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Abstract

Problem Statement: Many effective instructional strategies, methods, and techniques, which were developed in accordance with constructivist approach, can be used together in social studies lessons. Constructivist education comprises active learning processes. Two active learning approaches are cooperative learning and systematic teaching.

Purpose of the Study: The present study was conducted to determine the effect of the cooperative learning method and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches on student achievement and retention in teaching the social studies lesson unit “The Place We Live” in a 4th grade class at the elementary school level.

Method: The research was based on pretest-posttest control group experimental design. Accordingly, experiment group 1 received instruction based on the cooperative learning method, experiment group 2 received instruction based on the systematic teaching method, and control groups 1 and 2 were instructed through the constructivist learning approach. A total of 110 students were assigned to the experiment and control groups, and the paired samples t test and one-way ANOVA were used to analyze the data.
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Findings: The results of the study suggested that the cooperative learning method and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches are effective ways of enhancing students’ achievement. Conversely, experiment and control group post test scores were not significantly different from each other. The cooperative learning method and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches (control-1) were found to secure retention of knowledge, but failed to achieve retention of the knowledge among students in control group 2.

Conclusion and Recommendations: The study found that cooperative learning and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches were effective in enhancing student achievement and retention in social studies lessons (except for control-2). Based on these results, it is recommended that in order to enhance academic achievement and retention of gains in social studies lessons, the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching can be used in addition to the constructivist learning approach. Moreover, failure of the constructivist learning approach to achieve retention in control group 2 can be based on different reasons. One reason can be the teachers’ lack of knowledge about the basic philosophy and steps of constructivist approach. In this context, it is recommended that teachers should have in-service training about the constructivist approach.
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Introduction

With the implementation of the 2005 curriculum in Turkey, the constructivist learning approach was employed to provide students with basic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values regarding social life in social studies lessons. Constructivism is based on the idea that people learn better when they actively construct knowledge and associate new knowledge with previous knowledge (Smerdon, Burkam & Lee, 1999). Students who learn according to the constructivist approach discover knowledge and use it effectively in various situations (Perkins, 1999). In this context there are two principles of constructivism. First, knowledge cannot be acquired in passively. Knowledge is actively constructed and this constructed knowledge can differ from person to person. Second, there is not a single truth in the world. Since individuals try to understand the world through their own experiences, truth differs according to every individual’s own perception (Wheatley, 1991). Furthermore, constructivism is not a theory of teaching but rather of learning (Richardson, 2003, p. 1629). Grennon Brooks and Brooks (1993, as cited in Brooks & Brooks, 1999, p. 20) define the five basic principles of constructivism as follows:

1. A constructivist teacher seeks for and cares about learners’ viewpoints.
2. A constructivist teacher constructs (plans) the lessons to challenge the students’ assumptions.

3. A constructivist teacher is aware that students need to make additions regarding the curriculum.

4. A constructivist teacher does not construct (plan) the lessons around small fragments of knowledge, but instead around great ideas.

5. A constructivist teacher does not evaluate the students’ learning separately, but instead within the context of daily classroom research.

Though it has different definitions and procedures, the nature of constructivist lessons involves four well accepted components. These are:

1. Students construct meaning on their own.

2. New learning is constructed on previous knowledge.

3. Learning is consolidated with social interaction.


These principles must be considered if the constructivist learning approach is to bring about meaningful learning and students’ awareness (Unal, 2010). Another approach that can help achieve meaningful learning in social studies lessons is cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is the most remarkable and productive of all fields of practice, research, and theory in education (Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000). Johnson & Johnson (1999, p. 68) state that cooperative learning is a versatile procedure and can be used for a variety of purposes. In other words, cooperative learning develops when students work together in order to achieve common learning goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1999 as cited in Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000). Furthermore, cooperative learning is the cooperative work of students in order to achieve shared learning goals, including the completion of certain assignments and tasks in a period of several weeks (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1998). To succeed in these cooperative activities, basic principles of the cooperative learning method should be taken into consideration. These five basic principles include: positive interdependence, face-to-face interaction, individual accountability, social skills, and group process (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 1992).

