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ABSTRACT

This study titled “Evaluating the Effects of Class-Size on Social Studies Students’ Academic Performance in Junior Secondary Schools in Giwa Educational Zone Kaduna State, Nigeria”. Three objectives, three research questions and three hypotheses each were formulated for the study. The study used quasi experimental design. The total population of public Junior Secondary Schools students in Giwa Educational Zone was 5449 from which a sample of three hundred and eighty three (383) students were selected using random sample technique. Furthermore, four (4) schools were purposely selected. The study used pre-test and post-test group design. The students were further grouped into two groups (i.e. Group A: large class-size and Group B: small class-size). The main instruments used for the data collection was Social Studies Students Academic Performance Test (SOSSAPET). The pilot study has the reliability coefficient of 0.551. T-test statistic was used to test the null hypotheses at p<.05 level of significant. The study revealed that students mean scores performance was higher in small class size than large class size. There was no significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of male and female students when the class size and sex were considered together. There was no significant effect on students performance based on the school location in small class size and those in large class sizes. Based on the results of the findings, it is recommended that small class size in teaching enhance students learning ability in Junior Secondary Schools. Government should decongest large classes by constructing more classes and upstairs in urban and rural areas so as to encourage students by allowing them to seat 40 or less than that quantity for effective teaching and learning. This will also promote students academic performance in Junior Secondary Schools.
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Academic Performance: Refers to how students deal with their studies and how they cope with different task given to them by their teachers.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

For many years, educators and people in general have debated on the number of students a teacher can work effectively to ensure students adequate learning. Although most people would agree that having a few student to teacher ratio would benefit the student academically, mainly will also argue that it does not guarantee success and would cost school a great deal or more money. Prior to reviewing the research, a clarification of terms associated with the research context is necessary. Students achievement applies to making sure all students have the necessary skills and knowledge of function in school so that they may also succeed as adult (National Education Association, 2002). But others see a much broader, richer, picture. Three areas that fit into the broader picture are academics, essential life skills and responsibility to the community. Definitions vary across the research spectrum, but for the purpose of this paper, small class size will be defined as classes with approximately 30 students, while large or regular class will be defined as classrooms with approximately 40 or more students (Harris and Plank, 2000). The term average class size is a calculation of the total number of students in a grade level divided by the number of classroom sections in that school or school district.

The major problems schools are running into is that funding for these small class sizes is not available, or decreasing. Many states and school districts dealing with shortfalls in revenue are smaller classes. Advocate of small classes believes that small class size allow teacher to give more individualized attention to students, manage their classrooms more effectively and provide more effective instruction that leads to better
students performance. In a smaller classroom, a teacher has more time to get to know each student’s personality and academic strengths and weaknesses, students receive more attention and are less likely to become discipline problems with less time spent on classroom management, teachers can focus more on classroom instruction and students learning. Patricia A. Wesley of the college of Education at the University of Washington writes “my teaching and research experiences have convince me that both small classes and small schools are crucial to a teacher’s ability to succeed with student” (Wesley, 2002). Some people are not convinced, however, that reducing class size ensures an academic advantage. Kirk A. Johnson is a senior policy analyst in the center for data analysis, heritage foundation and asks the question, “are class size reduction programmes uniformly positive or does a downside exists to hiring and placing more teachers in its public schools? (Johnson, 2005). Because of state mandate in classroom reductions, schools are required to hire more inexperienced teachers and are suffering from lack of qualified teachers to fill the classroom (Johnson, 2005). Others argue that there is no substantive proof that class size makes a difference in students performance and there may be other influences affecting students performance. Evidence linking smaller classes to improved performance is inconclusive for instance, difference studies have varied in their definition of small class size.

According to Erik Haunshek (2003) of the Hoover Institution, only 15 percent of the studies found that reducing class size has a statistically significant positive effect on performance. Moreover, almost as many studies (13 percent) found that reducing class size has a statistically negative effect on student performance. The remaining 72 percent indicate that reducing class size has no statistically significant effects on performance.
The results were similar in the 136 studies of elementary school class sizes. Only 13 percent of them found that reducing class size increase students performance, and 120 percent indicate that a reduction harms performance. Thus, in the word of Hanuyshek “there is little reason to believe that smaller class sizes systematically yield higher student achievement” (Barcia, and Fredua, Kwarteng, 2008). Evidence linking smaller classes to improved performance is therefore inconclusive.’

Researchers have long investigated whether smaller classes improve students performance. Their conclusions suggest that class-size reduction can result in greater in-depth coverage of subject matter by teachers, enhanced learning and stronger engagement by students, and safe schools more fewer discipline problems (Cohen, Miller, Stnonchill, & Geddes, 2000; Hertling, Leonard, Lumsden, & Smith, 2000; Thompson & Guningham, 2001). Montagna & Toth (2002), have attributed students performance in social studies to a large class room size in our secondary schools. They further listed a number of other factors that can be considered to be responsible for contributory factors to the trend of poor performance of students. These includes:

i. Work over-load by teachers

ii. Dissatisfaction with the little or no infrastructural materials

iii. Experience or disposition of teachers to use child-centered method of teaching

iv. Lack of initiative on the part of the teachers-using the locality available materials as an improvisation in the teaching and learning process.

v. General teaching skills (subject mastery) by the teacher

vi. Poor perception and negative attitude of students towards Social Studies

vii. Compulsory nature of the subject
For example, Noble (2000), in examining the assumption about the possible course-effect relationship between class-size and students performance, these areas include:

- Students attitude and readiness to learn.
- Remediation for ill-prepared and educationally disadvantage students.
- Understanding of learning styles and processes as well as teaching styles and mind-leading skills.
- Student motivation and effort and
- Widespread grade inflation and the watering down of standards, (Nobel, 2000).

In assessing the possible effect of class-size on performance, the issue of a good measure of academic performance has been called into question. The major problem schools are running into is that funding for these class-sizes is not available, or is decreasing (Gilma & Kiger, 2003). The promise that reducing class-sizes can lead to improved teaching and learning is one that most teachers and parents would readily endorse, (Kennedy, 2003); given a choice between a classroom with 20 students and with 30 students, who want to argue that the larger class would be a better learning environment for each student in the class? Nevertheless, the results of studies surveyed conclude that the influence of class-size on performance depends upon the measure of performance and that when measure of knowledge are used the large class-method is as effective as the small-class methods.

However, when measures of transfer of knowledge to new situations, retention of information, problem solving, critical thinking and attitude change or motivation are used, small-class size. The relationship between class-size and academic performance has
been a perplexing one for educators. Studies have found that the physical environment and class overcrowding are the variables that affect students performance (Molnar, et al., 2000). Other factors are school population and class-size (Gentry, 2000 and Swift, 2000). Stated the issue of poor academic performance of students in Nigeria has been of much concern to all and sundry. The problem is so much that it has led to the decline in standard of education. Since the academic success of students depends largely on the school environment, it is imperative to examine the impact variables of class-size and the academic performance of students in junior secondary school.

Large class-size has direct impact of the quality of teaching and instruction delivery. Overcrowded classrooms have increased the possibilities for mass failure and make students to lose interest in schools. This large class-size do not allow individual student to get attention from teachers which invariably lead to low reading scores, frustration and poor academic performance. In order to better understand the skill levels of students, it might be necessary to evaluate factors affecting their performance. These factor can include: school structure and organization, teacher quality, and teaching philosophies (Driscoll, Hakoussis, Svorny, 2003). The purpose of this study is to examine “the evaluation of class-size on Social Studies academic performance among junior secondary school students in Giwa Zone Kaduna State, Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In recent times, performance of Junior Secondary School students according to report made by office of the statistics in PPSMB 2016, calls for proper investigation of courses of poor performance of students. Probably the high level of students enrolment without adequate provision of corresponding learning facilities in our schools. The
National Policy on Education (NPE, 2014) stipulates that a normal class size at JSS should be forty (40) students per class for effective teaching and learning. However, prevailing conditions in most Nigerian junior secondary schools today is that a single classroom has a population of about 80 or more students, yet the same class to teach the class-size of 40 students are also being used in teaching the class-size of 80 students. It would be expected therefore, that the increase in students enrolment would create problems for teachers and effective classroom management. This could be the major reason responsible for the decline of students performance in social studies since population explosion directly affects effective teaching learning procedure.

Although, several scholars have proposed various factors responsible for the poor performance of students, only a little research has been dedicated to the correlation between class-size population and academic performance.

The high rate of failure in public examination is a proof that the education sector is ailing and requires urgent attention. In an attempt to find out the cause of this mass failure, several factors have been identified to be responsible for this situation. One of such factors is the high teacher-students ratio. It has been observed that some schools record book contain eighty or more students in a class. This problem is particularly severe in Giwa educational zone. The objectives of secondary school education is to produce high quality students who should be able to face the challenges of the society and prepare them for higher education. Today, Social Studies students are faced with large class sizes which lead to ineffective teaching and learning of social studies. It also leads to students not being able to understand the subject in the correct way. This results in the decline of students academic performance. Hence, this study is aimed at evaluating
the effects of class size on the academic performance of social studies in Junior Secondary Schools in Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State, Nigeria with the view of providing remedial strategies to improve the situation.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The major objective of the study is to evaluating the effects of class size on students academic performance in social studies in Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State, Nigeria. More specifically the objectives of the study are:

1. to find out the effects of class size on academic performance scores of JSS Social Studies Students.
2. to find out the effects of class size on academic performance scores of male and female JSS Social Studies students.
3. to find out the effects of class size on academic performance scores of rural and urban JSS Social Studies students.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. what is the effect of class size on academic performance scores of JSS Social Studies students?
2. what is the effects of class size on academic performance scores of male and female JSS Social Studies students?
3. what is the effects of class size on academic performance scores of rural and urban JSS Social Studies students?
1.5 Null Hypotheses

Based on the research questions raised above, the following research hypotheses have been formulated to guide the researcher in the study.

H0₁: there is no significant effects in the academic performance scores of JSS Social Studies students based on congested and incongested classroom.

H0₂: there is no significant effects in the academic performance scores of male and female JSS Social Studies students based on congested and incongested classroom.

H0₃: there is no significant effects in the academic performance scores of urban and rural JSS Social Studies students based on congested and incongested classroom.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study of the effects of class size on social studies students academic performance in junior secondary schools is significant in a number of ways. Some of these are outlined below.

Firstly, the study provides valid research based on the data that brings about improvement in the educational programme. It is difficult to ascertain if the educational programme is doing what it is supposed to do when it has not been formally evaluated as it relate to the current large class sizes. Secondly, the research findings are significant to stakeholders in education like: Government and policy makers. They will find the findings of this study useful as it will assist them to identify, analyse and interpret the negative consequences of large class population on students academic performance in the study area and beyond. This will help in providing the much needed data for planning and evaluation purposes which by looking at the situation to improve special consideration.
To the UBEC and SUBEBS, the study will assist them in the area of providing necessary information about students on small class benefit to enable them refine the various level of educational programmes and reposition them for greater efficiency thereby producing students that will be toast of the society.

This study is significant to curriculum planners and developers who want to evaluate and modify the JSS curriculum, making it progressive for the development of learners in the aspect of cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains. Also, teachers and students can benefit from the findings of the study as it will provide a good guide for effective classroom management. The research also aids in stimulating cordial teacher/student relationship and enhances the teaching/learning process. In addition, this study will serve as a necessary impetus to principals and school administrators to organize workshop, seminars and symposia on the effects of class size on students academic performance in the Junior Secondary Schools. Furthermore, the study serve as a background for other researchers to identify areas for further studies the relationship between class size and students improvement at various levels of educational programme particularly in secondary schools.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study is limited to JSS II in Giwa Educational Zone Kaduna State, the Zone has twenty six (26) junior secondary schools. The study is restricted to four (4) public sample schools which includes GJSS Doka, GJSS Hunkuyi, GJSS Kudan and GJSS Tabansani. Used marriage as treated topic from JSS II scheme of work where lesson plan was used. The students were grouped into two (2). A: small class, B: large class. Also, it is limited to evaluating the effects of class size on student academic performance in
junior secondary schools. In small class size instruction, the teacher may provide special assistance to groups who request it. The output of this study therefore, explores and illustrates the differences and importance of small class size and large class size and its effect on students academic performance. This work also aims to encourage social studies students on how to improve and overcome social studies related problems and phobia that is associated with the learning of social studies at junior secondary school level.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.01 Introduction

This chapter reviewed relevant literature in the area of study under the following sub-headings:

- Theoretical Framework for the Study
- Aims and Objectives of Social Studies Education in Nigeria
- History and Justification of Social Studies Education in Nigeria
- Nature and Scope of Social Studies
- Role of Evaluation in Social Studies
- Concept of Class Size
- Importance of Class Size in Teaching and Learning
- Concept of Performance
- Relationship between Class Size and Students Academic Performance
- Review of Related Empirical Studies
- Summary

2.02 Theoretical Framework for the Study

Classroom are bound to encounter of different sizes from time to time. It will also have to handle students of different abilities. This study ‘evaluating the effects of class size on social studies students academic performance in junior secondary schools in Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State, Nigeria’. Therefore, revolves round the philosophy of functionalism. Functionalism is itself an offshoot of pragmatism. The focus of this theory is that man is rational and would necessarily do those things that would be of benefit to...
his or her individual person. The theory was developed by American philosophers; Charles Sanders Peirce and William James in 19th century. The reasoning is the focus of practical application and scientific utility or knowledge to the benefit of the individual. They argued that pragmatism:

i. Nothing is permanent that the only thing that is permanent is change.
ii. Values are relative.
iii. Man has both biological disposition and social nurture.
iv. Man is very intelligent and makes use of his critical and intellectual abilities.

On this concept, man action are dictated by his rational mind and would rather do those things that will advance his development as a functional member of the society rather than concentrate on those things he consider as a waste.

Functionalism focuses its examination of purpose of the mind and behaviour as they mental process of the individual. It dwells on the practical application of the mind. Its core idea is that mental state (believe, desire, being in pain or happy etc.) are constituted solely by their functional role that they are causal relation to other mental state, sensory input and behavioural output (Black, 2010). Functionalism as applied in this study is based on the principle that the secondary school students have preference in term of what they think would be of benefit to them. Therefore, they will pay attention if they consider what is understandable to them and that they would be benefit from the activities where this is not the case, it would be assumed that they will not pay attention and advise effect of such development could be envisage in term of poor performance. It would therefore be expected that the students would associate their attention. Therefore, the importance of interaction, participation and involvement for students learning are widely recognized as
part of effective classroom activities (Inamullah, Hussain & Din, 2010). This dependency could have adverse effect on students performance in schools. It would therefore help to improve students performance if they are verbally active in class despite their ability or size of the class.

2.03 Concept of Social Studies

The term Social Studies is a derivation of two Latin words viz “socii” (socialies) which is rooted in the Italian “socie”, which means state (human society) and stadium which connotes study. From the etymological point of view, “Social Studies” could be said to mean the study of state or the study of human society. Based on this etymological perspective of Social Studies, it could be added that as a study of human society or the state, Social Studies extends its tentacles into the study of patterns of interaction among the subjects in the state or the society. In light of this, it studies human behavior as a whole and in relation to the environment that provides a stage for the cultivation of the said behavior.

Apart from the etymological view, Social Studies is equally perceived and recognized as a course or set of course taught in basic and post basic levels of education around the globe. In this view, Social Studies draws its content from various fields including socio-political science, history, economic, religious studies, geography, psychology, anthropology and civics (Free Encyclopedia, 2014).

