Enhancing University Students’ Achievement in Physics using Computer-Assisted Instruction
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Abstract

Twenty-first century classrooms have come with a lot of changes in instructional delivery at various levels of education. However, most lecturers in Nigerian universities still adopt the traditional method of instruction not minding the demands of the twenty-first century classrooms. As a result of this, there is a dearth of empirical evidence on the impact of computer-assisted instruction on the students’ achievement in physics. This study, therefore, sought the efficacy of computer-assisted instruction (CAI) on students’ achievement in physics. A randomized controlled trial experimental design was adopted for the study using a sample of 120 participants. Physics Achievement Test (PAT) was used to collect data for the study. Analysis of covariance was used to analyze the data. It was found that Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) had a significant effect on students’ achievement in physics at posttest and follow-up assessments. Thus, Physics education lecturers should be trained on how to design and use CAI package for effective twenty-first century classroom instructional delivery in a Nigerian university.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Problem of the Study

Over the years, the students’ achievement in the sciences, most especially in physics has been below expectations (Akanbi et al., 2018; Ugwuanyi et al., 2019a). Students’ performance in physics examinations has not been encouraging at different levels of education (Ugwuanyi et al., 2020a). Besides, Erdemir as cited in Ugwuanyi et al. (2020a), found that performance in physics is lower than other science subjects such as biology and chemistry. The implication is that shortly, the nation may not have enough efficient manpower and would have no choice than to rely on the product and efficient manpower from other countries. Azuka (2013) stated that out of the major factors that influence students’ achievement, teacher factors appear prominent.

Students’ poor performance in physics can be attributed to the lack of teachers’ use of innovative teaching strategies in the twenty-first-century classroom (Ugwuanyi et al., 2020a). According to Ugwuanyi et al. (2020a), information communication technology (ICT) has a significant impact on students’ achievement, especially in this twenty-first century world. This implies that the method of instruction adopted by the teachers largely determines the achievement of students in mathematics and physics. There is thus an urgent need for a paradigm shift in the methods that the contents of physics are passed on to the students, especially in the twenty-first-century classrooms. The use of Computer system especially Multimedia projection in teaching can be a solution to the poor performance of students in physics. This is buttressed by Idahosa (2003) who opined that since students are very much interested and excited in the use of computer systems, it is necessary for mathematics and physics teachers to catch in the opportunity to use the machine as a teaching aid. Explaining further, Idahosa asserted that computer is highly adaptable in teaching vital parts of mathematics, most especially the elementary parts. It enables the students to grasp very well the major background concepts behind advanced mathematical calculations.
In the view of Oranu (2006), a well prepared and presented CAI or CAL package helps in the facilitation of the education process since interests of students are generated as they are actively involved in what they view on the screen. The use of multimedia projection, a subset of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), can enhance teaching and learning. Thus, every teacher must be ICT literate in all ramifications (Azare, 2019). Based on the foregoing, the researchers determined the efficacy of the CAI on physics students’ achievement within the theoretical framework of Richard Mayer’s cognitive theory of multimedia learning.

1.2 Theoretical Background of the Study

This study was anchored on Richard Mayer’s (1947) cognitive theory of multimedia learning which states that learning becomes effective when it comes from words and pictures than words alone. Mayer believes that deep learning by the students is achieved through sounds and images. Mayer stipulated that auditory and visual channels are important for processing information. According to Mayer, auditory and visual processes influence sensory, working, and long term memory. This theory is related to the present study in that computer-assisted instruction consists of both visual and audio channel which can help the students to understand mathematics and physics concepts. This theory has been successfully utilized by Ejimonye et al. (2020a), Ejimonye et al. (2020b), Hamzat et al. (2017) and Edo (2017) to carry out similar studies.

1.3 Review of Related Empirical Studies

A lot of studies have been conducted on the effects of computer-assisted instructions on students’ achievement as well as motivation in science and social science subjects. Abidoye and Omotunde (2015), Ayotola and Abiodun (2010), Gambari et al. (2014) and Salisu (2015) found that computer-assisted instruction had a significant effect on students’ achievement in different subjects of which physics is not part. Hamzat et al. (2017) found that students who were exposed to computer-aided instructional package had significantly higher achievement scores than those who were not so exposed. Etim et al. (2016) found that computer-aided learning course in waves had a positive effect on student's academic performance. Anigbo and Orie (2018) revealed that Microsoft PowerPoint Instruction Strategy had a significant effect on students' achievement. Ezza, Alhuqail and Elhussain (2019) found that instructional technology significantly enhanced learners’ composing skills. Ruzicka and Milova (2019) found that there was a significant effect of video analysis in providing feedback on the process of downhill skiing skills acquisition. Ugwuanyi et al. (2019a) found that flipped classroom instructional technology was effective in enhancing the achievement of physics students at both post-test and follow-up measurements. Ugwuanyi et al. (2019b) found that powerpoint presentation had a significant effect on students’ achievement in physics and mathematics. Ugwuanyi et al. (2020a) found that animated powerpoint presentation (PPT) significantly enhanced the achievement of students in physics. Ejimonye et al. (2020a, 2020b) found that the 2D animation technique had a significant effect on students' motivation and achievement in the quantitative/mathematical content of economics respectively. Ugwuanyi et al. (2020b) found that digital game-based learning significantly (p < 05) improved the achievement of primary school pupils at both the post-test and follow-up measures.