Another approach to enhance learner achievement in social studies lessons is systematic teaching. Systematic teaching is based on the probability philosophy, which states that education can be arranged for every student, for certain groups, or even for all people. Moreover, teaching, learning, and evaluation activities can be handled in a similar vein with multi or single dimensional perspectives. How all activities are constructed changes according to the situation and conditions. As there is no single learning-teaching strategy, theory, method, technique, or tactic for now, there may be no strategy, theory, method, technique, or tactic that learners always use to acquire every kind of behavior. Many rationales can be employed. One may
prefer discovering, comprehending, using, and reproducing knowledge while acquiring knowledge, skills, affects, and intuitions (Sonmez, 2004).

Systematic teaching is based on discovering, making sense of, using, and reproducing knowledge by students. A teacher can only be a guide. Any kind of learning and teaching activity can generally be centered on the students. Teachers should generally arrange the settings and provide resources for the students to discover, comprehend, use, and reproduce knowledge. Students should discuss with pictures, slides, cases, dialogues, and dramatizations, and discover the principles and method themselves. Teachers should only provide cues, feedback, and correction (Sonmez, 2010). Educational games, contests, scientific research, time, love, reasoning, a democratic environment, and multidimensional evaluations are the major components of systematic teaching (Sonmez, 2010).

In this context, both cooperative learning and systematic teaching can be regarded as active learning methods. Considering the theoretical accounts above, it is assumed that social studies lessons conducted per the constructivist learning approach can be executed with the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching as well. The constructivist learning approach, cooperative learning method, and systematic teaching mainly suppose that students can access and internalize knowledge through different activities and participation in learning activities. In addition to this, considering that enriching the learning environment with different strategies, methods, and techniques enhances learning, the cooperative learning approach, the cooperative learning method, and systematic teaching are believed to be effective ways of instruction. The rationale behind this study was the pedagogical importance of investigating and comparing the contributions of the constructivist learning approach, the cooperative learning method, and systematic teaching to students’ learning and retention of knowledge. It is also believed that this comparison will once again stress the necessity of using different activities, like the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching, beside those in the teacher’s guide for a social studies course in order to enhance the retention of knowledge. It is thought that the findings of this study will contribute to increasing the efficacy and productivity of social studies lessons and serve as a reference to future research.

A review of relevant literature reveals there is research on cooperative learning for different grades, subject fields, and units, and cooperative learning has been generally compared with traditional teaching methods or the constructivist approach (Karaoğlu, 1998; Ozkal, 2000; Celebi, 2006; Law, 2008; Eskitürk, 2009). Various research has been conducted about using systematic teaching for different grades, subject fields, and units, and it is generally compared with traditional teaching methods or the constructivist approach (Alacapinar, 2002; Cetin, 2003; Kocak, 2004; Memisoglu, 2004; Pas, 2004; Pijí, 2006; Kapicioglu, 2006; Kucukoglu, 2007; Takacak, 2007; Ontas, 2010). No research has been found with the aim of comparing the efficacy of more than one approach in this subject field, unit, and grade. Therefore, the present research is regarded as important in providing resourceful findings for future research.
**The Purpose of the Study**

The present research aimed to investigate whether or not there is any statistically significant difference between the levels of achievement and knowledge retention of 4th class elementary students regarding “The Place We Live” unit taught in social studies using the cooperative learning method and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches. In line with this major purpose the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: There are statistically significant differences between pre- and post-experiment achievement levels of students who were taught using the cooperative learning method (experiment-1) and the systematic teaching (experiment-2) and constructivist learning approaches (control group 1-2).

Hypothesis 2: There are no statistically significant differences between post-experiment achievement levels of students in experiment and control groups.

Hypothesis 3: There are no statistically significant differences between post-experiment achievement levels and knowledge retention levels of students in experiment and control groups.

Hypothesis 4: There is no statistically significant difference between knowledge retention levels of students in experiment and control groups.