The Social Studies concept is engrossed with numerous definition by various scholars and authorities. A search through textbooks and literature confound the students with numerous definitions of the concepts of Social Studies. This is evident in the multilateral opinions or views held by people on the subject. Thus, Ikwumelu (1993)
posits that the field of Social Studies is to cut in ambiguity, in consistency and contradiction that it presents a complex schizophrenic, bastard child. As if that is not enough, Social Studies has been seen as an extended civic, simplified of Social Sciences, as citizenship education, applied Social Sciences as well as a supplement or complement of the traditional subjects that constitute the humanities and social science subjects, (Mezieobi, 1992).

Zarrillo, (2013) see Social Studies as the interdisciplinary integration of social science and humanities concepts for the purpose of practicing problem solving and decision making for developing citizenship skills on critical social issues. This definition stresses the purpose of Social Studies education as being to help the learners think critically and to utilize the said knowledge positively thereby becoming active citizens. Also, Merriam-Webster Unabridge Dictionary (2012), view Social Studies as a course of study that deals with human relationships and the way society works. This suggests that Social Studies concern with social relationships and the functioning of the society. However, the vagueness of Social Studies does not end with scholars and teachers, parents, educational administrators alone, even government seems to be more confused about the subject, methodology and its importance.

Therefore, a cursory look and consideration at some definition by scholars will help drive home this point. The committee on primary schools Social Studies programme defines the subject as “those common learning of man’s interaction with social and physical environment (Ololobou, 2004). Also Coe (2014), views Social Studies as a discipline that helps students become responsible citizens is culturally diverse, democratic society within an interdependent world. It should be added that Social Studies
assists students to become responsible citizens through the exploration of history, geography, economic and civics. This exploration enables students to learn about people places, issues, areas and events that shape our world.

Similarly, an often quoted definition of Social Studies by Kissok cited in Okojie (2007) address Social Studies as “a programme of study which a society uses to instill in a students the knowledge, skill, attitudes and actions it consider important concerning the relationship human being have with each other, their world and themselves. While the various definition of Social Studies presented above may be mutually exclusive.

Above all, the various ideas, generalizations of features that are common among this definition include the following:

i. Man and his environment constitute the major focus of Social Studies.

ii. There is inter-relationship between man and his environments.

iii. Social Studies aim at solving man’s problem, i.e. social, political and economic etc.

iv. Social Studies provide the learner with citizenship, humanities intellectual and values education.

2.04 Aims and Objectives of Social Studies Education in Nigeria

For teaching to be successful, the subject, teacher and students must have goals and objectives. The two terms (aims and objectives) are related, but they are different in meaning. Some people may define Social Studies as a course devoted to the promotion of citizenship education and reflective inquiry. The argument may further add that Social Studies has the responsibility for preparing youth for roles as active participants in their various communities. This educational goal or aim of Social Studies is very broad and
vague. Therefore, the reasons for teaching Social Studies and what we teach in it, is a fulcrum to which the success of the entire programme is built upon. Social Studies was introduced into Nigerian schools system as a remedy to existing social problems prevalent in the society. It aim at studying social actions, relationship, addressing social needs and problems.

The objectives of Social Studies vary from one country to another; this is dependent on the situation and condition of the country adopting it. Thus, they are varieties of objectives of Social Studies as they are varieties of social problems (Tikuma, 2009). Argungu (2009) posits that, Social Studies as stated earlier was introduced into Nigerian schools as a core and compulsory subject at primary and junior secondary schools as a catalyst to the performance of the four national educational aims and objectives.

Obameata, Agu and Laosebikan (1981), Argungu (2009) explained that the objectives of Social Studies in Nigeria naturally reflect national objectives of education as a whole. This is basically on the premise that Social Studies, is a subject that draws its concepts from all the basic subjects at the primary and secondary levels of education such as history, geography, economics, government among others. Based on this, the objectives of Social Studies tend to reflect the objectives of these subjects. Secondly, the subject is designed to offer specific solutions to societal issues or offer remedy to national problems. Thus, its objectives must be relatively interwoven with national goals of education if it is good to answer this call. The national goals of education as presented by the national policy on education (1998) states the following:

- Inculcation of national consciousness and national unity.
- Inculcation of the right types of values and attitudes for the survival of individual and the Nigerian society.
- Training the mind in understanding the world around.
- Acquisition of appropriate skills and development of mental, physical and social abilities and competencies as equipment for the individual to live in and contribute to the development of his society.

It is based on these goals that the objectives of Social Studies were designed. According to Ololobou (2004) a typical Social Studies programme must encompass four cardinal objectives viz the environment, the various skills, values and skills and the emerging issues. Equally in his work, Ololobou (1999) observed that Social Studies in Nigeria seeks to re-establish the pre-colonial African educational values, which includes honesty, hard-work, mutual cooperation and conformity to traditional social order.

Corbin (NERDC, 1983) delineated the Social Studies education objective into two levels i.e. the junior and senior levels. He maintained that “junior level the emphasis should be on encouraging the development of social responsibility towards other children, adults and the world about them”. While “at the senior level children should be encouraged to develop values, attitude, skills and understanding necessary to live in the society.

NERDC (1980) in Ikwumelu (2000) categorized the objectives into the following:

i. Citizenship education: preparing the students for social responsibilities.
ii. Humanistic education: helping the students to comprehend his life.
iii. Intellectual education: introducing the students to the mode of thinking and enquiry of the social science.
iv. Value decision: inculcating in the individual some expected. Attitudes, values and feelings.

However, the opinion of Social Studies scholars are not different from the objectives of Social Studies in Nigeria. Thus, Dubey in (1980), Aina et al., (1982), Corbin NERDC (1983), Ikwumelu (2000) are of the same view that is based on the rational for the introduction of Social Studies in Nigeria. The objectives of the Social Studies programme may be broadly outlined as follows.

a. To create and increasing awareness and understanding of our evolving physical and social environment.

b. To develop a capacity to learn and to enquire certain skills including not only those of listening, speaking-reading and writing, and of calculation but also those of hands and head.

c. Ensure the acquisition of the body of relevant knowledge and information, which is an essential prerequisite to personal development as well as to a positive contribution to the betterment of mankind.

d. To develop a sympathetic appreciation of the diversity and interdependence of all members of the local community, and the wider national and international communities.

e. Develop in the students, positive spirit of togetherness, comradeship and cooperation towards healthy nation.

f. Promotion of understanding of social problems of their locality.

g. Promotion of the ability to think reflectively.

h. Creation of awareness that discipline essential for an orderly society.
i. Demonstration of flexibility and willingness to accept necessary changes within a system.

j. The promotion of effective and active citizenship.

Consequently, upon these objectives, new objectives can always be conceived and developed in relation to the dynamics and on the move nature of the society to ensure the purposive nature of Social Studies as a problem-solving programme. Thus, Maduewesi, (2003 p. 20) refers to this point in his foreword to the national curriculum for primary school Social Studies. This he stated as follows:

“The curricular prescriptions presented in this document represent the minimum content of what should be taught in all Nigerian schools. This notwithstanding, teachers in the different states and local government area are free to draw upon their immediate environment for additional materials”.

It is the desire to achieve the objectives of Social Studies through the various level of our educational system as prescribed by the National Policy on education that justified the objectives of Social Studies at the primary, junior secondary and the N.C.E level. Thus, this study is the implementation of N.C.E Social Studies programme in Federal Colleges of education in Nigeria. The Social Studies objectives as prescribed by the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE, 2009). This programme is designed with the objectives of producing teachers who are both professionally contents and academically competent in the Social Studies philosophy contents and methodology (NCCE, 2009). The objectives of NCE Social Studies in Federal Colleges of Education in Nigeria includes:
a. To produce professionally and academically competent NCE Social Studies teachers for the basic 1-9 schools.

b. To prepare teachers who will inculcate in their pupils rational adjustment to their physical and social environment through acquisition of knowledge, attitudes, values, appreciation and skills necessary for developing social and civic responsibilities.

c. To pursue students who are capable of benefiting from further education in Social Studies and other related areas.

2.05 History and Justification of Social Studies in Nigeria

Social Studies was first conceived in United State and this idea later spread to Europe countries. The Social Science viz economic, sociology etc. were well grounded before the Second World War. It was after the Second World War that Social Studies was identified as a course that is relevant to the understanding mans problems in the society conferences were held both in Queen’s College Oxford.

Nigeria in the mid-nineteenth century with emphasis on numeracy, to satisfy their dream of hegemony and domination. This education system started slowly soundly, developing during the colonial time because it met the needs and aspiration of its designers until the conclusion of the Second World War. This aspiration according to Amaelo (2007), was to produce people who would be of service to the member of the trinity of the colonialism the Church to government and the commercial firm. This curriculum was uncritically accepted and assimilated by the indigenous people of Nigeria who were raped of their culture values and beliefs by the domineering colonial masters.
In the immediate post colonial period, pronounced political and economic crisis motivated by ethnic and religious elements engulfed the country that separated the Northern from the Southern people. This brought a great concern in the social system as to bring a mechanism that could savage the country that was at the blink of collapse. Similarly, Akinlua (2007) reported that immediately after independence, the colonial education which was inherited by Nigerian was criticized for being too theoretical to be able to make meaningful impact on the life of Nigerians. The source further stressed that the subject taught in school then reflected the test of the colonial education officials, hence, school curricular were build around the existing colonial values. Nigeria become desirous of solving its ethno-regional crisis, religious violence, political instability and insecurity. Others include the problem of unity in diversity and adaptation to change society. These challenges emerged because the British inherited education has been a disappointment in meeting Nigerian problems of national cohesion. These was therefore the feeling that the existing content and method of traditional geography and history, among others disciplines, were foreign and were not meeting the needs of Nigeria’s rapidly changing society. This therefore, called for a need to reposition the existing curriculum that will inculcate the right moral values in the youth.

At Mombasa, Kenya in 1968 where it was agreed that teaching of history and geography should be reviewed. Many African countries such as Ghana, Sierra Leone, Uganda including Nigeria attended the conference.

The first serious attempt to develop Social Studies was made at Aiyetoro Comprehensive high School, Aiyetoro in 1965, through the assistance of the Ford Foundation and working in conjunction with the Western Religion Ministry of Education
two Books. Social Studies for Nigeria secondary schools Book 1 and 2 for use in form 1 and 2 at the secondary level of education.

About 1968, the former six Northern States requested Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria to assist in the development of Social Studies in to the educational system. Gradually, Social Studies as a concept started diffusing into various areas of Nigeria. In furthering the development of the subject, many seminars and workshops have been organized by such bodies a Nigerian Education Research Council (NERC) and now (CESAC) Comparative Education Studies and Adoption Centre.

Esu and Inyang-Abia (2004), in their submission pointed out that some of the problems as mentioned on top needed social solution that should emphasize the need for complete re-orientation of the masses. The school curriculum therefore was a veritable measure through which large population of the youths could be reached. Thus, Social Studies came at a time of great expectations as to what education could do to transform Nigeria. Its introduction in the Nigerian school system was part and parcel of that movement to make education suitable for the needs of country. Social Studies was therefore sees as a discipline with the greatest mandate to address this social and political quagmire that was prevalent at the period.

Social Studies is being taught and learnt in Nigeria through an integrated approach which makes the discipline to be the favorite of other subject in the curriculum at all levels of our educational system in the country bare not for its non implementation in the senior secondary school level. Therefore, this make the subject to gain more recognition among other discipline thus making its future to be more prosperous and encouraging. Furthermore, Social Studies is being taught in all levels of our educational
system in the country viz primary, secondary and tertiary institutions, thus many student are developing keen interest in learning the subject with an overwhelming enrolment in colleges of education and universities in recent time.

Many universities have introduced degree programmes at various levels viz: undergraduate and postgraduates degree in Social Studies which encourages many students to specialize in this discipline at their various levels thus projecting the image of the discipline. Presently, there is an association of the Social Studies Education (Social Studies Association of Nigeria) that has metamorphosed to Social Studies and Civic Educators Association of Nigeria (SOSCEAN), formed at tertiary level of our education in the country.

Thus, for a clear understanding of the justification for Social Studies in Nigeria, the need to look at the philosophy behind its introduction and what it is intended to achieve is important. According to Aina, Adedoyin, Obilo, & Ahmadu (1981) Social Studies was introduced in to the Nigerian system as an answer to specific and national problems. In the late 1960s, most educators in Nigeria clamoured and agreed that the schools must be Nigerian in outlook rather than emphasizing foreign ideas. This is because in designing the form and content of education for Nigeria, the British colonizer according to Tikumah (2009) aimed at enlightening the Nigerian more about Europeans than about themselves as a Nigerian. In effect, the education provided by the British was inadequate to meet the needs of Nigerian youths and society. As Akinmloye (1981 p. 19) rightly observed,

“The present education system instead of developing positive values in the society in which African child lives, tend to alienate him from his cultural
environment, in other words, the system educates the child out of the environment”.

Consequently, the educational reforms that led to the introduction of Social Studies in Nigeria had the following underlying motives which according to him are as follows:

a. The need to use education for national integration and socio-economic development.

b. The need to make education more relevant to the needs for the individual and society.

c. The need to develop the right societal values.

d. The need to make an individual responsible to the society in which he lives.

Based on these, it was taught that through Social Studies education, a love of the country could be developed in our school-children in such a way that they will develop a strong attachment for their country and government.

As Tikuma (2009) rightly observed that Social Studies was introduced in Nigeria as a “corrective study” that is to remedy the colonial activities of the past with notion to properly address the present and future needs of Nigerians. The cultural and ethnic diversity of the Nigerian nation provided diverse relationships among the inhabitants of Nigerians. This relationship is manifested in multi-lingual, religious and ethnic sentiments that culminate in relative lack of peace, unity and undemocratic living. This specter of cultural, linguistic and ethno-religious relationship appears to influence ember and animosity between Muslim and Christian worshippers in Nigeria. Thus, Okam (2002) is view that Social Studies in Nigeria aims at breaking the ethnic, religious, linguistic and
cultural barriers that keep apart the various groups that constitute the Nigerian society, so that nation building can be facilitated by the concerted efforts of those divergent people of the Nigerian policy.

Amdii (2004) instruct that the social function of Social Studies has been the preparation of pupils and students for responsible citizenship. Thus, Social Studies was introduced as a programme to help in developing and improving social living in the community’s country, and in the world as a whole. Amdii (2004) posits that Social Studies was introduced to make Nigerians understand as observed by Lebowitz (1981) in Tikuma (2009) that the people constituting the Nigerian population have much more in common than they differ. Ilori (1994) observed that, if Nigerian is said to be a nation in need of “ethical revolution”, then Social Studies as an inculcator of values and attitudes is indispensable for the country.