The forgoing indicated that computer-based instructional strategies are effective in enhancing students' motivation to learn as well as their achievement in science and social science subjects. However, none of the studies reviewed studied the efficacy of computer-assisted instruction on University students’ achievement in physics in Nigeria and this gap in literature necessitated this study. In the twenty-first century era, computer instructions are better practiced at higher education level to enable the students to acquire the skills of independent learning. Besides, the present COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated a paradigm shift in the method of instruction, especially at the higher education level. Other countries of the world most especially the developed countries have fully integrated various parts of information and communication technology into their education system, but such is lacking in developing countries like Nigeria. Hence, the study determined the efficacy of CAI on Nigerian university students’ achievement in physics. The researchers hypothesized that CAI would have a significant impact on students’ achievement physics.

2. Methods

2.1 Design of the Study

A randomized controlled trial (RCT) experimental design was used for the study. RCT experimental design sought to measure and compare the outcomes after the participants have received the interventions. This study design has been used by Nwokeoma et al. (2019), Onyishi et al. (2020), Ugwuanyi et al. (2020c), Ugwuanyi et al. (2020d), Ede et al. (2020) to carry out similar studies.
2.2 Ethical Considerations
University of Nigeria committee on research ethics approved this study through its institutional review board. The participants were served informed consent forms to fill and sign before the recruitment process. The researchers ensured the anonymity of the participants’ information throughout the research.

2.3 Participants
A sample of 120 participants was used for the study. Purposive sampling technique was used in selecting participants in schools that have computer laboratories in Enugu State, Nigeria.
Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (46.67%)</td>
<td>26 (43.33%)</td>
<td>54 (45.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32 (53.33%)</td>
<td>34 (46.67%)</td>
<td>66 (55.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>120 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>36 (60.00%)</td>
<td>32 (53.33%)</td>
<td>68 (56.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24 (40.00%)</td>
<td>28 (46.67%)</td>
<td>52 (43.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>120 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Measures

PAT consists of 50-item multiple-choice questions of response options A, B, C & D. PAT was developed by the researchers using test-blue print or table of specification to ensure its proper content coverage. Items of PAT were generated from some contents of PHY 101 – Introduction to Physics I. These contents are force and motion, energy, heat, sound and light. PAT was face validated by three test development experts. The content validity of the PAT was determined using a table of specifications. An internal consistency reliability coefficient of the items of the PAT was estimated as 0.71 using Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR-20) formula, while the estimate of temporal stability was obtained as 0.83 using the Pearson correlation.

2.5 Procedure

PAT was administered as a pretest to the two groups to collect baseline data for the study before the commencement of the treatment procedure. After that, the experimental group was exposed to computer-assisted instruction (CAI) while the control group was exposed to the normal talk and chalk method of teaching. The contents of the instruction were drawn from PHY 101 – Introduction to Physics I. These contents are force and motion, energy, heat, sound, and light. The two approaches for the Experimental and Control groups were identical in terms of content, basic instructional objectives, and content of evaluation. The only difference was in the instructional activities. Each of the groups was exposed to a 6-week intervention program using CAI and the normal talk and chalk method respectively. At the end of the treatment, the posttest was administered to the two groups while the follow-up measure was also administered two months after the termination of the treatment. The data collected from the pretest, posttest, and follow-up measures were arranged, cleaned, and subjected to analysis.

2.6 Computer-Assisted Intervention Program

The CAI intervention program involved the development of computer-aided instruction on PHY 101 course contents. The instructional package was made of six different lessons on each of the contents of PHY 101 course that were considered for the study. Each lesson was programmed to last for 40 minutes with an additional 20 minutes for self-evaluation and clarification from the teacher. The role of the teacher in the intervention was mainly to guide the students, especially where they had a problem with the learning process.

2.7 Data Analysis

The effect of CAI in enhancing the achievement of university students in physics was determined using a mixed-design analysis of variance (ANOVA). The sphericity assumption of repeated-measures ANOVA was tested using Mauchly test of sphericity which was not significant (Mauchly W = .853, p = .418), implying that the assumption was not violated. The effect size of the treatment was reported using Partial Eta squared.
Figure 2. Schematic Representation of the Methodology
3. Results

Table 2. Mean analysis of the students’ achievement scores at pretest, posttest, and follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43.48</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the mean achievement score of the experimental group (M = 15.31, SD = .91) was almost the same with that of the control group (M = 15.42, SD = .96) at the pretest. However, at the posttest, the mean achievement score of the participants of the experimental group (M = 42.50, SD = 4.96) was higher than that of the control group participants (M = 24.15, SD = 5.16). Similarly, the mean achievement score of the participants of the experimental group (M = 43.48, SD = 5.24) was higher than that of the control group participants at the follow-up (M = 25.18, SD = 6.72).