**Method**

**Research Method**

In line with the purpose of the study a quantitative approach was employed and pretest-posttest control group experimental design was used. The experimental method is based on experiments, defined as a test conducted under controlled conditions in order to investigate the truth of a hypothesis or to reconfirm an already known truth. The key element in this definition is control, which distinguishes experimental design from non-experimental designs (Muijs, 2004, p. 13).

**Data Source**

Data were collected from 4th grade students studying at two elementary schools in Kirsehir province during the 2011–2012 school year. Since four groups (two experiments and two controls) were involved in the study, a multi-stage sampling method was used. Multi-stage sampling requires using different sampling methods at every stage of sampling (Buyukozturk, Kilic Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2010). A convenience sampling method was used for the present study, which brings speed and ease to the research (Yildirim & Simsek, 2011). Accordingly, the sample was selected from the city where the researchers worked. In the second stage a simple random sampling method was used. Accordingly, the names of the elementary schools in Kirsehir province were written on pieces of paper, and one paper was selected randomly. In the third stage the purposive sampling method was used. Those schools similar to elementary school A (selected in the second stage) in
terms of socio-economic environment and school success were determined; i.e., a homogeneous sampling method was used. Next, the second school (B) was selected randomly from among the elementary schools selected according to the homogeneous sampling. Elementary school A had a total of five 4th classes and school B had eight 4th classes. All of these classes were administered the pre-test and, according to the results, three classes (two experiment and one control) were selected from school A and one class (control group) was selected from school B as the study groups. A total of 110 students were involved in these four groups. These four equivalent 4th classes were randomly assigned as experiment and control groups. Some descriptive are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Descriptives for the Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Experiment-1</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Experiment-2</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>Systematic teaching</td>
<td>4-C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Control-1</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Constructivist learning</td>
<td>4-D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Control-2</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>Constructivist learning</td>
<td>4-C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-G</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those 4th graders who participated in the study, 55 (50%) were boys and 55 (50%) were girls.
Instrument

In order to measure to what extent the students in the experiment and control groups gained the objectives of the unit, an achievement test developed by researchers was used. This test was administered on the participants three times as a pre-test, post-test, and retention test. The achievement test was developed according to the objectives of the “The Place We Live” unit in the curriculum of 4th grade Social studies lesson in line with the following steps:

1. First, a table of specifications was prepared for the achievement test.

2. After preparing the specifications table, 65 multiple-choice items were written for unit “The Place We Live”, based on the 4th grade social studies curriculum, course books, student workbooks, teacher guide books, and reference books.

3. The draft test was consulted by an expert panel of three academicians from Ahi Evran University who specialized in teaching social studies; one social studies teacher and two classroom teachers. The test was revised based on their feedback. Next, an achievement test was administered to 196 fifth graders who had already studied the relevant unit. As a result of the pilot study, indices for difficulty and discrimination for each item and the reliability for the test in general were calculated. The final form of the achievement test comprised 25 items and the alpha reliability coefficient of the test was estimated to be .82.

Procedure

Necessary permissions were granted before implementing the study and the following actions were taken:

1. The instrument was developed. Using this instrument, study groups were assigned and the pre-test applied.

2. Lesson plans were prepared in accordance with the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching to be implemented in experiment groups 1 and 2, respectively. Lesson plans for systematic teaching were prepared based on the sample plans developed by Sonmez (2010). The cooperative learning method-based lesson plans were consulted by two academicians from Ahi Evran University who had written a thesis and articles about cooperative learning. Systematic teaching-based lesson plans were consulted by three academicians who specialized in curriculum development. Based on feedback from these academicians, lesson plans were revised.

3. As the social studies lesson plans are currently used based on the constructivist approach, no alternative lesson plans were prepared for the control groups. The lesson plans provided in teacher guides were used for these groups.

4. Before the treatment, students in experiment groups 1 and 2 were separately informed about the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching and the relevant activities used in these methods, respectively.
7. The treatment was done for five weeks between 1 November 2011 and 30 November 2011. The duration of the treatment, as assigned in the curriculum, was 15 lesson hours.