The justification for the inclusion of Social Studies arise from the deficiencies of the separate social science subjects such as History, geography, Political Science, Economic, Government among others as a means of studying the entire society. Thus, Ken Mezieobi, Fubara, & Sam Mezieobi, K.A. (2011), observed that the segregation and fragmentation of courses in humanities and other social sciences in their distinctiveness present the world in its false view, therefore, Social Studies in its integrative approach to learning was seen as capable of cutting across artificial subject boundaries and present knowledge in an integrated and unified knowledge approach to learners. Thus, its introduction was facilitated. More so, Social Studies in Nigeria is equally justified by the multitudes of negative values, poor attitudes to work, disrespect for constituted authorities and the absence of a sense of patriotism by Nigerian (Mezieobi, K.A., 2011).
Therefore, Social Studies a value-laden subject was thought to provide a value re-orientation platform to inculcate socio-civic and effective competence for Nigerians and Nigeria society. This will expose the Nigerian youths to the problems in the society and equip them with the necessary skills needed for their survival (Aina et al., 1981). Amdii (2004) equally informs that, the introduction of Social Studies in to the school curriculum in Nigeria was part of a general response to the problems of independence and tends to reverse the colonial education which did not cater for our societal values. In addition to these, its introduction was designed to develop basic skills that are essential to the healthy development of the ideals of democracy such as thinking and creative among others. Aina et al., (1981) assert that these skills are accomplished through learning experiences which involve problem solving and critical thinking. Social Studies provide these opportunities. Above all these, the National Policy on Education (2013) stipulates that the quality of instruction at all level of Nigerian education system must be geared towards inculcating the following values in learners.

- Respect for the worth and dignity of the individuals.
- Faith in man’s ability to make rational decisions.
- Moral and spiritual values in inter-personal and human relations.
- Shared responsibility for common good of society.
- Promotion of the emotional, physical and psychological health of all children.

Social Studies objectives are derived form the National Educational objectives and are aimed at the realization of the aspirations of the National Educational objectives. It was introduced to achieve such goals as national consciousness, national unity, development of positive attitudes towards democratic values and effective citizenship.
among others. Thus, Social Studies based on its objectives was introduced as the most adequate subject for the realization of the national educational objectives at all levels of our educational school systems.

2.06 Nature and Scope of Social Studies

Social Studies centres on man, it view man in a broad framework and tries to study him in relation to the various components of his social and physical environment. In order to do this successfully, Social Studies draws upon the view points of the existing Social Science disciplines (history, geography, economics, sociology, political science anthropology) and many other subjects. The purpose of the social science has been to develop generalization and build theories about the behavior of man. But they do not integrate these into a whole for the child to understand. Social Studies develops its own theories and makes use of the theories developed by the social sciences, integrate and interprets them in an attempt to study man comprehensively. Social Studies therefore, draws its content from the social science subjects and from the environment in which the child exists and integrates them in order to help the child develop complete knowledge and method of reflective thinking.

This is very important because most life’s decision you may take as an individual have to do with events of the past (history), physical and cultural objects (geography), power struggle (political science), satisfaction of unlimited wants and needs with limited resources (economics) as well as understanding the values, customs and cultures of groups and relationships among man in general (sociology and anthropology). Social Studies, in this way, integrates and inter-relates ideas of social science disciplines in order to help man solve his problems.
Social Studies sees it as part of our Educational pursuit in Africa. According to Balyesusa (1981), has been seen as an African ideas and creation of the concerted Educators, philosophers and educators such as Kwami Nkuruma, Tafawa Bakewa, Julius K. Nyerere, Jomokenyata, Leopard Senghor and a host of many others. These pioneers of African scholars are nationalists who were educated the colonial rule observed and saw the negative consequences of the colonial education as an instrument of European imperialism. They brought it to become heroes and reformers. Their recommendation, policies and charters become the pillow upon which the present day educational policies take roots. And this helps to form the real core on which Social Studies stand. The idea of Balyejesa is not to forestall the idea of indigenous Social Studies before the colonial instruction. Thus, Onabamiro (1983) and Ikwumelu (2001) observed that indigenous Social Studies is as old as man. And they bare their mind with the traditional Social Studies Education as;

“That process by which children born in to a society is made to understand the environment in which they have been born, to learn the things that members of the society should do to enhance the welfare and progress of the society and to learn why they should avoid doing things that might be injurious to the wellbeing of the society”.

In indigenous Social Studies is this child society centered. This therefore buttresses the assertion of Fafunwa (1974) “that African education (including indigenous Social Studies) emphasized “social responsibility job orientation, political participation, spiritual and moral values”, this therefore portrays that the indigenous Social Studies is both situational and temporal, that is, it’s flexible, changing from place to place and from
time to time. Nevertheless, it follows the spiral format extending from known to unknown and from simple to complex.

Social Studies as earlier stated is a corrective study. Balyejusa argues that it is corrective because it aims at upsetting the colonial educational activities. Its purpose is to remedy the educational ills of the society. It seeks to replace irrelevant learning experience with relevant one. Since the product of any colonial education system was not meant to serve the interests of his follow indigenous. Therefore, Social Studies is meant to correct all ills vis-à-vis, educational, social and technological ills that were inherent in the colonial system of education and the Nigerian society. Social Studies is a subject that emphasizes on subjects before any content could be of significance to the learner. This Balyejusa (1981), Ikwumelu (2001) and Mezieobi (2008) bare their mind to. They agreed that the teacher has to understand why he is doing before any meaningful learning can take place. In Social Studies, a teacher must know what he is supposed to accomplish for the benefit of the child and society.

According to Mezieobi (2011) posits that Social Studies is also equally a study that emphasizes the importance of man, it places man in a control position and his activities are studies in relation to his various environments which could be physical, social or psychological, and the goals/objectives of Social Studies is to produce responsible and participative citizens with analytic, relative skill and attitudes to make their environments yield all that make the society for good successful living.

Akande (1987) affirms that the nature of Social Studies teaching refers to a predominantly controlled of directed interactive learning oriented activities inside and outside formal classroom situation in which the learner actively participates and makes a
conscious and deliberate act to induce and acquire significant learning under the teacher serving as a learning collaborator, a director, a guide, a catalyst and a helper. The teacher in Social Studies teaching is not a taskmaster or an autocrat dishing out encyclopedic knowledge. Learning is accomplished through active student/teacher’s interaction in ensuring that learning takes place.

2.07 Role of Evaluation in Social Studies

Evaluation aims at assessing the extent to which the anticipated outcome is achieved. It enhances a comparison between the actual outcome and expected outcome. Evaluation therefore has been defined as the process through which the performance of students, their teachers as well as the effectiveness of the programme is assessed.

In the words of Ogunsanya (1984) Social Studies evaluation therefore is “concerned with one’s attempt to find out the extent to which the teaching and learning objectives of the subject have been met by the teacher and the students, but more importantly the latter”.

This goes to show that the primary aim of the teacher is to enable pupils to show and understand what they are taught rather than to fail or pass them. Evaluation should thus not end with grading the pupils performance because whether or not the pupils do well as expected, the teacher ought to ask himself why some of them perform very well and others perform badly. He should also find out whether or not he has contributed to the problems or success of the pupils as might be indicated by the evaluation results, and what has been the nature of his contributions. For instance, did he teach the subject well enough? Did he sufficiently motivate the pupils? did he take special care of individual differences in the class?.
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However, Mangge (2003) opines that the current practice in evaluation generally and in the evaluation of Social Studies in particular tends to completely ignore the evaluation of the teacher himself and to concentrate on the learners. Kissock (1981) has this to say “evaluation presents students, teacher and curriculum developers with feedback on their success in achieving programme objectives and form the basis for making sound decision on which to modify and improve the programme”.

In Social Studies, evaluation serves three major purposes, firstly, it is used for course improvement. This is because it helps in identifying weaknesses in the set objectives. Contents, materials and methods, secondly, evaluation helps in identifying the needs of the individuals for the purposes of planning their instructions. Thirdly, it assists in the judgment of an educational programme in term of workability and suitability. It is obvious then that evaluation is multidimensional in nature, focusing on programmes, students, teachers and the society.

Social Studies lends itself to the use of a good number of evaluation techniques, this to enable the teacher to determine the extent to which instructional objectives are achieved. These evaluation techniques include test, observation, interview, questionnaire, self-report among others. Ogunsanya (1991) asserts that “a comprehensive assessment in Social Studies should involve the use of combinations of some of these techniques even if all the techniques mentioned above could not be used together, it is still much better to use more than one technique at a time then to use a single one to the exclusion of others.
2.08 Concept of Class Size

Over the past several decades, researchers, politicians and corporate leaders have focused reform efforts on the size of educational contexts. Hundreds of billions of public and private funds have been invested to reduce the size and scope of both classrooms and schools (Lee & Ready, 2007). Unlike many education reform, these downswing plans have attracted support from virtually every quarter, and a united front of stakeholders has come together behind the notion that “smaller is better”. Efforts to reduce elementary school class sizes have bring particularly strong popular and political support. Despite its popularity, some academics and policymakers remain skeptical of class size reduction, concluding that the researcher may not justify the enormous sums currently being invested (Hanushek, 2002; Harris, 2002).

In particular, critics question the axiom that class size is related to student learning. A common criticism of class-size initiatives is that they neglect teaching and learning, focusing on structure at the expense of instruction (Cohen, Raudenbush, & Ball, 2003; Hanushek, 2002; Milesi & Gomoran, 2006). Among the more cynical conclusions is that support for smaller classes among teachers stems from a desire to reduce workloads, and to increase the number of teachers and union members (Christopher, & Steven, 2009). Interest in class-size is widespread today. Conflict has often appeared concerning ideal class-size. Debates often appear about “ideal” class-size and controversial efforts to reduce class-size have appeared across the nations of the world. Responding to this debate, several recent experimental studies may have contributed substantially to the research knowledge on the “impact of class-size” than for any other question in education.
Class-size refers to the number of students in a given course in classroom, specifically either (1) the number of students being taught by individual teachers in a course or classroom or (2) the average number of student being taught by teachers in a school, or education system. The term may also extend to the number of students participating in learning experiences that may not take place in a traditional classroom setting, or it may also refer to the total number of students in a particular grade level or “class” in a school (although this usage in less common in public education). Florida School Indication Report (FSIR, 2003-2004) defines class-size as a count of students meeting in a particular classroom for a class section.

Adeniyi (2005), define class-size as an educational tool to describe the average number of students per class. (education at a glance, OCED; 2002, Glossary) defines class-size as the average class size as the average number of students enrolled by the number of classes under the control of a teacher per class. Blachford (2003) defines class-size as the number of students in a class with one teacher. It should be noted that schools, zone, state and federal education agencies commonly track and report average class sizes while average class size are commonly expressed as a ratio of students to teachers, a “student teacher ratio is usually different than average class size.

Not all the question about the impact of class size reduction have been answered not have all the debates been settled. However, the pattern of research findings points more and more towards the beneficial effects of reducing class-size. The National Policy on Education (FME, 2013) stated that educational activities should be centered on the learner for maximum self development and fulfillment. It emphasizes that education and training facilities should continue to be expanded in respond to societal needs and made
progressively accessible to individual students. The National Policy on Education (FME, 2013), thus considers 40 students per class as the recommended class-size for a teacher.

In 1985, Tennessee initiated a longitudinal class size reeducation experiment that would serve as the foundation for similar efforts across the country. The experiment, titled project STAR (student/teacher performance ratio), randomly assigned over 6,000 kindergarteners to one of three within-school experimental conditions: a small class enrolling between 13 and 17 children, a large class enrolling between 22 and 26 children with single teacher, or large class with a teacher and aide (Krueger, 2000; Krueger & Whitmore, 2002; Nye, Hedges, & Konstantopoulous, 2002). At the end of kindergarten, the performance of children in small classes was almost one month ahead of the performance of children in the other two classroom conditions. By the end of first grade, the same children were almost two months ahead. After four years of treatment, children who attended small classes were ahead by roughly one-quarter standard deviation. In terms of grade-equivalent norms, after four years of the intervention, small class children were 5.4 month ahead. Results from the Tennessee class-size experiment do suggest differential class-size effects. In other words, the small-class effect was roughly twice as large for black students (Krueger & Whitmore, 2002). Moreover, these compensatory effects appear to have persisted over time. For instance, by high school, black students who had been in the small elementary school classes were 25% more likely to take admissions tests and to score higher on those tests than black children who were enrolled in large classes (Krueger & Whitmore, 2002) students in low-performing schools did benefit more from smaller class sizes (Krueger & Whitmore, 2002). In short, in schools with large numbers of low-achieving, reported class-size effects may be spurious,
meaning that they reflect other trait of teachers, schools and communities that are related to both student performance and class size but not necessarily the relationship between the two (Biddle & Berliner, 2002; Hoxby, 2002). For example, class-size effects may be biased upward. To reduce the potential for selection and omitted variable bias, the author examined naturally occurring class-size variation within the same schools over time. Hoxby (2000), concludes that class-size is unrelated to student learning. Her primary explanation points to the fact that, unlike the teachers in her sample of Connecticut schools, small-class teachers in the Tennessee study were aware that they were part of the treatment group, and thus may have had incentives to produce greater students performance gains that teachers in her study did not.

Several recent non experimental class-size studies have employed data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K) sponsored by the National Center for education Statistics. Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten (ECLS-K) is currently recording the progress of a nationally representative group over 20,000 children who were in kindergarten during the 1998-99 school year. Using these data and multilevel methods, Milesi and Gamoran (2006), explored class-size effects on kindergarten cognitive development in public and private schools, the authors conclude that kindergarten class-size is unrelated to students learning in either reading or Social Studies. Other non experimental analysis of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K) data, however, support findings from the Tennessee and Wisconsin class-size experiments. Ready & Lee (2007) estimated the effects of small compared with medium-sized classrooms for kindergarten and first grade students. Importantly, they found no differences in kindergarten literacy or Social Studies
gains, between schools offering small rather than medium-sized kindergarten classrooms. A second meta-analysis arrives at very different conclusions from Glass and Smith. Hanushek (1997, 2002) analyzed 59 publications that provided 227 estimates of the relationship between class size (or student/pupil ratios) and student outcomes. Hanushek (2002) concludes, “despite the political popularity of overall class size reduction, the scientific support of such policies is weak to nonexistent”.

An advantage of using this measurement is that it provides a useful insight into the average number of students in each class. It is also possible to look at the distribution of class-sizes, e.g. proportion over a certain size. However, the average class-size does not include classes with more than one teacher or take into account of the number of support staff in the classroom.

Therefore, there could be a seemingly large class of 45 but there may be two (2) support staff in the class which would in fact give a student adult ratio of 15. While class-size denotes the average number of students entrusted in the care of one teacher over the course of one year, student-to teacher ratio refers to the number of students within a local educational authority divided by the number of certificated personnel servicing the students population employed by the organization, Achilles (n.d.). Differences between student-teacher ratio and class-size were found to be as large as 10 students. In a nutshell, given a student-teacher ratio of 17 students to one teacher in a building, the actual classroom load may be as large as 27 student for one teacher (Achilles, Finn & Pate-Bain, 2002).

Yet, in spite of these differences, the literature related to instructional settings has used erroneously both concepts interchangeably. While actual class-size may vary during
the year or even during the same day, student-teacher ratio are usually smaller since they may include certificated personnel not assigned to one classroom or assigned to smaller classes such as those typically required to service special need students. To rephrase the above remark, although both constructs are highly correlated, it is likely that students-teacher ratio will be considerably lower than the one calculated by the actual class size construct.

Researcher in the area of class-size and academic performance focused on increasingly smaller sizes, comparing classes comprised of between 15 and 35 students. The effect of class-size on student performance and the learning of Social Studies over the years have been of great interest to educational researchers and policy makers and had raised concern in the mind of researchers, on what should be an “ideal” class-size. Responding to the debate, several major analyses and used of various analytical methods to draw conclusions through reviews of already existing research studies and high-quality experimental data have consistently demonstrated the positive effects of small classes on average student performance for all students. The methods used and the included vary somewhat, but most of them have concluded that reducing class-size is related to increased student learning. Consequently, more studies may have surfaced for this topic than for any other question in education (Nye, Hedges & Konstantopoulos, 2000a).

