-test mean scores and standard deviation values .

Table 1

*Pre-test, Mean scores and Standard Deviation values of the two groups*

Groups	N	X	S.D
Control	12	31.52	8.87
Experimental	12	31.72	9.99

The table above indicated that the achievement test mean score of the control group before the experiment was 31.52, while that of the experimental group was 31.72. This is an indication that the achievement levels of both groups were similar at the start of the study. The difference between the mean scores was -0.20. A t-test was conducted to determine the significance of the difference between mean scores of the groups. This is illustrated in table 2 below.

Table 2

*T-test results of Pre-test mean scores*

Groups	N	X	S.D.	T	Df	P
Control	12	31.52	8.87	- 0.169	22	0.734
Experimental	12	31.72	9.99			

The t-test result shown in table 2 above revealed no significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) between pre-test mean scores of both groups. This further buttressed that the initial achievement levels of the groups were similar. The post-test mean scores of groups after the experiment is presented in table 3.

Table 3

*Post-test Mean scores and Standard Deviation values of the two groups*

Groups	N	X	S.D
Control	12	62.50	13.62
Experimental	12	67.51	10.98

Table 3 shows the post-experimental mean achievement scores of the control and experimental groups. The mean score of the control group was 62.50, while that of the experimental group was 67.51. The difference between the post-test scores of the groups was  $62.50 - 67.51 = -5.01$ .

Table 4

*T-test results of post-test mean scores*

Groups	N	X	S.D	T	Df	P
Control	12	62.50	13.62	- 1.754	22	0.432
Experimental	12	67.51	10.98			

Table 4 above shows the results of the independent t-test conducted to determine the significance of the difference between mean scores. The table revealed no statistical significant difference in the post-test mean scores of both groups ( $P > 0.05$ ). Hence, the null hypothesis which states that “there will be no statistical difference in the achievement of students taught using the interactive whiteboard and those taught using the conventional lecture method” is upheld. In essence, the use of the interactive whiteboard did not significantly increase students’ academic achievement in the course (Educational Broadcasting).

As stated earlier, the experimental groups were further given an attitude to the use of interactive board for learning questionnaire. This is an open-ended six – item questionnaire soliciting for their view on the use of the board, whether it helps them to learn more as well as the challenges they faced when it was adopted for teaching. Their views are summarised thus:

The use of interactive whiteboard motivates me to develop more interest to learn in class with ease, despite my age. It makes me to be an active learner, and do not day dream in class again. I was really happy that I was participating in the lessons. Learning is fun, exciting and enjoyable: and not boring. I hardly believe that 2 hours has gone so soon: how time flies. I would love to learn all my courses using the interactive whiteboard. However, some of us who are not technological minded were finding it difficult doing some exercises on the screen.

## Discussion

From the findings, it was revealed in table 4 that there was no significant difference in the achievement of students taught with the use of interactive whiteboard and those taught using only the modified lecture method. Though, there was no significant difference, table 3 revealed that the experimental groups had higher academic achievement scores and also a higher mean gain score. Although, it was realised that the use of interactive whiteboard had not increase students’ academic achievement significantly, however, it has contributed positively in no small measure to learning. This could be seen in the area of students’ participation in class, making teaching student-centred, motivating them to learn and thereby making them to be more committed to learning. This view was supported by Higgins et.al (2007) when they stated that interactive whiteboards has been found to have a positive effect on students’ motivation to learn. Glover et.al (2005) however emphasised that if students interact with the board themselves, motivation and attention can also be

increased. These benefits were also mentioned by Wall et.al (2005) and Smith et.al (2005). In addition, use of interactive whiteboard made learning to be fun for the students. There was no boredom because different activities were being carried out.