8. Students heterogeneously assigned into clusters during cooperative group work in experiment group 1, and scenarios were successively given to each cluster in accordance with the lesson objectives. Five distinct topics in the unit “The Place We Live” were taught using techniques from the cooperative learning method, including combining, ask together learn together, student team achievement parts, learning together, and group inquiry. The activities arranged in accordance with the basic principles and steps of these techniques were applied for five weeks. Each of these techniques and relevant tasks were introduced and explained to the students before the treatment. Students were given different tasks and thus engaged to the lesson activity. Group members were changed for each topic. The seats were rearranged before each lesson according to the techniques. Various resources and materials were used while teaching the unit and topics. Various worksheet and activities were prepared for the topics and revision tests were administered at the end of each week. Activities took place in the classroom.

9. Students in experiment group 2 were taught lessons using systematic teaching. Various resources and materials were used while teaching the topics. The behavioral objectives were determined and the teaching and learning processes were arranged. The lesson plans included proper and consistent activities regarding the behavioral objectives, and strategies, methods, and techniques suitable for these objectives. The questions to be asked to the students, and their correct answers, cues, corrections and feedback, and reinforcements were prepared. Questions were asked equally to all students in order to engage them in the lessons. Relevant pedagogical materials were prepared and used when necessary. Colored picture sets and sample cases were used to ensure that students could discover the knowledge and produce new knowledge based on what they had learned. During the development part of the lesson the teacher projected slides and used examples about the topic to contextualize verbal explanations. The teacher asked questions about the concepts taught. After explaining the topics, the teacher helped the students acquire the relevant knowledge thanks to colored pictures and sample cases. Students were asked to make short dramatizations (using puppets) about the topics. Summaries were provided from time to time. Supportive points were presented during transitional summaries, and main points were presented during the final summary. Relevant activities were prepared and revision tests were administered at the end of each week. Students were evaluated for their gains during the process.

10. Students in control groups 1 and 2 were taught the lessons according to the constructivist learning approach. The teacher used the methods as specified in the teacher guidebook in order to have the students achieve the objectives. She used the activities in the student workbook and adopted the lesson plan as suggested in the teacher guide book. The constructivist approach-based social studies curriculum was implemented accompanied with a main course book and a student workbook. Before transition to the main topic, the teacher made an introduction using the statements
from the lead-in part of the lesson plan, and then implemented the instructional activities following the directions in the teacher guidebook. Classroom teachers met before the lessons and exchanged their views about how to teach.

11. A social studies achievement test was administered twice following the completion of relevant lessons with all four groups, one as the post-test (2 December 2011) and the other as a retention test 4 weeks later (30 December 2011).

Data Analysis

While evaluating the social studies achievement test administered as the pre-test, post-test, and retention test, correct answers were scored with one (1) point, whereas wrong or unanswered items were scored as zero (0). Scores were recorded in a computer and analyzed using SPSS software. The data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, paired samples t test, and one-way ANOVA. The level of significance was considered p< 0.05.

Results

One-way ANOVA was used to test the statistically significant differences between the pre-test scores of students in the experiment and control groups. The results are given in the table below.

Table 2.
Results of One-Way ANOVA Test regarding Pre-Test Scores of Experiment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>13.690</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.563</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>2283.401</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.542</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2297.091</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, there is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of groups [F(3,106) = .212; p>0.05]. Based on this finding, the pre-test scores of the groups before the treatment can be said to be equivalent.

Hypothesis 1: There are statistically significant differences between pre- and post-test experiment achievement levels of students who were taught using the cooperative learning method (experiment-1) and the systematic teaching (experiment-2) and constructivist learning approaches (control group 1-2).

To test the first hypothesis a paired sample t test was used. The results are presented in the following table.
Table 3.