However, it is tempting to imagine class-size reduction as an educational intervention that increases academic performance for all students and reduces the performance gap between lower-and-higher-achieving students by producing larger gains for low achievers. The important question of whether class-size reduction can reduce the performance gap and hence affect the academic performance of low-and high-achieving
students differently has not been fully answered thus far. Class-size reduction (CSR) has been suggested by a number of researchers as a way to lessen the effects of economic and social inequities to increase academic performance and to strengthen the foundational skills students develop in the primary grades. A second generation of researchers recognized that teacher activity created opportunities for students learning, (Achilles et al., 2002). Maloney, (2001) and Shuaibu (2003), consider a small class to be one having one teacher to handle 15 to 17 students. And Anderson (2002), noted that small classes would not, in and of themselves, solve all educational problems, what teachers do matters. Achilles et al., (2002) say class-size should be in the ratio of 50 students and above to a teacher. He felt that the numerical strength of the class does not permit the teacher to cope effectively with the demand of individual student. Individual student is buried in the group as a result of the largeness of the class. More so, uniform instructional technique is reaching out to all the students with different ability at the same time (Booze & Maloney, 2001; & Shuaibu, 2003).

Controversy has continued for more than fifty (50) years over the effects of class size of student performance and on non-cognitive variables such as self-esteem, attitudes towards learning and instruction and mean of reducing the cost of education (Grave, Hatch, Rao, & Oen, 2007). Therefore, small classes are more effective not simply because they are smaller, but because they offer an educational setting in which it is easier and more feasible for these activities to occur.

The National Policy on Education (FME, 2014), stated that educational activities should be center on the learner for maximum self development and fulfillment. It emphasizes that education and training facilities should continue to be expanded in
response to societal needs and made progressively accessible to individual students. It is in consonance with these stated goals that the policy (2014), went on to recommend an average class of 40 students to a teacher. In line with National Policy on Education (NPE, 2014), recommendation therefore, a small class size in this study will be take to constitute 20-40 students to a teacher, medium will constitutes 50-70 students to a teacher, while large class-size will be 80-100 students and above to a teacher. The small, medium and large class size will be responded to the same instructional strategies, the students will be grouped into large class size and small class size. Tennessee’s project, Students-Teachers Performance Ratio (STAR, 1985) compared classes of 13-17 with class of 22-26 students both with and without an additional instructional aide in the large classes, participating teachers did not receive any professional training focusing on teaching in reduced size classes. The evidence from students in STAR showed that the students in the smaller classes out-performed the students in larger classes, whether or not the large class teachers had an aide helping them. Project STAR found that; smaller class students substantially out performed large class students on both standardized (Stand Ford Performance Test) and Curriculum-Based Test (Basic Skill First). Project STAR data reconfirmed the original finding that “students in smaller classes scored higher on standardized test than students in regular classes”.

In ‘a policy brief’ by Schanzenbach, D.W (2014), he summarizes the academic literature on the impact of class size is an important determinant of a variety of student outcomes, ranging from the test scores to broader life outcomes. Smaller classes are particularly effective at raising performance levels of low-income and minority children. He suggested that policymakers should carefully weigh the efficacy of class-size policy
against other potential uses of funds. While lower class size has demonstrate cost, it may prove the more cost-effective policy overall. A reanalysis of the Tennessee STAR experiment found that small classes (15-17 pupils) in kindergarten through third grade (k-3) provide short and long-term benefits in terms of improved test outcomes, school engagement, and reduced grade retention and dropout rates, (Achilles, C.M., et al., 2012).

Schanzenbach, et al. (2011), concludes that attending a small class increase the rate of college attendance, with the largest positive impact on black and poor students. Among those students with the lowest predicted probability of attending college, a small class increased rate of attendance by 11 percentage point. Attending small class also increases the probability of earning a college degree, and to shift students towards earning degree in high-earning fields such as science, technology, engineering and mathematic (STEM), business and economic. Bascia, N. (2010), reviewed research base and analyzed statistical data collected by the Canadian Ministry of Education between 2003, 2004 and 2007-2008. Involved field research in eight school districts, 24 schools, and 84 classrooms, classroom observations were undertaken at each primary grade level from k-3, all teachers were surveyed in each school. Parent surveys included representation from every school district in Ontario. “Nearly three-quarters of the primary teachers reported that the quality of their relationships with students had improved as a result of the smaller class size, and two-thirds said their students were more engaged in learning than before class size reduction. Many parents of children enrolled in smaller classes reported that their children appeared to be learning more and more and were more comfortable at school. Nye et al (2000), analysed project STAR data to determine if certain subgroups of students had greater gains in achieving when placed in small classes,
the researcher found that minority students participating in small classes had larger gains in achieving than white students in small classes for both reading and social studies in grades k-3. (The gain were slightly more than white boys, and minority girls had greater gains than white girls, Konstanpoulos, & Chun, (2009), found that the effects significant in all the tested subjects, and for those in smaller classes for four years was very substantial. The results provided convincing evidence that all types of students (e.g. low, medium and high achievers) benefit from being in small classes (in early grades) across all performance test in certain grades, in reading and Social Studies, the cumulative effects of small classes for low achievers are substantial in magnitude and significantly different from those for high achievers. Thus, class size reduction appears to be an intervention that increases the performance levels for all students while simultaneously reducing the achieving gap.

Managing a class of several hundred students in certainly a demanding job, but it cannot consume all of the teacher’s attention. Likewise, the teacher cannot focus too much on being a disciplinarian, because the presentation and delivery of the subject materials require preparation and organization. Careful time management is thus another essential component of class-size instruction. Teaching anything anywhere has its challenges. Here in Nigeria are common challenge teacher face is large class-size. Classroom management becomes paramount in delivering effective lessons in such a situation. Too many good teachers have seen their lessons derailed by deficient classroom management skills.

Classroom management begins the moment you first step into the classroom on day one. It is important to set the classroom culture on the very first day of class. A great
way to do this is through the establishment of class rules. Some teaches simply dictate their class rules and expect students to follow them. We feel this may not be best as it excludes students from the process of forming the classroom culture. We strongly feel students should be included in this stage since they are obviously integral members of the classroom. Rather than merely dictating classroom rules, have an activity where students decide in groups what class norms should be instilled. This can prove to be a great ice-breaking activity since students often come up with creative and absurd rules. This can help to create a more comfortable atmosphere on the first day of class.

Hopefully, when groups share their answers, you will have some reasonable rules and at this time, you can add your own rules, if students fail to mention any that you deem important. If students help make the rules, they will be more inclined to follow them.

Michael (nd) has success taking the list of student-generated norms and making a class contract. With great ceremony, he has the students swear to uphold the contract for the duration of the course. He also likes to post the norms on the wall for everyone to see. If a student forgets to follow the norms, a simple nod in the direction of the poster is enough to get them on track. Student involvement in the creation of the norms is really important so that the teacher can simply remind the students that they are not following the norms that were created together.

While establishing class rules with your students is paramount, equally as important is having consequences if those rules are broken. If students break rules without any consequences, your class management system will undoubtedly break down. There are various consequences you can establish for rule-breaking, depending on your
teaching context. For public school teachers who have large class-sizes (30-40 students), a great classroom management technique is to use an ongoing group merit/demerit point system. If student are given merit/demerit points based on group, this will them police themselves, this shifting the responsibility from you to your students. Peer pressure can be exerted in powerful ways so that students that are hurting their teams will strive to do the opposite.

In elementary schools, it is important to have merit/demerit score chart visible for all students to see so that they can trade their progress often, you motioning" towards the score chart can cause students to stop misbehaving. Each class, students can receive points/stickers based on their performance which can go towards a reward either at the end of week, month, or term.

An on-going reward system set up in this way is far more effective than giving daily 'candy' rewards to students. These classes can resemble a parade because of all the candy being thrown around, and the rewards strategy often loses its effectiveness after a few weeks as students expect real in every class. It is still possible to give more frequent rewards that are not material in nature.

Project STAR found substantial evidence that reducing class-size improved student academic performance. It was designed as large scale, longitudinal (four Years) study, which involved nearly 80 schools from 42 school districts. It included about 7000 k-3 students from families ranging from very poor to very affluent. Project STAR required schools to commit to the four year time frame as a condition of participation, and also required schools to agree to random assignment of teachers and students to small (13-17 students) or large (22-26 students) classes as a condition of participation.
Class-size reduction programs in grades (k-3) have been implemented in different ways. Some programs focus on student-teacher ratio, while others restructure classes in some ways. Still others emphasize professional development and related policies. The student-teacher ratio in the programs studied varied widely, some set a ratio of 13:1 as their benchmark for "small" classes, which were compared with a ratio of 20:1 (or higher). Others considered classes with a ratio of 20:1 to be "small". In other words, one program's 'small' class could be another program's 'large' class, making comparison even difficult.

Smaller classes may vary in other ways, in addition to student-teacher ratio, depending upon school leadership, facilities and teaching staff, as well as official policy. The typical mode is one teacher in one classroom teaching an assigned number of students, but other models have been implemented Project STAR focused strictly on class-size reduction, and did not provide special training or professional development to teachers or aides (Finn, 2002). Studies of other interventions concluded that more attention should have been paid to the training and experience of teachers, and to the professional and curriculum development that might have helped them make the most of small classes (Kurecka and Claus, 2000 and Munoz, 2001).

The most influential contemporary evidence that smaller Classes lead to improved performance is Tennessee's project STAR. Because this program set up randomly selected control and experimental groups of students, researcher could compare students who had four year of small class participation to students who had none. This meant that researchers could more reliably evaluate the impact of the class-size reform.
Project STAR (Finn, 2002), found that students in smaller classes did better than those in large classes throughout the k-3 grades and the more years spent in reduced classes, the longer lasting the benefits. Nye et al. (2001a), explored the relationship between the number of years that students participated in project STAR small classes and their level of performance. After one year, the students in smaller classes had significantly higher performance scores on the Stanford Performance and Test reading and Social Studies sub test than students in large classes. The gap in scores widened after two years, indicating that the effects of small classes are cumulative.

Nye et al. (2001b), also conducted a follow-up study of Project STAR students, which showed the positive effects of small classes maintained over time. The researchers compared the subject Social Studies performance of 9th grades students who had been in small classes for at least one year during grades k-3 with that of 9th grade students who had been in large classes in the third grade (and in earlier grades, depending on the year in which they were assigned to the study). In general, students who participated in a small classes for at least one year continued to show higher scores on Standardized subject test at grade 9. Performance in Social Studies and reading as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has remained consistently flat over the three decades of the 20th century (Johnson, 2002). Although these figures suggest that lowering the student-teacher ratios due not translate gains in academic performance, the proponents of smaller class-size point out at the changing nature of education. Indeed, the growth of specialized areas of instruction such as special education gives the illusion that class-size have been reduced (Achilles et al, 2000), by lowering the pupil-teacher ratio while class-size itself remained consistent or even increased over the same period. Other
researchers (Biddle & Berliner, 2002) further contend that Hanushuks conclusions lack external validity since the sample groups used in his studies were small and not representative of the whole U.S population. Moreover, the use of student-teacher ratios uncontrolled for other characteristics to describe class purportedly hides confounding variables (Biddle & Berliner, 2002, 2003).

Research in the area of class-size and academic performance focused on increasingly smaller sizes, comparing classes comprised of between 5 and 35 students. Filder (2001), looked at the impact of smaller classes over time within the California class size. Reduction program, the study examined the Stanford Performance Test in reading, language, and Social Studies subject scores of students in grades 4 to 6 who had completed at least one year of the C S R program in the Los Angeles unified, school District. The analysis found that the longer students participated in C S R, the greater their performance gains. Specifically students who participated in C S R for three years or longer had greater gains than student who participated for just one year, these gains were modest, but statistically significant.

Heilig, Williams, & Jez, (2010), Examined readily available input variables in Texas Ed. database in three of the four largest TX districts (Houston Dallas and Austin) in 419 schools that are majority Latina/over 4 years (2005-2008), evaluated variables such as school funding expenditures, tests scores, ethnicity, and teacher-student ratio and degree obtainment to identify any impact on student performance in urban elementary schools.

Jespen, & Rivkin, (2009), investigates the effects of California’s billion-dollar class-size reduction programme on students performance, there is little or no support for
the hypotheses that the need to hire large numbers of teachers following the adoption of class size reduction (CSR) led to a lasting reduction in the quality of instruction”, according to the study. “Overall, the findings suggest that class-size reduction increased performance in the early grades for all demographic groups.

In another look at project STAR data, Nye et al., (2004) explored the long term effects of reading and Social Studies performance for minority students who had participated in small classes.

Researchers also examined several districts level class-size reduction programme, Michigan’s Saginaw City School District reduced class-size for first and second grade to 18:1 and 21:1 respectively. The control groups consisted of first classes of 21 students or more and second classes of 28 students or more.

Analysis by Krurecka and Claus (2000), found no significant statistical differences between the control groups and experimental groups in special education placement, attendance or promotion rate for either first or second grade. For first grade, they found no significant differences in reading performance between control and experiment groups over the course of the year. No pre-test was administered for the second grade. As the researcher noted, an array of issues could have contributed to their finding of no impact, students were not randomly assigned, reading comprehension measures were inadequate and poorly administered, and the intervention was too brief.

In 2001-2002, North California’s wake country public school system launched a class-size reduction programme, through which the system allocated 40 new teacher positions to 23 schools. Most of schools created one entirely new teacher position, with the new class about equal size to the others in that grade, enabling the school to
somewhat reduce the student-teacher ratio for that grade, but rarely to achieve the goal of 18:1 set by the enabling legislation even three years into implementation (Speas, 2003). More schools placed the new teachers in first grade than grades k-2 or k-3 schools that received two teachers positions usually established class-size-reduction classes in two separate grades. Speas, (2003) found mixed results in an evaluation of the wake county class-size-reduction programmes impact on performance in its third year. at grade 3, no significant differences were found in reading Social Studies performance between students in reduced size classes and those in regular (large) size classes.

The researcher noted however, that Wake has contributed to this finding, many classrooms had a student-teacher ratio of more than 18:1, and implementation across grades k-3 was uneven.

Likewise Munoz (2001), found no impact on student learning as measured by standardized reading and Social Studies and reading test after a one-year class reduction in the third grade of the Jefferson county public schools in Louisville, Kentucky.