Table 3. Mixed design repeated analysis of variance for the tests of within-subjects effect and between-subjects effects of the treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tests of Within-Subjects Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>27182.617</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13591.308</td>
<td>1191.556</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>27182.617</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>16841.869</td>
<td>1191.556</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Treatment</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>6716.150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3358.075</td>
<td>294.404</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>6716.150</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>4161.208</td>
<td>294.404</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>Sphericity Assumed</td>
<td>2691.900</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>11.406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>2691.900</td>
<td>190.451</td>
<td>14.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tests of Between-Subjects Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>276058.225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>276058.225</td>
<td>23336.385</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>13432.225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13432.225</td>
<td>1135.484</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>1395.883</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>11.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 revealed that there was a significant difference across the three time measures, $F(2, 236) = 1191.556, p = < .050, \eta^2 = .910$, and significant difference between groups, $F(1, 118) = 23336.385, p = < .050, \eta^2 = .995$ in the achievement of university students in physics. The results also showed that there was a significant interaction effect of time and group on the achievement of students in physics, $F(2, 236) = 294.4040, p = .000, \eta^2 = .714$. This interaction indicated that there was no significant difference between the baseline, and the control group did not improve well on their achievement in physics. However, the mean achievement scores of the university students who were exposed to CAI improved significantly over time, implying that CAI had a significant effect on the achievement of university students in physics. Besides, the effect size of .995 indicated that 99.5 percent increase in the achievement of university students in physics can be attributed to the effect of the CAI package. The nature of the interaction of treatment and time of measures is shown in Figure 3.
Table 4. Post Hoc Pairwise Comparisons for the significant difference across the three times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Time</th>
<th>(J) Time</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-17.908*</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-18.732 - 17.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-18.917*</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-19.947 - 17.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.908*</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>17.084 - 18.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.008</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-2.282 - .266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.917*</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>17.886 - 19.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

Table 4 showed that the mean differences for the various pairs of measures are significant at \( p < .050 \) except for the mean differences between measures 2 and 3, 3 and 2 with \( p > .050 \). Thus, the mean difference for 2 and 3, 3 and 2 did not contribute to the significant effect of time of the exposure of students to the CAI package on their achievement in physics.

4. Discussion of the Findings

The findings of the study showed that CAI had a significant impact on university students’ achievement in physics. This result goes to portray the interactive nature of CAI which may have activated the interest of the students and thus served as a motivator to learning by the students who participated in the experimental treatment. The improved interest and motivation by the experimental group may have accounted for the enhanced achievement of the students in physics. This result is in line with Usman and Esaduwha (2007) who opined that e-learning is used to enhance and support learning for improvement in students’ performance. This finding is also in conformity with Fakae (2014) who opined that e-learning subset such as ICT has greatly improved teaching and learning. This is also in line with Azare (2019) who noted that the use of computers in teaching can best contribute to both teachers’ knowledge and teaching effectiveness.
Buttressing the findings, Etim et al. (2016) found that computer animation learning course in waves had a positive effect on student's academic performance. Falode et al. (2016) found that students taught Agricultural Science through computer animation instructional package performed better than their counterparts taught the same concept with the lecture method. Anigbo and Orie (2018) revealed that Microsoft PowerPoint Instruction Strategy had a significant effect on students' achievement in school. Ezza, Alhuqail and Elhussain (2019) found that instructional technology significantly enhanced learners’ composing skills. Ruzicka and Milova (2019) found that the use of video analysis in providing feedback has a positive effect on the process of downhill skiing skills acquisition. Ugwuanyi et al. (2019a) found that flipped classroom instructional technology was effective in enhancing the achievement of students in physics. Ugwuanyi et al. (2019b) found that powerpoint presentation had a significant effect on students’ achievement in physics and mathematics. Ugwuanyi et al. (2020a) found that animated powerpoint presentation (PPT) significantly enhanced the achievement of students in physics. Ejimonye et al. (2020a, 2020b) found that the 2D animation technique had a significant effect on students' motivation and achievement in the quantitative/mathematical content of economics respectively. Ugwuanyi et al. (2020b) found that digital game-based learning significantly (p < .05) improved the achievement of primary school pupils at both the post-test and follow-up measures. Flipped classroom instructional technique enhanced the achievement and retention of physics students (Ugwuanyi et al., 2020c). Teachers can develop Computer Aided Learning (CAL) and use it to promote understanding of concepts in different subject areas. The researchers have, therefore, contributed to the existing body of knowledge in physics education by proving the efficacy of CAI in enhancing the quality of teaching and learning of physics at university level.

5. Conclusion
The researchers concluded that CAI is very efficacious in enhancing the achievement of university students in physics. Thus, effective use of CAI by physics education lecturers will enhance students’ achievement in physics. Based on that, the researchers recommended among others that:

- Physics Lecturers should use CAI in teaching physics education concepts.
- Both Federal and state governments should equip university computer laboratories for effective implementation of CAI in the teaching of physics concepts.
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