Results of Paired Samples T Tests Comparing Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Experiment And Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment-1</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>4.4843</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-11.524</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>2.6254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment-2</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>4.5546</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-13.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>4.1087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-1</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>5.1170</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-8.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>2.8011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-2</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>4.3667</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-7.745</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>4.4524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of table 3 reveals that there are statistically significant differences between pre-test and post-test achievement scores of experiment and control groups \( [t(27)= -11.524; p<0.05]; [t(25)= -13.001; p<0.05]; [t(27)= -8.011; p<0.05]; [t(27)= -7.745; p<0.05] \). Based on these findings, the first hypothesis of the research is proven. In other words, using the cooperative learning method (experiment-1) and the systematic teaching (experiment-2) and constructivist learning approaches (control groups 1 and 2) had a positive impact on student achievement.

**Hypothesis 2:** There are no statistically significant differences between post-experiment achievement levels of students in experiment and control groups.

To test the second hypothesis a one-way ANOVA was used. The results are presented in the following table.

Table 4.

Results of One-Way ANOVA Comparing Post-Test Scores of Experiment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>76.465</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1355.253</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12.785</td>
<td>1.994</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1431.718</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4 there is no significant difference between the post-test achievement scores of the groups \( F_{3,106}= 1.994; p>0.05 \). In other words, the second hypothesis was also proven. According to these findings, the post-test achievement scores of the groups are not statistically different from each other.
**Hypothesis 3:** There are no statistically significant differences between post-experiment achievement levels and knowledge retention levels of students in experiment and control groups.

To test the first hypothesis a paired sample $t$ test was used. The results are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment-1</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>2.6254</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>2.7282</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment-2</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>4.1087</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>3.8813</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-1</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>2.8011</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>3.7978</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-2</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>4.4524</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>5.2163</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of Table 5 reveals there are no statistically significant differences between post-test achievement scores and retention test scores of both experiment groups and the control group 1 [(t(27) = .510; $p>0.05$); (t(25) = .101; $p>0.05$); (t(27) = .412; $p>0.05$)], whereas there is a statistically significant difference between post-test achievement scores and retention scores of control group 2 in favor of post-test scores (t(27) = 3.126; $p<0.05$). These findings suggest that the third hypothesis of the study is contradicted. In other words, while the teaching approaches used in experiment groups 1 and 2, and control group 1, secured the retention of knowledge the students learned, in control group 2 the constructivist learning approach failed to guarantee the retention of knowledge.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is no statistically significant difference between knowledge retention levels of students in experiment and control groups.

To test the fourth hypothesis a one-way ANOVA was used. The results are presented in the following table.
Table 6.

Results of One-Way ANOVA Comparing Retention Test Scores of Experiment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference (Scheffe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>284.168</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.723</td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1701.687</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16.054</td>
<td>5.900</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1985.855</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 6, a significant difference was observed between the retention scores of the experiment and control groups \(F(3,106) = 5.900; p< 0.05\). The post-hoc Scheffe test revealed there are significant differences between experiment group 1 and control group 2, and between experiment group 2 and control group 2, in favor of the experiment groups.

Discussion and Conclusion

According to the results of the research, there were no significant differences between pre-test scores of the experiment and control groups; i.e., the groups were equivalent in terms of achievement before the experiment.

It was concluded that the cooperative learning method (experiment-1) and the systematic teaching (experiment-2) and constructivist learning approaches (control groups 1 and 2) increased the level of student achievement significantly and positively. The relevant literature also suggests that the cooperative learning method (Karaoğlu, 1998; Özkal, 2000; Celebi, 2006; Eskitürk, 2009; Kus & Karatekin, 2009), systematic teaching (Sonmez, 2001; Kocak, 2004; Memişoğlu, 2004; Pas, 2004; Takkac, 2007; Ontas, 2010; Sezginsoy & Akkoyunlu, 2011) and constructivist learning approach (Unal & Celikkaya, 2009) enhances learning success in social studies lessons. Moreover, it was reported that students’ academic achievement in other lessons are enhanced through the cooperative learning method (Johnson, Johnson & Scott, 1978; Walker & Crogan, 1998; Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000; Anderson, Mitchell & Osgood, 2005; Adeyemi, 2008) and through the systematic teaching (Alacapınar, 2002; Cetin, 2003; Kapıcıoğlu, 2006; Pijl, 2006; Kucukoğlu, 2007) and constructivist learning approaches (Karasu & Unlu, 2006; Teyfur, 2010). Thus, it appears that the findings of the present study are in agreement with the results of previous research.