The researcher observed “A one year intervention does not produce immediate results in students learning”. Johnson (2000), examined the data from the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading examination on academic performance, and found little or no impact. Small classes were defined as those with 20 or fewer students per teacher, and large classes as 31 or more students. The study looked at academic performance by analyzing six factors: class-size, race and ethnicity, educational attainment of parents, number of reading materials in the home, free or reduced price lunch participation, and gender. The researcher examined a nationwide sample of public school children in grades 4, 8, and 12. The study found that being in a
small class did not increase the likelihood of a student attaining a higher score on the NAEP reading tests. Looking at the other variables Johnson also found no evidence of any impact of class-size on the reading ability of any of the student in specific populations (e.g free or reduced: lunch, race/ethnicity, educational attainment of parents, etc). Jo Kwantlen summarizes other recent research showing no relationship between Class-Size and performance; negative relationship (Larger Classes yield less student performance); Larger Classes enhance student outcomes; larger classes are effective as Smaller Classes; and that student characteristics and instructional design are important factors. Kwantlen quotes an Ohio stale web set; "research results: mixed" A summary of more recent research is given in (Toth & Montagna 2002) and Kwantlen University (2004), Toth and Montagna summarize eight studies from 1990 to 1999 which find mixed results for three studies, positive increases or outcomes or Class-Sizes are reduced for two, outcomes are and concludes that for courses that emphasize recall facts, large classes are equally effective as small Classes; for courses emphasizing "Problem-Solving, critical thinking, long-term retention, and attitude toward the discipline...Small Classes are more successful" (Kwantlen. 2004.). Johnson concludes that it is quite likely, in fact, that class-size as a variable vales in comparison with the effects of" many factors not included in the NAEP data as teacher quality and leaching methods. Although, a majority of the body of research on the effectiveness of class-size has found that smaller class-size improves student performance including Konstantopoulos (2009), and Schanzenbach (2007), and many small class-size advocates promote a "nationwide application, this conclusion has its critics. Critics such as (Hoxby, 2000), and many others researchers that class-size reduction programs are either too expensive, create certified teacher shortage or
have flaws in their methodology and therefore, different and more cost effective ways of improving student performance should be considered.

Kwantlen (2004) summarizes other recent research showing no relationship between Class-Size and performance; relationship (Larger Classes less performance); Larger Classes enhance student outcomes; larger classes are effective as smaller Classes: and that characteristics and instructional design are important factors. Kwantlen quotes an Ohio State web set: "research results: mixed" A summary of more recent research is given in (Toth & Montagna, 2002), and Kwantlen University (2004), Toth and Montagna Summarize from 1990 to 1999 which find mixed results for studies, positive increases for outcomes or Class-Sizes are reduced for two, outcomes are and concludes that for courses that emphasize recall facts, large classes are equally effective as small classes for emphasizing 'Problem-Solving, critical thinking, long-term retention, and attitude toward the discipline...Small Classes are successful.' (Kwantlen, 2004).

2.09 Importance of Class Size in Teaching and Learning

Identifying the impact of class-size in teaching and learning on students performance has pre-occupied educational researchers in many countries since the early twentieth century. Despite this widespread interest, most studies have been undertaken in the USA, often with state aid, the reasons are not hard to detect. Class size research is both difficult and costly to initiate and to sustain. Some also suggest that for reasons of equity it is unethical and politically unwise to conduct experimental and control studies on children.

There very little evidence on the importance of class-size in teaching and learning performance. Two studies (Jenkins, et al., 2007; Levacile et al., 2006), found that a lower
student-teacher ratio (STR) was associated with higher performance in schools discipline and at key stage 3, and with higher performance in science and on the capped GCSE point score at GCSE. However, the measure used in these studies was expenditure per student on teacher in general, not number of students per class. Increased per student expenditure on teacher could be used to decrease class size or to give teacher more contact time or more training. The studies did not investigate which approach was more common effective.

Wilson (2002), found that the British evidence on secondary schools was “inclusive” and cautioned against any spurious interpretation of the positive correlation in secondary schools between larger classes and student performance as schools tend to assign less able students to smaller groups/classes. A study by smaller Hattie (2009) found the impact of reducing class-size in attainment to be smaller than the impact of other intervention. Hattie argues that value for money in raising performance in schools is better achieved through other intervention than class-size reduction. This is supported by researcher from Rivkin et al., (2005) which finds that increasing teacher effectiveness as greater value for money than reducing class-size. While Hanushek (2011), suggests assigning the most effective teachers to the largest classes to maximize the potential economic benefit.

2.10 Concept of Academic Performance

Academic performance has been described as the scholastic standing of a student at a given moment. This scholastic standing could be explained in term of grade in a course, group of course or subjects or group of subjects in the educational system of learning. Academic performance according to Cambridge University Reporter (2003) is
frequently defined in terms of examination performance. It is refers to what the students have learned or what the students has learned and is usually measured through assessment like standardized tests and performance assessments (Santrock, 2006).

In the higher system of learning, the descriptive assessment information will usually be translated through grading system such as Grade Point Average (GPA), Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) and Course Grade. Some other researchers use test results or previous years result since they are studying performance for the specific subject or year (Hijazi & Naqvi, 2006). The indicators for academic performance according to Ma et al., (2009) include standard test scores, grade point average (GPA), and self-perceived academic performance. The pattern of grading students in the junior secondary certificate (JSC) and the senior secondary certificate (SSC) emanation in Nigeria is such that the distinction grade is being represented by A1 and B3. The credit grade is represented by C4 to C6. The ordinary pass grade is represented by D7 and E8 while the failure grade is represented by F9 (WAEC, 2006).

Academic performance which is measured by the examination results is one of the major goals of a school. Hoyle (2006) argued that schools are established with the aim of imparting knowledge and skills to those who go through them and behind all this is the idea of enhancing good academic performance. The academic deans and proprietors and the quality assurance committee are concerned about those who do not perform well because if this poor performance goes unchecked, the school system may lose its reputation, which may result in loss of confidence in the graduate of higher learning (Kyoshaba, 2009).
2.11 Class-Size and Students Performance

The relationship between class-size and student effective performance is still a debate since it has not been possible to exclude other confounding effects on students performance.

McKeachie (1980) reported that the relationship between class size and student performance was probably the first problem associated with school teaching approaches by educational research. However, it is an educational issue partly because of conflicting findings and partly because of deeply held beliefs about class-size and its impact of learning. Baker and Westrup (2000) viewed that in classroom where individual students learning needs have the central focus of teaching and learning, the learning gain have tended to be high and there have been very few cases of repetition and dropt. In classroom reducing a class-size is to increase student performance is an approach that has been tried debate, and analysed for several decades. The premise seen local with fewer students to teach, teachers can coax better performance from each of them, but what does the research show?

Some researchers have not found a connection between smaller classes and higher students performance, but most of the research shows that when class-size reduction programmes are well-designed and implemented in the primary and secondary students performance rises as class-size drops. Also, class size and students performance using longitudinal variation in the population associated with each grade in elementary schools, using variation in class size driven by idiosyncratic variation in the population. The estimates, according to him, indicate that class-size does not have a statistically significant effect on students performance. The different literature showed that there is no
definite conclusion drawn on the effect of class size on students performance. Also, relationship between class size and academic performance is not well understood. This study is attempting to find out if there is any significant effect of class size and ability levels on students performance in social studies.

2.12 Review of Related Empirical Studies

A review of some empirical studies were carried out to find out the effects of class size on students performance in other fields of academic endeavours among students by different researchers. Numerous studies have been done to access the impact of class size reduction. Although, most students do show a relationship between small class size and increased students performance, researchers disagree on how to interpret the results. Because there are so many variables in the average classroom, the quality of the teacher, home of the students, quality of curriculum, leadership of the school-it is difficult to draw definite conclusions about students performance based on the class size alone.

The study by Ogbonnaya (2007) investigated on the effect of teaching mathematics with mathematics laboratory with small class size in secondary schools and students performance in mathematics. This study involved all JSS III students in Ohauku Zone of Ebonyi State, Nigeria. The studies was experimental type. The population was four thousand, two hundred and thirteen (4,213) students in seventeen schools. The sampled size of the studies is 357 students were randomly chosen for the study. Three null hypotheses has been formulated and tested to help the study. T-test statistical tools was employed in testing the null hypotheses at 5% level of significant or at 0.05 level of significance. Findings reveal that students in mathematics with laboratory in Ohauku
Zone of Ebonyi State perform better when appropriate instructional resources were made available and are utilized in the teaching and learning process among the students. Also, the results of the study indicates that teachers who’s were professional taught the students with a small class size in the laboratory and available materials, performance of the students in the subject was enhanced.

The present study is similar to the past study in the issue of class size on students academic performance. But, the past study carried out ion mathematics used laboratory. And the present study is evaluating the effect of class size on students academic performance in social studies. Also, past study is from Ebonyi State while the present is carried out in Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State mean different location. The past study population and sampling is lower than the present population. The present population study in the area of quantity. The past study used t-test for tested the null hypotheses also the present study is like that.

Yusuf (2010), investigated the effect of computer assisted instruction (CAI) in small class on secondary schools students performance in biology. The target population was six hundred and sixty two (662) students. The sample of the study is 248 students who were randomly chosen for the study. Also, three null hypotheses has been formulated and tested. The researcher used gender as a variable. Quasi experimental involving 3 x 2 factorial designed were used in the study. The students were pre-test and post-tested, and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used data analysis. The findings of their study revealed that the performance of students exposed to CAI in small class either individually or cooperatively were better than their computer part exposed to the small class room instruction. However, there is no significance differences existed in the
performance of male and female students exposed to computer assisted instruction (CAI) either individual or cooperative setting.

The present study is similar with the past study in the area of investigated the students' performance based on the class size and on students' academic performance and designed of the research which are involved experimental post-test and pre-test. But the differences is the past study conducted on biology which the present is on social studies, the past study analysis is ANCOVA were used. The past study target population is six hundred and sixty two (662) students were the sampled 248. While the present is 5449 population with the sampled with 383 sampled based on the random sampling. Also, the past study used gender as variable while the present study used gender and location.

Oroke (2013) investigated the effect of small class size in laboratory teaching strategy on students' geometry performance and retention among junior secondary schools at Ebonyi North Educational Zone. This study had pre-test and post-test.

There were 86 junior secondary schools of about 7014 in total population. 120 students formed for sample in the study. One instrument used namely Geometry Performance Test (GAT) for data collection. The geometry performance test was developed by the researcher and validated by experts in the field (mathematics). The coefficient of reliability of GAT was found to be 0.84 analysis of the data using t-test revealed that the experimental group which was taught geometry concept using laboratory teaching strategy performed significantly better than the control group which were taught using conventional method of teaching. Also, experimental group exposed using laboratory had better retention than the control group taught after a period of time (two weeks). Three null hypothesis were formulated and tested at alpha level of 5%
Based on recommended of the findings the teachers in Ebonyi should always use laboratory in teaching geometry concept to junior secondary schools.

The past study and the present study are not the same in the area of: past study conducted at Ebonyi North Educational Zone of Ebonyi State. The present study is from Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State. The past study population is 86 junior secondary schools of about seven thousand and fourteen (7,014) in the total. 120 students formed for sampled in the study. Instrument used is geometric performance test (GAT) while the present study used social studies academic performance test (SOSSAPAT). The similarity between the studies are all experimental the research designed. Also, the past has three null hypotheses, the present study used three null hypotheses.

Moro (2014) impact of class size and teaching method on mathematics performance among senior secondary schools in FCT Abuja. The researcher has 48448 from which a sample of 377 students were selected using purposive random sampling techniques and same techniques were use to select the schools. The study used pre-test, post-test group design and also further grouped into two i.e. large group and small group class sizes. The main instruments were (TALM) client 0.89 and 0.97 respectively which were used to collect data for the study. The t-test statistical was used to test the hypothesis at p ≤0.05 level of significant. The study revealed that students mean scores performance were high in small class size than large class size. Similarly, significant interaction existed between class size and method of teaching. Also, there were significant differences between mean performances of students in post-test using problem solving method in small class than large class size. Based on the result of the findings in
this research, it is recommended that teachers should incorporate problem solving strategy in teaching mathematics at all level of secondary schools.

The past study has 48448 population from which sampled of 387 students. The present study has 383 sample from the population of 5449. The studies were selected from random sampling techniques for chosen the students sample and purposive sampling techniques to select to schools. Also, past study used pretest and post-test group design. The present study used the design also. Lastly, past study investigate the impact of class size and teaching method on mathematics performance among senior secondary schools in FCT. While the present study carried out on evaluating the effect of class size on social studies students academic performance in junior secondary schools in Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State.

Abdullahi (2015), investigated the effectiveness of computer assisted instruction (CAI) on academic performances, retention and attitude in electrolysis concept among secondary school students in Kankia education Zone. The study has four research objectives, four research questions and four null hypothesis. The research consist 123 students were 78 males and 45 females selected using simple random sampling techniques formed the sample of the study. This study adopted pre-test and post-test quasi experimental and control group design. The experimental group were taught using computer assisted instruction (CAI) while the control group were exposed to lecture method for period of six weeks. Two validated research instrument with reliability coefficient of 0.9 and 0.7 namely electrolysis concept performance test and student attitude towards electrolysis concept questionnaire were used in data collection. The researcher tested three null hypotheses using t-test statistic and other, using Mann-
Whitney u-test at 0.05 at level of significant. The major findings from the revealed that there is significant differences in the post-test means scores of experimental group in favour of experimental group. Also, revealed the significant differences in the retention ability of the subject (chemistry) students taught electrolysis concept using computer assisted instruction and these taught using lecture method. They recommended that the federal and state government should adequately trained chemistry teachers on using computer assisted instruction in teaching chemistry.

The present study is similar to the past study because both studies adopted pre-test and post-test experimental and control group design. But the past study investigate the effectiveness of computer assisted instruction (CAI) on students academic performance in Katsina Educational Zone, Katsina State. While the present study is evaluating the effect of class size on social studies students academic performance. Also, past study has four objectives, four research questions, four null hypotheses. The present study has three objectives, three research questions and three null hypotheses. The past study consist of 123 students where 78 males and 45 were selected used random sampling techniques. The present study has 383 sampling out of 5449 population in the study. The past study conducted in science (chemistry). The present study was carried in social studies (Art and Social Science Education).

Summary

The chapter has attempted to review essential areas that are related to the present study to gain an insight in to the issues bordering on Social Studies and evaluating its effect in many ramifications. The review was intentionally presented from two perspectives, viz: the conceptual and previous studies perspectives. Some of these issues
that emerged at the literature review include the introduction, the theoretical framework, Social Studies in Nigeria, the aims and objectives of Social Studies in Nigeria, the history, and justification for introduction of Social Studies in Nigeria, the nature and scope of Social Studies, the performance of evaluation in Social Studies, the concept of class-size, importance of class-size in teaching and learning, the concept of performance, class-size and students performance, empirical studies on students academic performance, relationship between class size and students academic performance, summary of the literature review.

Nevertheless, studies over a period of years have pointed to a number of trends as a result of lowering class-size:

- Gains associated with small classes generally appear when the class-size is reduced to less than student.
- Gains associated with small classes are stronger for the early grades.
- Gains are stronger for students who come from groups that are traditionally disadvantage in education-minorities and immigrants.
- Gains from class-size reduction in the earlier grades continue for student in the upper grade. Students are less likely to earn better grades.

Reducing class size is an appealing and visible way for public schools to show that they are improving the quality of education. Because smaller classes allow teachers to devote more time to instruction and less to classroom management, smaller classes are popular with teachers and administrators. Many students have shown an increase in student performance, fewer discipline problems and improvement in teacher morale and retention as a result of class-size reduction.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This study aims at finding the relevance of class size on social studies students academic performance among junior secondary schools in Giwa Zone Kaduna State, Nigeria. This chapter discusses the procedure that was used in collecting and analyzing the data for the study under the following subheadings:

- Research Design
- Population of the Study
- Sample and Sampling Procedure
- Instrumentation
- Procedure for Data Collection
- Statistical Analysis Procedure

3.2 Research Design

The design of the study is quasi-experimental. It is an impact evaluation that assigns numbers to the treatment group and control group by a method other than random assignment (National Centre for Technology Innovation, 2007). Specifically the study used the non-equivalent pre-test comparison group designs. It is widely believed to be the most commonly used of quasi-experiment (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002). According to Salihu (2015) the design requires a pre-test and post-test for a treated and comparison group. It is a design in which the effects of a treated on intervention are estimated by comparing outcomes of treatment group and comparison group but without the benefit of random assignment (Salihu, 2015).
The design of the study is illustrated in figure.