### Conclusion

This study focused on the effects of the use of interactive whiteboard on university postgraduate students' academic achievement when exposed to a 10-week course (Educational Broadcasting) in Educational Technology. The research revealed no significance difference between academic achievement scores of the experimental and control groups. In essence therefore, it can be ascertained that an interactive whiteboard should not be seen as a tool that increases academic achievement, but one that brings information and communications technology to the classroom, thereby leading to new instructional activities.

Also, in a similar study (Ajelabi, 2015) carried out by the researcher using undergraduates as the subjects, it was revealed that there was no significant difference in academic achievement of both the experimental and the control groups. Though, it can be seen from this study that it has not increased academic achievement, however, its unique contributions to learning cannot be undermined. Finally, this study revealed that new teaching and learning activities emanates from the utilisation of interactive whiteboard.

### References

1. Ajelabi, Peter Ayoola (2015). The effects of the use of interactive whiteboard on undergraduate students' achievement :*International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE) Volume 2, Issue 7, July , 51-54.*
2. Akbas, O . and Pektas H.M. (2011). The effects of using an interactive whiteboard on the academic achievement of University students. *Asia-Pacific Forum on science learning and teaching*, 12(3) 1-7.
3. Beeland, W.D. (2001). Student engagement, visual learning and technology: can interactive whiteboard help? *Computers & Education*, 45 (2), 191-201.
4. Digregorio, P. and Sobel-Lojeski, K. (2010). The effects of interactive whiteboards (IWBs) on student performance and learning: A literature review. *Journal of Educational technology Systems* , 38 (3) 255-312.
5. Glover, D. Miller, D., Averis, D., & Door, V. (2005). Leadership implications of using interactive whiteboards, *Management in Education*, 18(5), 27-30.
6. Hall, I and Higgins, S. (2005). Primary Schools Students Perception of Interactive whiteboards. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21, 102-117.
7. Higgins, S., Beauchamp, G., & Miller, D (2007) . Reviewing the literature on interactive whiteboards . *Learning, Media, & Technology*, 32(3), 213-225.
8. Lewin, C., Somekh, B., & Steadman, S. (2008). Embedding interactive whiteboards in teaching and learning: The process of change in pedagogic practice. *Education & Information Technologies*, 13(4), 291-303.
9. Martin, S. (2007). Interactive whiteboards and talking books: A new approach to teaching children to write? *Literacy*, 41(1), 26-34.
10. Miller ,D., Glover, D., and Averis, D. (2005). Presentation and Pedagogy: the effective use of the whiteboards in Mathematics lessons, in D.Hewitt (Ed), *Proceedings of the Sixth British Congress of Mathematics Education*, held at the University of Warwick, 105-112
11. Schroeder, R. (2007). Active learning with interactive whiteboards: A literature review and a case study for college freshmen. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 1(2), 64-73.
12. Schuck, S., & Kearney, M. (2007). Exploring pedagogy with interactive whiteboards :A case study of six schools (Sydney, University of Technology Sydney). Available online <http://www.eddev.uts.edu.au/teacheread/research/iwbproject/pdfs/iwbreportweb.pdf> (accessed January 10, 2015).
13. Smith, F., Hardman, F., and Higgins, S. (2006). The impact of interactive whiteboards on teacher-pupil interaction in the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategies, *British Educational Research Journal* , 32 (3), 443-457
14. Smith, H., Higgins, S., Wall, K., & Miller, J. (2005). Interactive whiteboards: Boon or bandwagon? A critical review of the literature. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(2), 91-101.
15. Solvie, P. (2007). Leaping out of our skins: Postmodern considerations in use of an electronic whiteboard to foster critical engagement in early literacy lessons. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 39(7), 737-754.
16. Thompson, J., & Flecknoe, M. (2003). Raising attainment with an interactive whiteboard in Key Stage 2. *Management in Education*, 17(3), 29-33.
17. Wall, K., Higgins, S. And Smith, H. (2005). 'The Visual Helps me understand the complicated things' : pupils views of teaching and learning with interactive whiteboards. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36 (5), 851-867.