No significant difference was observed between post-test scores of the experiment and control groups. In other words, cooperative learning, systematic teaching, and constructivist learning approaches altogether increase the students’ success without any superiority or inferiority to each other.

It was concluded that the cooperative learning method and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches applied in both experiment groups 1
and 2, and control group 1, had a positive impact on the retention of the knowledge students learned. However, the constructivist learning approach applied in control group 2 had no significant effect on the retention of the knowledge students learned. The relevant literature suggests that the cooperative learning method (Karaoğlu, 1998; Eskitürk, 2009) and the systematic teaching (Sonmez, 2001; Kocak, 2004; Memişoğlu, 2004; Pas, 2004; Sezginsoy & Akkoyunlu, 2011) and constructivist learning approaches (Unal & Celikkaya, 2009) had a positive effect on the retention of knowledge in social studies lessons. The failure of the constructivist learning approach to achieve retention of knowledge does not concur with either the results for control group 1 or the results in the literature.

The research also revealed significant differences between the experiment and control groups’ scores from retention tests 4 weeks after the completion of treatment. These significant differences were between experiment group 1 (where the cooperative learning method was used) and control group 2 (where the constructivist learning approach was used), and between experiment group 2 (where systematic teaching was used) and control group 2 (where the constructivist learning approach was used) in favor of experiment groups 1 and 2. Karaoğlu (1998) and Eskitürk (2009) found that the cooperative learning method was more effective on the retention of academic achievement of the students compared to other methods. Likewise, Sonmez (2001), Alacapınar (2002), Çetin (2003), Kocak (2004), Memişoğlu (2004), Pas (2004), Kapıcıoğlu (2006), Piji (2006), and Sezginsoy and Akkoyunlu (2011) also found that systematic teaching was more effective in the retention of the academic achievement of the students compared to other methods. These findings support the findings of the present study. However, it was observed that although the constructivist learning approach achieved long-lasting learning in control group 1, it failed to do so in control group 2. This may stem from several different factors. For example, teachers may be inadequate in applying the constructivist approach in these groups. Furthermore, the fact that the constructivist learning approach was applied by teachers dependent on the teacher guidebooks (this is just an observation that needs to be investigated and proven) might have created an improper setting of constructivist learning environments.

Recommendations

This study concluded that both the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching were effective in enhancing student achievement and retention in social studies lessons. Based on these results, it is recommended that the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching be used to enhance academic achievement and retention of gains in social studies lessons.

According to the research results, the cooperative learning method and the systematic teaching and constructivist learning approaches were effective in enhancing student achievement and retention in social studies lessons (except for control group 2). Teachers teach social studies lessons - and all other lessons (though this needs research) - following teacher guidebooks. Based on the results of the present study, it is recommended that in order to enhance academic achievement and
retention of gains in social studies lessons, teachers should not confine their lessons only to the activities in the guide books. Instead, they should use other approaches, strategies, methods, and techniques, especially those using the cooperative learning method and systematic teaching.

It was found that while teaching social studies lessons with the constructivist approach increased achievement and secured retention in control group 1, it only increased achievement and failed to guarantee retention in control group 2. This may be for different reasons, such as the teacher factor. In the present study, lessons in experiment groups were conducted by the researchers, while lessons in control groups were conducted by classroom teachers. In the future, research lessons in experiment and control groups should be conducted by the researcher and the results should be retested.

It was concluded that using systematic teaching was effective in enhancing student achievement and retention in social studies lessons. In this context, considering its contribution to teaching social studies lessons, the systematic teaching approach should be taken into consideration in curriculum development procedures.