**Key**

EG = Experimental Group

CG = Control Group

$0_1$ = Pre-test

$X_1$ = Treatment

$X_0$ = Teaching method

$0_2$ = Post-test

### 3.3 Population of the Study

The population of this study covered all the JSS II students in public junior secondary schools students in Giwa Educational Zone Kaduna State, there was a total number of 5449 students comprising 3095 males and 2354 females spread across the 26 public junior secondary schools in Giwa Educational Zone. Table one (1) below indicates the population distribution of JSS II students according to schools.
Table 1: Population distribution of students by gender and location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Name of Junior Secondary School</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Number of Male Students</th>
<th>Number of Female Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GGISS Dr. Shehu Lawal</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GJSS Basawa</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GJSS Bomo</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GJSS Danmahawayi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GJSS Doka</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GJSS Fatika</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GJSS Galadimawa</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GJSS Gangara</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GJSS Giwa</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GJSS Hunkuyi</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GJSS Iyatawa</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GJSS Jama’a</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GJSS Kakangi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GJSS Kauran Wali</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GJSS Kaya</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>GJSS Kidandani</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>GJSS Kudan</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GJSS Kwangila</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>GJSS Marabar Guga</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GJSS Sakadadi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>GGISS Samaru</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>GJSS Shika</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>GJSS Taban Sani</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>GJSS Wazata</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>GJSS Yakawada</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>GJSS Yansarki</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 3095 2354 5449

Source: Kaduna State Ministry of Education Science and Technology Zonal Division Giwa (2017)

3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques

This study used purposive sampling to choose the participating schools for the quasi-experiment. Purposive sampling (Oliver and Jupp, 2006) is a non-probability sampling in which decisions concerning the individuals to be included in the sample are taken by the researcher, based upon a variety of criteria which may include specialist knowledge of the research issue, or capacity and willingness to participate in the
research. The study used 383 students as sample size. This is based on Research Advisors (2006) table for sample specification. It states that for a population of 5449 at 95% confidence level and margin error of 5% 383 sample size is adequate. Based on the above, the sample of this study selected four (4) junior secondary schools from 26 in the zone. Schools were classified into groups ‘A’ and ‘B’. Group ‘A’ was classified as large class, while group ‘B’ was classified as small class size. The total number of students in the groups for sampling were three hundred and eighty three (383) out of 5449 students.

Table 2: Sample Size of Students by location and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Name of Schools</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GJSS Doka R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GJSS Hunkuyi U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GJSS Kudan U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GJSS Taban Sani R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows the sample size of schools and students of large class size that was used for the study.

Table 3: Sample Size of Large Class Size BY Gender and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Name of Schools</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GJSS Doka R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GJSS Hunkuyi U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GJSS Kudan U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GJSS Taban Sani R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows the sample size of schools and students of small class size that was used.
Table 4: Sample Size of Small Class Size by Gender and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Name of Schools</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GJSS Doka</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GJSS Hunkuyi</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GJSS Kudan</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GJSS Taban Sani</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the sample size of male and female from urban and rural areas of small class size that was used for the study.

3.5 Instrumentation

The instrument that was used for the study is the Social Studies Students Academic Performance Test (SOSSAPET), the researcher used the test to identify the difficulties students encounter while learning social studies. This instrument was used to test the hypotheses and answer the research questions. The researcher treated marriage which was divided into meaning, types, purpose and condition of “marriage”. The data was collected in three (3) parts, the first part is personal data, the second part is computation objectives then the last part is true or false for pre-test before receiving any kind of treatment by the researcher. The purpose of this was to determine their initial performance of the students. The post-test was administered after the students had undergone their separated treatment to help the researcher assess their understanding of the item through written work. The test was drawn from JSS II topics treated during normal school time.

The researcher used the lesson plans to conduct a template teaching in large and small class size respectively. Textbooks were used to develop these activities. These textbooks are:
- Basic Social Studies for Junior Secondary Schools FGN, UBE 2013.

3.5.1 Validity of the Instrument

To ensure that the designed instruments meet the objectives of the study in terms of its construct, content and face validity, it was presented to the supervisors, curriculum experts, language specialist and statisticians. Table 3.4 shows the distribution of test questions in different content areas.

Table 5: Specification for JSS II Social Studies Student (Bloom Taxonomy, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Areas</th>
<th>Knowledge Objectives</th>
<th>Understanding Objectives</th>
<th>Application Objectives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposes of marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of specification above showed the number of questions set at various levels of cognitive domain. Sixteen (16) questions each are set as the knowledge, understanding and application levels making a total of forty eight (48) questions.

3.5.2 Reliability of the Instrument

A Pilot study was conducted in Government Junior Secondary School Chindit using thirty (30) JSS II Social Studies students. The pilot tested school was not among the sampled area of study. Test was administered to the students using 30 minutes. This helps the researcher to check difficulties on the instrument and made all necessary adjustments before using it on the population for the actual research. The data collected from the pilot study were subjected to reliability of the instrument. The Cutman Splithalf Formular was used to determine the reliability coefficient. Calculated was 0.551 obtained from the data.
Therefore, the result 0.551 was found to be reliable and suitable for the pilot study in line with Olayiwola (2011) who says that reliability coefficient of 0.05 and above is adequately for the purpose of two different results collected for a quasi experimental design theory.

3.6 Procedure for Data Collection

The researcher collected a letter of introduction from the Department of Art and Social Science Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. And from there a letters of introduction to respective schools was collected from Giwa Zonal Education office to the respective schools by the researcher. He proceed to the respective schools, where the principals with the assistance of other staff introduced the researcher to the students. The researcher trained three research assistants to assist the researcher in instrument explanation, distribution, administration and collection of the test questions from the sampled schools and also from the control and experimental groups within four(4) weeks. The test scores for pre and post test for both groups was collected for comparison using appropriate statistical procedure.

3.7 Statistical Analysis Procedure

The data for the study was the scores of the teacher made-test obtained from the pre-test and post-test administered to the control and experimental groups. The study used simple participation and frequency counts to analyze the bio-data variables of the study participants. The research questions were answered using arithmetic mean and standard deviation. The t-test independent samples was used in testing the research hypotheses. The t-test independent sample was chosen to test the null hypotheses because the variables to be measured were two and t-test are effective in establishing if
differences exist between two mean. According to Salihu (2015), t-test is used for determining the significant difference between two mean. All the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discussed the analysis and interpretation of the data collected through the test administered from the control and experimental group. In the course of the analysis of the data, tables of frequencies and percentage were used. The demographic characteristics of the students were presented in tables of frequencies and percentages. The responses of the students who are the respondents to this study on several questions and testing of research hypothesis form the basis of the analysis in this chapter. Consequently, the analysis of data are presented under the following subheadings:

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Participants Profile

4.2.1 Number of Participants in Small and Large Class Size

4.2.2 Number of Participants by Gender

4.2.3 Number of Participants by Location

4.3 Summary

4.4 Discussion of Findings

4.2 Participants Profile

This section provides information concerning the participants in terms of the treatment received, location and gender. Frequencies and percentages were used to interpret the number of participants in each of the variables.
4.2.1 Number of participants in small and large class sizes

The number of respondents in small class and large class sizes are presented in form of frequencies and percentages. The distribution of the frequencies is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Frequencies and percentages of small and large class sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small class size</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class size</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 presents the frequencies and percentages of respondents in small class and large class sizes. There were 114 (29.8%) students in small class size who took part in the study, while there were 269(70.2%) who were in the large class size. This indicated that the number of students in the large class size doubled the number of students in the small class size.

4.2.2 Number of participants by gender

The number of male and female respondents in small class and large class sizes are presented in the form of frequencies and percentages. The distribution of the frequencies is presented in Table 7.
Table 7: Frequencies and percentages of male and female respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 presents the frequencies and percentages of male and female respondents in small class and large class sizes. There were 237 (61.9%) male students who took part in the study, while there were 146 (38.1%) who were female. This indicated that the number of male students is higher than the number of female students who took part in the study.

4.2.3 Number of participants by location

The number of respondents in small class and large class sizes from urban and rural schools are presented in form of frequencies and percentages. The distribution of the frequencies is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Frequencies and percentages of respondents from urban and rural schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the frequencies and percentages of respondents from urban and rural schools who participated in this study. There were 198 (51.7%) students from urban schools who took part in the study, while 185 (48.3%) were from rural schools. This
indicates that the number of students from urban schools is higher than the number of students from rural schools who took part in the study.

Answering Research Questions

This section presents the results of the analysis conducted in order to answer the research questions posed in this study. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations.

Research Question One

What is the difference in the academic performance scores of JSS students of congested class taught social studies and JSS Students of incongested class taught social studies?

This research question was answered using descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations. The result of the computation is presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Mean and standard deviations on academic performance scores for small and large class sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small class size</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>5.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class size</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presented the academic performance scores of students in small and large class sizes using means and standard deviations. The mean academic performance score of students taught social studies in small class size (M=27.29, SD=5.380) was higher than (M=21.90, SD=6.420) for the students taught social studies in large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of the students taught social studies in small class sizes.
Therefore, there is a difference in the mean academic performance scores of JSS students of small class size taught Social Studies and JSS students of large class size taught Social Studies. This indicated that students that were taught social studies in small class sizes performed better than those taught under large class condition.

**Research Question Two**

What is the difference in the academic performance scores of male and female JSS students of congested class taught social studies and that of male and female students of incongested class taught social studies?

This research question was answered using descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations. The result of the computation is presented in Table 10.

**Table 10: Mean and standard deviations on male and female students’ academic performance scores for small and large class sizes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small class size</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>5.503</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>4.995</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class size</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>6.514</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>6.256</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>6.836</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>6.372</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>6.689</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presented the academic performance scores of male and female students in small and large class sizes using mean and standard deviations. The mean academic performance score of male students taught social studies using small class size (M=28.47, SD=5.503) was higher than (M=26.59, SD=4.995) for the female students taught social studies using the same small class size. The mean academic performance score of male
students taught social studies in large class size (M=22.28, SD=6.514) was higher than (M=21.31, SD=6.256) for the female students taught social studies in the same large class size. The mean academic performance score of students taught social studies in small class size (M=27.29, SD=5.380) was higher than (M=21.90, SD=6.420) for the students taught social studies in large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of the students taught social studies in small class sizes. Therefore, there is a difference in the mean academic performance scores of male and female JSS students of small class size taught Social Studies and that of male and female JSS students of large class size taught Social Studies. This indicated that male and female students that were taught social studies in small class sizes performed better than those taught under large class condition.

**Research Question Three**

What is the difference in the academic performance scores of urban and rural of JSS students of congested class taught social studies and that of urban and rural of JSS students of incongested class taught social studies?

This research question was answered using descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviations. The result of the computation is presented in Table 11.
Table 11: Mean and standard deviations on academic performance scores for small and large class sizes in urban and rural schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small class size</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>5.531</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>5.253</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class size</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>6.131</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>6.732</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>6.526</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>6.870</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>6.689</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presents the academic performance scores of students in small and large class sizes from urban and rural schools using mean and standard deviations. The mean academic performance score of urban students taught social studies in small class size (M=27.56, SD=5.531) was lower than (M=28.04, SD=5.253) for the students taught social studies in small class size from rural schools. The mean academic performance score of urban students taught social studies in large class size (M=21.69, SD=6.131) was higher than (M=22.13, SD=6.732) for the students taught social studies in large class size from rural schools. The mean academic performance score of students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small class size (M=27.79, SD=5.380) was higher than (M=21.90, SD=6.420) for the students taught social studies in large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of the students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small class sizes. Therefore, there is a difference in the mean academic performance scores of JSS II students of small class size from urban and rural schools.
taught Social Studies and that of urban and rural JSS schools students of large class size taught Social Studies. This indicated that urban and rural schools students that were taught social studies in small class sizes performed better than those taught under large class condition.

**Null Hypotheses Testing**

This section presents the analysis conducted in order to test the null hypotheses postulated for this study. All the three null hypotheses were tested using inferential statistics. Null hypothesis one was tested using independent samples t-test while null hypothesis two and three were tested using two-way analysis of variance.

**Null Hypothesis One**

There is no significant difference in the academic performance scores of JSS students of congested class taught social studies and JSS students of incongested class taught social studies.

This null hypothesis was tested using an inferential statistic of independent samples t-test. The result of the computation is presented in Table 12.
Table 12: Summary of independent samples t-test on academic performance scores of students of small and large class size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.225</td>
<td>251.871</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.629 to 7.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presented the academic performance scores of students in small and large class sizes using mean and standard deviations. The mean academic performance score of students taught social studies in small class size (M=27.29, SD=5.380) was higher than (M=21.90, SD=6.420) for the students taught social studies in large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of the students taught social studies in small class sizes. The 95% confidence interval of the mean difference was 4.629 to 7.143. This was supported by the result of t(251.871)=9.225, p=0.001; the hypothesis which stated no significant difference was rejected, using Welch’s procedure. The Welch’s procedure was used because the groups that were compared had different number of participants. Therefore, there was a significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of JSS students of small class size taught Social Studies and JSS students of large class size taught Social Studies. This indicated that students that were taught social studies in small class sizes performed better than those taught under large class condition.
Null Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference in the academic performance scores of male and female JSS students of congested class taught social studies and that of male and female JSS students of incongested class taught social studies.

This null hypothesis was tested using an inferential statistic of two-way ANOVA. The result of the computation is presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Summary of two-way ANOVA on academic performance scores of male and female students of small and large class size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2926.665^a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>975.555</td>
<td>26.100</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>181176.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181176.091</td>
<td>4847.276</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>2443.628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2443.628</td>
<td>65.378</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>150.866</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.866</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size * sex</td>
<td>15.560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.560</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14165.842</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231410.000</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .171 (Adjusted R Squared = .165)

Table 13 presents the result obtained after conducting a two-way analysis of variance on academic performance scores of male and female students of small and large class size. The mean academic performance score of male students taught social studies in small class size (M=28.47, SD=5.503) was higher than (M=26.59, SD=4.995) for the female students taught social studies in the same small class size. The mean academic performance score of male students taught social studies in large class size (M=22.28, SD=6.514) was higher than (M=21.31, SD=6.256) for the female students taught social
studies in the same large class size. The mean academic performance score of students taught social studies in small class size (M=27.29, SD=5.380) was higher than (M=21.90, SD=6.420) for the students taught social studies in large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of the students taught social studies in small class sizes. This is supported by F(1,379)=65.378, p<.05, for the class size, which shows that there is a difference in the mean academic performance scores of students taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size. Again, F(1,379)=4.036, p<.05 for the sex, which shows that there is a significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of male and female students when taught social studies. When the class size and sex were considered together, F(1,379)=15.560, p=.416>.05, which shows that there is no significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of male and female students taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated no significant difference was retained. That is, class size has no significant influence in the gender performance.

**Null Hypothesis Three**

There is no significant difference in the academic performance scores of urban and rural JSS students of congested class taught Social Studies and that of urban and rural JSS students of incongested class taught social studies.