In this study five different techniques belonging to the cooperative learning method (combining, ask together learn together, student team achievement parts, learning together, and group inquiry) were used. These techniques were effective in increasing the success and retention of learning in social studies lessons. In future research, these different techniques should be used to determine their impact on learning success and retention. Moreover, the subjects in the teacher guide books that are compatible with cooperative learning be determined, and teachers can be informed in detail about which techniques to use to apply the relevant methods.

One finding of the present study was the failure of the constructivist learning approach in control group 2 to achieve the retention of knowledge. This result suggests that there may be some drawbacks in implementation of constructivism. In this context, it can be said that teachers need some in-service training.
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İşbirlikli Öğrenme Yöntemi ve Dizge Eğitimin Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Öğrencilerin Başarısına ve Bilgilerinin Kalıcılığına Etkisi
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Özet
Problem Durumu: Yapılandırıcı anlayışa göre hazırlanan sosyal bilgiler dersinde etkili öğrenme ve öğretmeyi sağlayacak pek çok strateji, yöntem ve teknik bir arada kullanılabilmektedir. Yapılandırıcı anlayış aktif öğrenme süreçlerini kapsamaktadır. Aktif öğrenme yaklaşımlarından biri işbirlikli öğrenme ve bir diğer de dizgeli eğitim olabilir. Yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımı, işbirlikli öğrenme yöntemi ve dizgeli eğitim temelde öğrencilerin farklı etkinlikler yoluya ve öğrenme etkinliklerine katılabilmeleri bilgiye ulaşabilecekleri, ulaşabildikleri bilgileri
bu yollarla kalıcı hale getirebileceğini varsayılmaktadır. Bununla birlikte öğrenme ortamlarının farklı strateji, yöntem ve tekniklerle zenginleştirilmesinin öğrenmeyi olumlu yönde etkilediği duréecesinden hareketle yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımının, işbirlikteli öğrenme yönteminin ve dizgeli eğitimin bu bağlamda etkili olabileceği düşünülmektedir.

Bu araştırma ile yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımı, işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemi ve dizgeli eğitimin öğrencinin başarısına ve bilginin kalıcılığuna etkisinin karşılaştırılmasını eğitim öğretim açısından önemli olduğu düşünülmüştür. Bu karşılaştırma ile Sosyal Bilgiler derslerinin sadece öğretmen kılavuz kitaplarında yer alan etkinliklerle değil işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemi ve dizgeli eğitim gibi öğrencilere farklı aktiviteler yapmaya ve böylelikle öğrenilenlerin kalıcılığı artırılmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçlarının, Sosyal Bilgiler öğretiminde etkili ve verimli olmasına katkıda bulunacağı ve yapılacak araştırmalarla kaynaklık edebileceği düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu araştırmada işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemi, dizgeli eğitim ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımına göre öğrenim gören 4. sınıf öğrencilerinin Sosyal Bilgiler dersine “Yaşadığımız Yer” ünitesiyle ilgili başarı ve bilginin kalıcılık düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı düzeyde bir farklılık olup olmadığını betimlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu temel amaç doğrultusunda aşağıdaki hipotezler test edilmiştir:

1. İşbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemi (deney-1), dizgeli eğitim (deney-2) ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımına göre öğrenim gören öğrencilerin deneysel işlem öncesi ve sonrası başarı düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı düzeyde bir farklılık vardır.

2. Deney ve kontrol gruplarında öğrencilerin deneysel işlem sonrası başarı düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı düzeyde bir fark bulunmamaktadır.

3. Deney ve kontrol gruplarında öğrencilerin son test başarıları ile edindiği bilgilerin kalıcılık düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı düzeyde bir fark bulunmamaktadır.

4. Deney ve kontrol gruplarında öğrencilerin edindiği bilgilerin kalıcılık düzeyleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı düzeyde bir fark bulunmamaktadır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Araştırmanın modeli öntest-sontest kontrol grubu deneySEL desendir. Deney-1 grubunda işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntem, deney-2 grubunda dizgeli eğitim, kontrol-1 ve kontrol-2 grubunda ise yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımı uygulanmıştır. Deney ve kontrol gruplarında toplam 110 öğrenci yer almış ve verilerin çözümlemesinde bağlı gruplar t testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizinden yararlanmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırma sonunda elde edilen bulgulara göre, işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntem, dizgeli eğitim ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımının öğrencilerin akademik başarılarını artırma etkili olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Deney ve
kontrol gruplarının akademik başarı son test puanlarının birbirinden anlamlı düzeyde farklı olmadığı bulgulanmıştır. İşbirlikli öğrenme yöntemi, dizgeli eğitim ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımlarının (kontrol-1) öğrencilerin edindikleri bilginin kalıcılığını sağlamada etkili olduğu ancak kontrol-2 grubunda öğrencilerin edindikleri bilginin kalıcılığını sağlamada etkili olmadığı tespit edilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Araştırmanda işbirlikli öğrenme yöntemi (deney-1), dizgeli eğitim (deney-2) ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımlarının (kontrol-1 ve kontrol-2) öğrencilerin akademik başarılarını anlamlı ve olumlu düzeyde artırdığı, deney ve kontrol gruplarının son test toplam puanları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı tespit edilmiştir.irection andpnces of the study, taking into account the research hypothesis, the results will indicate that the experimental group scores significantly higher than the control group on the post-test. However, further studies are needed to confirm these findings.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Araştırmanda işbirlikli öğrenme yöntemi (deney-1), dizgeli eğitim (deney-2) ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımlarının (kontrol-1 ve kontrol-2) öğrencilerin edindikleri bilginin kalıcılığını sağlamada etkili olduğu ancak kontrol-2 grubunda öğrencilerin edindikleri bilginin kalıcılığını sağlamada etkili olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu araştırmada her iki deney grubu ve kontrol-1 grubunda uygulanan işbirlikli öğrenme yöntemi, dizgeli eğitim ve yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımlarının öğrencilerin edindikleri bilginin kalıcılığında olumlu düzeyde etkili olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmuştur. Fakat kontrol-2 grubunda uygulanan yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımın öğrencilerin edindikleri bilginin kalıcılığında etkili olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bununla birlikte, deney ve kontrol gruplarına deneySEL işlemler bittikten 4 hafta sonra uygulanan kalıcılık testinden grupların aldığı toplam puanları arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmuştur. Bu anlamlı fark işbirlikli öğrenme yönteminin uygulandığı deney-1 grubu ile yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımlarının uygulandığı kontrol-1 ve dizgeli eğitiminin uygulandığı deney-2 grubu ile yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşımlarının uygulandığı kontrol-2 grupları arasında deney-1 ve deney-2 grupları lehine olmuştur.


Bu araştırmada dizgeli eğitimin Sosyal Bilgiler dersinde öğrencilerin başarılarını ve öğrenilenlerin kalıcılığını artırmada etkili olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Bu bağlamda Sosyal Bilgiler öğretiminde dizgeli eğitimin katkısı göz önde tutularak program geliştirme aşamalarında bu anlayışın da dikkate alınması önerilebilir.

Bu araştırmada işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemine ait beş farklı teknik (bireleştirme, birliktə soralım birliktə öğrenelim, öğrenci takımları başarı bölümleri, birliktə öğrenme, grup araştırması) kullanılmıştır. Bu teknikler Sosyal Bilgiler dersinde başarıyı ve öğrenilenlerin kalıcılığını artırarak etkili olmuştur. Yapılacak diğer araştırmalarda işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemine ait birden fazla farklı teknik kullanarak bu tekniklerin başarı ve kalıcılık üzerine etkisi belirlenebilir. Ayrıca öğretmen kılavuz kitaplarında hangi konuların işbirlikteli öğrenmeye uygun olduğu belirlenebilir, belirtilen yöntemlerin hangi teknikle verileceği ayrıntıları ile açıklanarak uygulanabilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Sosyal bilgiler, işbirlikteli öğrenme yöntemi, dizgeli eğitim, yapılandırıcı öğrenme yaklaşıması.