This null hypothesis was tested using an inferential statistic of two-way ANOVA. The result of the computation is presented in Table 14.
Table 14: Summary of two-way ANOVA on academic performance scores of male and female students of small and large class size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2793.562&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>931.187</td>
<td>24.682</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>197605.952</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197605.952</td>
<td>5237.635</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>2771.697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2771.697</td>
<td>73.465</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>16.818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.818</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size * location</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14298.944</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>231410.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>383</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>17092.507</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>. R Squared = .163 (Adjusted R Squared = .157)

Table 14 presented the result obtained after conducting a two-way analysis of variance on academic performance scores of students in small and large class size from urban and rural schools. The mean academic performance scores of urban students taught social studies in small class size (M=27.56, SD=5.531) was lower than (M=28.04, SD=5.253) for the students taught social studies in small class size from rural schools. The mean academic performance score of urban students taught social studies in large class size (M=21.69, SD=6.131) was higher than (M=22.13, SD=6.732) for the students taught social studies in large class size from rural schools. The mean academic performance score of students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small
class size (M=27.79, SD=5.380) was higher than (M=21.90, SD=6.420) for the students taught social studies in large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of the students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small class sizes. This is supported by F(1,379)=73.465, p<.05, for the class size, which shows that there is difference in the mean academic performance scores of students taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size. Again, F(1,379)=0.446, p=.505 for the location, which shows that there is no significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of students from urban and rural schools when taught social studies. When the class size and location were considered together, F(1,379)=0.001, p=.979>.05, which shows that that there is no significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated no significant difference was retained. That is, class size has no significant effect on students’ performance based on school location.

4.3 Summary

Based on the data collected, presented and analyzed to answer three research questions and three null hypotheses, the study finds out that:

HO1: A significant difference exist between the mean academic performance scores of students that were taught social studies in small class sizes than those taught under large class condition.
HO₂: There was no significant difference between the mean academic performance scores of male and female students taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size.

HO₃: There was no significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size.

4.4 Discussion of Findings

The major purpose of this research study is to Evaluate the Effect of Class-Size on Social Studies Students’ Academic Performance in Junior Secondary Schools in Giwa Educational Zone Kaduna State, Nigeria. Three null hypotheses were formulated and tested. The analyses were based on the scores obtained from the Social Studies Students Academic Performance Test (SOSSAPET) where the questions were drawn from the JSS II scheme of work where lesson plan was used. The respondents had equivalent knowledge of social studies through the pre-test given before the commencement of the post-test. Therefore, some of the differences observed were due to the post-test.

The analysis indicated the number of students in large class size doubled the number of students in the small class size. The analysis indicated that the number of male students is higher than the number of female students who took part in the study. From the result of the analysis it is indicated that the number of students from urban schools is higher than the number of students from rural schools who took part in the study by using frequencies and percentages.
The analysis indicated that students that were taught social studies in small class sizes performed better than those taught under large class condition. This increase in student interest and attitude was due to the teacher/students interaction in a conducive learning environment and proper application which lead to student’s good performance. This report was in agreement with earlier findings by (Krueger, 2000; Krueger & Whitmore, 2002; Nye, Hedges & Konstamtopoulos, 2002) who viewed that, the performance of children in small classes are ahead of the performance of children in other classroom condition.

From the result of the analysis indicated it is that male and female students that were taught social studies in small class size performed better than those taught under large class conditions. This report increases the agreement of earlier findings by Baker and Westrup; (2000) who viewed that in classroom where individual students learning needs have the central focus of teaching and learning, the learning needs have the central focus of teaching and learning, the learning gain have tended to be higher and there have been very few cases of repetition and dropout.

The result indicated that urban and rural schools students that were taught social studies in small size performed better than those taught under large class conditions. This report was supported by Nye et al. (2000), analyzed project STAR data to determine if certain subgroups of students had greater gain in achieving when placed in small classes, the researcher found that minority students participating in small classes had larger gain in achieving, while students in small classes for both reading and social studies in grades K-3.
From the result of analysis, it was found that a significant difference exists between small class size and large class size taught social studies. This was supported by the result of $t(251.811) = 9.225, \ p = 0.001$; the hypothesis which stated no significant difference was rejected using Welch procedure.

Therefore, it has been empirically determined by this study that there is an improvement in the academic performance of students with the application of small class. This study suggests that small class has a significant effects in students academic performance. Also, it agrees with the findings of Konstantopolus and Chun (2009) in their results which provided convincing evidence that all types of students (e.g. low, medium and high achievers) benefits from being in small classes especially in early grades across all the performance test.

It was observed that the result of the analysis indicated significant difference in the mean academic performance score of male students in small classes was higher than the female students in small classes. Also, scores of male students taught social studies in same large class size. This was supported by $F (1,379) = 65.378, \ p < 0.5$, for the class size which shows that there is difference. This report agrees with the findings of Ready and Lee (2007) who carried out the effect of intervention to improve students academic performance considered low achievement or at risk for failure, whose major objectives was the effect of size on the different categories of the students on their performance. The finding indicated that different intervention led to improvement in the student’s performance.
Also, it was observed that the result of the analysis indicated that there was no significant difference in the mean academic performance scores of students from urban and rural schools taught social studies in small class size and those taught in large class size.

The findings of this study revealed that for an effective learning performance to take place, the class size as well as learning ability is very important. Therefore, it is clear that class size may affect the quality of the learning process of different class sizes.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the summary of the problem statement concerning why the research study was carried out was made, the conclusions arrived at after the analysis of data were summarized and various recommendations were made. These recommendations included how small class-size in teaching strategies could be used effectively to encourage students to be motivated in learning social studies by doing things. This will help them to think about what they were supposed to do, applying concepts and exploring relationships between concepts thus encouraging positive attitude. The chapter ended with the highlight of the limitations of the study and suggestions for further studies.

5.2 Summary

This study is evaluating the effect of class size on social studies students’ academic performance in Junior Secondary Schools in Giwa Educational Zone Kaduna State, Nigeria. The major objective of this study is to evaluate the effect of class size on student’s academic performance in social studies in junior secondary schools specifically. The objectives of the study are to;

i. find out the effects of class size on academic performance in Social Studies of JSS II students in Giwa Education Zone Kaduna, Nigeria
ii. find out the effects of class size on gender academic performance in Social Studies of JSS students in Giwa Education Zone Kaduna, Nigeria.

iii. find out the effects of class size on academic performance in Social Studies of JSS students from different location in Giwa Education Zone Kaduna, Nigeria.

The research questions guides the study;

i. What is the difference in the academic performance scores of JSS social studies students taught in congested and incongested classroom?

ii. What is the difference in the academic performance scores of JSS male and female social studies students taught in congested and incongested classroom?

iii. What is the difference in the academic performance scores of urban and rural of JSS social studies students taught in congested and incongested classroom?

The following null hypotheses were raised and tested at a significant level of 0.05.

i. There is no significant difference in the academic performance scores of JSS social studies students taught in congested and incongested classroom.

ii. There is no significant difference in the academic performance scores of male and female JSS social studies students taught in congested and incongested classroom.

iii. There is no significant difference in the academic performance scores of urban and rural JSS social studies students taught in congested and incongested classroom.

The target population of the study was all the public JSS II students in Giwa Educational Zone Kaduna State, Nigeria. Experimental research design was adopted and used in the study. The total population of the study was 5449 students comprising 3095
male, 2354 female and the sample size was 383 students who were involved. The research instruments social Studies Students Academic Performance Test (SOSSAPET) comprised of 25 objectives question and 23 choosing true or false questions. Also, it comprised 2 template lesson plans using one topic from the JSS II scheme of work to teach and determine the performance level in social studies were used in collecting the data of pre-test and post-test respectively.

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistical method including independent t-test of confidence limit of pairwise 0.05 level of significance with different degrees of freedom were adopted for retaining or rejecting the hypothesis and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) as well as two way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Fishers Least Significance difference (L.S.D) test for multiple comparison where also used for the analysis.

The results for the analysis of data were therefore summarized thus:

It was found that there were 114 (29.8%) students in small class size, while there were 269 (70.2%) students in large class size. This indicated that the number of students in the large class size doubled the number in the small class size. (See Table 6).

It was found that there were 237 (61.9%) male students, while there were 146 (38.1%) who were female. This indicated that the number of male students is higher than the number of female students who took part in the study. (See Table 7).

It was found that there were 198 (51.7%) students from urban schools, while 185 (48.3%) were from rural schools. This indicated that the number of students from urban schools is higher than the number of students from rural schools who took part in the
study. (See Table 8). This showed that the student’s population increase on one hand, but building facilities did not increase to tally with the number of students.

It was found that the mean academic performance scores of students in small class size \( (M = 27.29, SD = 5.380) \) was higher than \((M = 21.90, SD = 6.420)\) for the students in large class size. The mean academic performance was 5.886 in favour of students taught social studies in small class size. This indicated that the students that were taught in small class size performed better than those taught under large class condition. (See Table 9).

It was found that mean academic performance scores of male students in small class size \((M = 28.47, SD = 5.503)\) was higher than \((M = 26.59, SD = 4.995)\) for the female students in the same small class size. The mean academic performance scores of male students in large class size \((M = 22.28, SD = 6.514)\) was higher than \((M = 21.31, SD = 6.256)\) for the female students in the same large class size. The mean difference was 5.886 in favour of students taught in small class size. (See Table 10).

It was found that both urban and rural schools students performed better in small class size than those under large class condition. (See Table 11).

A significance difference was found between the mean academic performance scores of junior secondary schools students in social studies based on the class sizes.

There was no significant difference between the mean academic performance scores of male and female students taught social studies in small class size and those who taught in large class size.
There was no significant difference between the urban and rural student’s academic performance scores based on the schools location in small class sizes and those in large class sizes.

5.3 Conclusions

The research study was on evaluating the effect of class size on social studies students’ academic performance in junior secondary schools in Giwa Educational Zone, Kaduna State, Nigeria. Based on the descriptive and statistical analyses of the data collected in the study that was presented in chapter four, the following conclusion arrived at from the findings:

Involving small class sizes is more effective in improving and promoting students performance. Also, providing proper utilization of the facilities provided for teaching and learning in social studies because it has a significant effect on the academic performance of students. Also, incongested classroom enhance the understanding of the subjects concepts and relationship which encourage student’s positive attitude towards their study. However, there is also a need for a more empirical study to investigate the existence and importance of class size in teaching and learning on student’s academic performance in different schools levels.

5.4 Contributions to Knowledge

This study establishes that:

i. Urban and rural schools students performed better in incongested class size than those under congested classroom condition.
ii. Congested class size obstruct classroom management as a result many students do not pay attention to classroom activities, and this disrupts effective teaching and learning of social studies.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

i. Incongested class size in teaching enhances social studies learning ability. Therefore, students are encouraged regardless of gender and location.

ii. Government should construct more classes and upstairs to decongest large class so as to tally with the standard of National Policy of Education (N.P.E) to get adequate seat and facilities for proper utilization which result in effective teaching and learning activities in social studies.

5.6 Suggestion for Further Studies

The researcher hereby suggested that similar studies be carried out on class size regarding gender and location in different level of educational system on student academic performance in the country, compared and a holistic action be taken by the government and other educational stakeholders in order to refine the various level of educational programmes to improve students standard of living which will enhance their academic performance.
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APPENDIX A:

GET
FILE='C:\Users\umar\Documents\SOS Candidate.sav'.
DATASET NAME DataSet1 WINDOW=FRONT.
RELIABILITY
/VARIABLES=odd even
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA
/STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
/SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] C:\Users\umar\Documents\SOS Candidate.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alphaa</td>
<td>-.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Itemsa</td>
<td>-.570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The value is negative due to a negative average covariance among items. This violates reliability model assumptions. You may want to check item codings.

Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>2.558</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>3.225</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>odd</th>
<th>even</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Maximum / Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Item Correlations</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Item Correlations</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>10.400</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>6.543</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scale Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>13.286</td>
<td>3.645</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

LESSON PLAN FOR CONTROL GROUP

Date
Day
Week
Age: 
Gender: Mix
Time
Duration
Class: J.S.S II
Subject: Social Studies
Topic: Marriage
Number of Student:
Method: Discussion Method
Behavioural Objectives: By the end of the lesson, students should be able to define marriage.
Previous Knowledge: The teacher and students have discussed about characteristic of a group.
Introduction: The teacher will introduce the lesson by asking the students, what is marriage? After writing the date, subject and topic on the chalkboard.
Presentation: Step 1: The teacher will try to explain the meaning of marriage verbally.
Step 2: The teacher will write the meaning of marriage on the chalkboard, permit the student to read by themselves and explain based on their understanding.
Step 3: The teacher will explain in detail based on the response and understanding of the student on marriage.
Step 4: The teacher will ask the students, who did not understand based on what we have discussed?
Evaluation: The teacher will evaluate the lesson by asking students e.g. who is the head of marriage?
Conclusion: The teacher will conclude the lesson and allow the students to copy the note into their exercise books.
APPENDIX C:

LESSON PLAN FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Date
Day
Week
Age: 14-15
Gender: Mix
Time
Duration
Class: J.S.S II
Subject: Social Studies
Topic: Marriage
Number of Student: 29
Method: Demonstration Method
Learning outcome: By the end of the lesson, students should be able to define marriage and identify who and who involve in marriage
Entry Behaviour: Students have already learned living in the family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Activities</th>
<th>Learner activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher activities</td>
<td>Learner activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. teacher will ask the students, what is marriage?</td>
<td>1. students will define marriage base on their understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. teacher will ask the students who among them can read the definition of marriage he wrote on the chalk board.</td>
<td>2. students will read the definition of marriage on the chalk board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. teacher will ask the students to translate the english definition of marriage into their own mother tongue.</td>
<td>3. students will translate the definition of marriage in their mother tongue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. teacher will ask the students that how many families are involve in marriage rite system?</td>
<td>4. students will answer the question base on their understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. teacher will guide the students on how to carryout marriage responsibilities.</td>
<td>5. student will try to carryout marriage responsibilities of their individual culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. teacher will ask the students who is the head of the marriage system?</td>
<td>6. Students will try to give an answer to the question on who is the head of the marriage system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. teacher will give assignment to the students on how many types of marriage do we have on the chalkboard?</td>
<td>7. Student will try to copy the assignment given to them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D:
SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENTS ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE TEST
(SOSSAPET)

PRE-TEST

Part ‘A’: Personal Data

School Name: ____________________________

Class: ___________________________________

Sex: ____________________________________

Part ‘B’: (Choose the correct answer)

Instruction: Attempt All Questions

1. Marriage creates ______ to man and woman.
   (a) work (b) laziness (c) fight (d) opportunity
2. Marriage is a commitment that two people make to share their ______
   (a) lives (b) work (c) sleeping (d) dress
3. Which of the following is among the marriage commitment?
   (a) cultural dress (b) cultural food (c) cultural dance (d) cultural arrangement
4. ______ is a very important aspect of marriage.
   (a) responsibility (b) ceremonies (c) greeting people (d) approval
5. Who among the following is superior in marriage system?
   (a) wife (b) father (c) husband (d) mother
6. The major types of marriage in Nigeria are ___
   (a) 4 (b) 5 (c) 3 (d) 2
7. Marriage performed according to religious, custom and tradition of the ___
   (a) people (b) woman (c) relatives (d) man
8. All are types of marriage except ___
   (a) traditional marriage (b) religious marriage (c) marriage under act (d) village marriage
9. Form of marriage are divided into ___
   (a) 4 (b) 2 (c) 5 (d) 3
10. Which of the following is among the form of marriage?
    (a) polygamy (b) monogamy (c) polyandry (d) polygyny
11. Which of the following is not a challenge in marriage?
    (a) conflict (b) alcoholism (c) greeting (d) divorce
12. All of the following are marriage procedure except ___
    (a) bride price (b) acceptance (c) courtship (d) eating together
13. Marriage increased a cycle of ___ among the people in the society=
    (a) group (b) brothers (c) sisters (d) association
14. Marriage sustained the family ___ and tradition
    (a) food (b) language (c) name (d) practice
15. A good function of marriage may contribute peace and maintenance in the ___
   (a) community (b) family (c) people (d) society

16. ________ of negative attitude should be done in love not in coercion.
   (a) understanding (b) correction (c) advice (d) divorce

17. Marriage can be separated in the _____ if parties not settled.
   (a) Mosque (b) Church (c) house (d) court

18. Traditional marriage done according to the ______ tradition of a community.
   (a) tribe (b) cultural (c) family (d) society

19. Because of ____ unfitness marriage can be destroyed.
   (a) psychological (b) cultural (c) traditional (d) family

20. It is the duty of the woman to give ______
   (a) birth (b) money (c) dance (d) hunger

21. Shared _____ can give solution to marriage problem.
   (a) value (b) cloth (c) shelter (d) food

22. Man need _____ to serve as pleasant or unpleasant.
   (a) father (b) girl (c) boy (d) partner

23. Marriage in the _____ way encourages monogamy.
   (a) Court (b) Christian (c) Islamic (d) Traditional

24. All are condition for marriage EXCEPT_
   (a) financial (b) maturity (c) social stability (d) association

25. All are the ways of traditional marriage conducted EXCEPT_
   (a) dressing (b) highly value (c) interesting (d) certificate

Part ‘C’: True or False

26. Marriage is looking together of a man and woman as husband and wife.
   True or False

27. In a marriage system, the family of a man and woman must agree before the union can be agreed as a marriage. True or False

28. Traditional marriage is conducted by local priest and elders in the society.
   True or False

29. Marriage under act contracted in a marriage registry and conducted by an appointed government official known as registrar. True or False

30. Islam and Christian marriage are similar? True or False

31. People marry to have children and money. True or False

32. Is the marriage gives one disrespect and dis-recognition in the society. True or False

33. Through the basis of marriage one can trace ones ancestor. True or False

34. Marriage also disunite the family members in the society. True or False

35. Monogamy is the type of marriage where a man marries many wives. True or False

36. Islamic marriage conducted based on the injunction of the Holy Bible. True or False

37. Christian marriage is performed by Imam in recognized Mosque with Holy Quran as guide. True or False

38. All the types of marriage usually conducted with ceremonies which are publicly witnessed by the community. True or False

39. Marriage can be successful when some basic condition are property. True or False
40. Marriage cannot basic and accepted knowledge of the family’s culture. True or False
41. Social stability is an important condition for a marriage. True or False
42. Maturity is not important factor that determine a successful marriage. True or False
43. Mutual respect and co-operation can enhance marriage problem. True or False
44. Traditional marriage is very expensive. True or False
45. The court is liable to separate any marriage that is not workable. True or False
46. Marriage is the joining of two people usually known as male and female. True or False
47. Correction of negative attitude should be done with force. True or False
48. Woman are functioning as wives to help and reduce stress in the family. True or False
APPENDIX E:
MARKING SCHEME

1. D  25. D
2. A  26. False
3. D  27. True
4. D  28. True
5. C  29. True
6. C  30. True
7. A  31. False
8. D  32. False
9. B  33. True
10. D  34. False
11. C  35. False
12. D  36. False
13. D  37. False
14. C  38. True
15. D  39. True
16. B  40. False
17. D  41. True
18. B  42. False
19. A  43. True
20. A  44. True
21. A  45. True
22. D  46. False
23. B  47. False
24. D  48. True
APPENDIX F:
SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENTS ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE TEST
(SOSSAPET)
POST-TEST

Part ‘A’: Personal Data

School Name: ______________________________

Class: ______________________________

Sex: ______________________________

Part ‘B’: (Choose the correct answer)

Instruction: Attempt All Questions

1. _______ of negative attitude should be done in love not in coercion.
   (a) understanding (b) correction (c) advice (d) divorce

2. Marriage can be separated in the ______ if parties not settled.
   (a) Mosque (b) Church (c) house (d) court

3. Traditional marriage done according to the ______ tradition of a community.
   (a) tribe (b) cultural (c) family (d) society

4. Because of ____ unfitness marriage can be destroyed.
   (a) psychological (b) cultural (c) traditional (d) family

5. It is the duty of the woman to give _____
   (a) birth (b) money (c) dance (d) hunger

6. Shared ____ can give solution to marriage problem.
   (a) value (b) cloth (c) shelter (d) food

7. Man need ____ to serve as pleasant or unpleasant.
   (a) father (b) girl (c) boy (d) partner

8. Marriage in the _____ way encourages monogamy.
   (a) Court (b) Christian (c) Islamic (d) Traditional

9. All are condition for marriage EXCEPT_
   (a) financial (b) maturity (c) social stability (d) association

10. All are the ways of traditional marriage conducted EXCEPT_
    (a) dressing (b) highly value (c) interesting (d) certificate

11. Marriage creates _______ to man and woman.
    (a) work (b) laziness (c) fight (d) opportunity

12. Marriage is a commitment that two people make to share their ______
    (a) lives (b) work (c) sleeping (d) dress

13. Which of the following is among the marriage commitment?
    (a) cultural dress (b) cultural food (c) cultural dance (d) cultural arrangement
14. ______ is a very important aspect of marriage.
   (a) responsibility (b) ceremonies (c) greeting people (d) approval
15. Who among the following is superior in marriage system?
   (a) wife (b) father (c) husband (d) mother
16. The major types of marriage in Nigeria are ____
   (a) 4 (b) 5 (c) 3 (d) 2
17. Marriage performed according to religious, custom and tradition of the ____
   (a) people (b) woman (c) relatives (d) man
18. All are types of marriage except ____
   (a) traditional marriage (b) religious marriage (c) marriage under act (d) village marriage
19. Form of marriage are divided into ____
   (a) 4 (b) 2 (c) 5 (d) 3
20. Which of the following is among the form of marriage?
   (a) polygamy (b) monogamy (c) polyandry (d) polygyny
21. Which of the following is not a challenge in marriage?
   (a) conflict (b) alcoholism (c) greeting (d) divorce
22. All of the following are marriage procedure except ____
   (a) bride price (b) acceptance (c) courtship (d) eating together
23. Marriage increased a cycle of ____ among the people in the society=
   (a) group (b) brothers (c) sisters (d) association
24. Marriage sustained the family ____ and tradition
   (a) food (b) language (c) name (d) practice
25. A good function of marriage may contribute peace and maintenance in the ____
   (a) community (b) family (c) people (d) society

Part ‘C’: True or False

26. All the types of marriage usually conducted with ceremonies which are publicly
   witnessed by the community. True or False
27. Marriage can be successful when some basic condition are property. True or False
28. Marriage cannot basic and accepted knowledge of the family’s culture. True or False
29. Marriage is looking together of a man and woman as husband and wife. True or False
30. In a marriage system, the family of a man and woman must agree before the
   union can be agreed as a marriage. True or False
31. Traditional marriage is conducted by local priest and elders in the society. True or False
32. Marriage under act contracted in a marriage registry and conducted by an
   appointed government official known as registrar. True or False
33. Social stability is an important condition for a marriage. True or False
34. Maturity is not important factor that determine a successful marriage. True or False
35. Mutual respect and co-operation can enhance marriage problem. True or False
36. Traditional marriage is very expensive. True or False
37. The court is liable to separate any marriage that is not workable. True or False
38. Islam and Christian marriage are similar? True or False
39. People marry to have children and money. True or False
40. Is the marriage gives one disrespect and dis-recognition in the society. True or False
41. Through the basis of marriage one can trace ones ancestor. True or False
42. Marriage also disunite the family members in the society. True or False
43. Monogamy is the type of marriage where a man marries many wives. True or False
44. Islamic marriage conducted based on the injunction of the Holy Bible. True or False
45. Christian marriage is performed by Imam in recognized Mosque with Holy Quran as guide. True or False
46. Marriage is the joining of two people usually known as male and female. True or False
47. Correction of negative attitude should be done with force. True or False
48. Woman are functioning as wives to help and reduce stress in the family. True or False
APPENDIX G:

MARKING SCHEME

1. B  25. D
2. D  26. True
3. B  27. True
4. A  28. False
5. A  29. False
6. A  30. True
7. D  31. True
8. B  32. True
9. D  33. True
10. D  34. False
11. D  35. True
12. A  36. True
13. D  37. True
14. D  38. True
15. C  39. True
16. C  40. False
17. A  41. False
18. D  42. True
20. D  44. False
21. B  45. False
22. D  46. False
23. D  47. False
24. C  48. True
### APPENDIX H:

SAMPLE SIZE FROM RESEARCH ADVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Confidence = 95.0% Degree of Accuracy/Margin of Error</th>
<th>Confidence = 99.0% Degree of Accuracy/Margin of Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264,000,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Copyright. The Research Advisors (2003). All rights reserved.
APPENDIX I

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=classsize sex location
/ORDER=ANALYSIS.

Frequencies

[DataSet1] C:\Users\umar\Documents\Suleiman Buhari Yusuf.sav

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classsize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Location Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

T-TEST GROUPS=classsize(1 2)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES=posttest

/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

### T-Test

**[DataSet0]**

**Group Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>classsize</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>6.986</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>8.592</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>9.225</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>251.871</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIANOVA posttest BY classsize sex

/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(classsize) COMPARE ADJ(LSD)
/EMMEANS=TABLES(sex) COMPARE ADJ(LSD)
/PRINT=ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE
/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=classsize sex classsize*sex.

Univariate Analysis of Variance

[DataSet0]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Subjects Factors</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classsize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>small class</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>large class</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Descriptive Statistics

**Dependent Variable:** posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>classsize</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>1 male</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>5.503</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 female</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>4.995</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>1 male</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>6.514</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 female</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>6.256</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 male</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>6.836</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 female</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>6.372</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>6.689</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

**Dependent Variable:** posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2926.665</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>975.555</td>
<td>26.100</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>181176.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181176.091</td>
<td>4847.276</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classsize</td>
<td>2443.628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2443.628</td>
<td>65.378</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>150.866</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.866</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classsize * sex</td>
<td>15.560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.560</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14165.842</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231410.000</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>17092.507</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .171 (Adjusted R Squared = .165)
## Estimated Marginal Means

### 1. clsssize

#### Estimates

Dependent Variable: posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clsssize</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>27.526</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>26.353</td>
<td>28.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>21.797</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>21.046</td>
<td>22.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pairwise Comparisons

Dependent Variable: posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) clsssize</th>
<th>(J) clsssize</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I - J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>5.728</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.335 - 7.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>-5.728</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-7.121 - -4.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

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

a. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (equivalent to no adjustments).
### Univariate Tests

**Dependent Variable: posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2443.628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2443.628</td>
<td>65.378</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14165.842</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F tests the effect of classsize. This test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.

### 2. sex

#### Estimates

**Dependent Variable: posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 male</td>
<td>25.373</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>24.527</td>
<td>26.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 female</td>
<td>23.950</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>22.843</td>
<td>25.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pairwise Comparisons

**Dependent Variable: posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) sex</th>
<th>(J) sex</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.a</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Differencea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 male</td>
<td>2 female</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.030 - 2.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 female</td>
<td>1 male</td>
<td>-1.423</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-2.816 - -.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

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

a. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (equivalent to no adjustments).
Univariate Tests

Dependent Variable: posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>150.866</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.866</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14165.842</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F tests the effect of sex. This test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.

UNIANOVA posttest BY classsize location

/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/EMMEANS=TABLES(classsize) COMPARE ADJ(LSD)
/EMMEANS=TABLES(location) COMPARE ADJ(LSD)
/PRINT=ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE
/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=classsize location classsize*location.

Univariate Analysis of Variance

[DataSet0]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Subjects Factors</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classsize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>classsize</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>5.531</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>5.253</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>6.131</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>6.732</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>6.526</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>6.870</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>6.689</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2793.562</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>931.187</td>
<td>24.682</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>197605.952</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197605.952</td>
<td>5237.635</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classsize</td>
<td>2771.697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2771.697</td>
<td>73.465</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>16.818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.818</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classsize * location</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14298.944</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231410.000</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>17092.507</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .163 (Adjusted R Squared = .157)
Estimated Marginal Means

1. classsize

**Estimated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>classsize</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>27.798</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>26.666</td>
<td>28.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>21.911</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>21.174</td>
<td>22.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pairwise Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) classsize</th>
<th>(J) classsize</th>
<th>Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>5.887</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.537</td>
<td>7.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large class size</td>
<td>1 small class size</td>
<td>-5.887</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-7.238</td>
<td>-4.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

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

a. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (equivalent to no adjustments).

**Univariate Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2771.697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2771.697</td>
<td>73.465</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14298.944</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F tests the effect of classsize. This test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.
2. location

Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>24.625</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>23.687</td>
<td>25.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>25.084</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>24.112</td>
<td>26.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pairwise Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) location</th>
<th>(J) location</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig. a</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>-.892 - 1.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rural</td>
<td>1 urban</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>-.892 1.809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

a. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (equivalent to no adjustments).

Univariate Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>16.818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.818</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14298.944</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>37.728</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F tests the effect of location. This test is based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.
APPENDIX J:
LETTER TO DIRECTOR, GIWA EDUCATIONAL ZONE, KADUNA STATE.

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

Our Ref: DASSE/3:1

Date: 13-3-17

DIRECTOR GIWA
EDUCATIONAL ZONE
KADUNA STATE

Dear Sir,

STUDENTS’ FIELD RESEARCH

The Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria requires each student working for a Degree to complete a research Thesis/Project. Our students entering the final year of their studies will be collecting data during the year.

Most of them will need to be allowed access to certain relevant documents and some valuable information which you may have.

Please give assistance as much as possible.

TOPIC OF RESEARCH:

EVALUATION OF CLASS-SIZE ON SOCIAL STUDIES ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AMONG JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN GIWA ZONE, KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA.

Thank you for your continuing cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name and Position]
APPENDIX K:
LETTER FROM DIRECTOR TO FIELDS (VARIOUS SCHOOLS E.G. GJSS HUNKUYI)

KADUNA STATE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
ZONAL OFFICE GIWA
P.M.B 103

Our Ref: ___________________ Date: 13th March, 2017

Your Ref: ___________________

The Principal

G J SS Hunkuyi

RE-STUDENTS’ FIELD RESEARCH

The bearer Sulaiman Yusuf Buhari is a student of the Department of Arts and Social Science Education of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria undertaking a research project on the topic:

Evaluation of Class-Size on Social Studies Academic Performance among Junior Secondary School Students in Giwa Zone, Kaduna State, Nigeria.

Based on that I am directed to write and request you to give him all the necessary assistant to make his research a success.

Thanks.

Muhtari Mohammed Kaya
AD/ES
For Director