

<https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.1.2.2019.68-82>



African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: <http://www.afjbs.com>



Research Paper

Open Access

Effects of Intervention on Reduction of Academic Backwardness of Rural School Students From Marathwada Region

Gaikwad N. B, Shaikh R. M

Senior Scientist,

AICRP-Human Development, College of Home Science VNMKV Parbhani (MS), India

Senior Research Fellow

AICRP-Human Development, College of Home Science VNMKV Parbhani (MS), India

Volume 1, Issue 2, July 2019

Received: 05 June 2019

Accepted: 25 June 2019

Published: 09 July 2019

[doi:10.48047/AFJBS.1.2.2019.68-82](https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.1.2.2019.68-82)

ABSTRACT

A sample of purposively selected 300 rural school students from operational villages of AICRP-Home Science namely Pokharni, Daithana, Dharmapuri and Takli (Kumbhkaran) of Parbhani district were selected and categorized on the basis of their academic grade cards issued by their respective schools. Further, these enrolled students were categorized based on the cut of points decided by Education Department (MS) i.e. D grade for 34-40% marks as poor and E grade for 21-34% marks as very poor grades. Out of 300 rural academically backward school students, 150 of them were considered as control group students (Gr I) and remaining of them as experimental group students (Gr II). Seventy-five girls and 75 boys were enrolled in both the groups, who were studying in 7th, 8th and 9th std in the schools of Pokharni, Daithana, Takli and Dharmapuri of Parbhani district. The experimental groups' (Gr- II) sample were provided with intervention on reduction of academic backwardness of rural school students for a period of 9 months such as assignments on reading, writing and arithmetic lectures, workshops, play way method of study, parents education, books exhibition and sale, health check ups at free of cost, health and hygiene etc.. After implementing the intervention all the sample academically backward school students in the control and experimental groups problem of their academic backwardness, GQ, IQ were reassessed for studying the effects of provided intervention. Intervention provided to the rural academic backwardness school students was found to be significantly useful for reducing rural school student problems associated with their academic backwardness.

Key words: Academic backwardness, rural school students, reduction, intervention

INTRODUCTION

Academic backward children are the children who have troubles with education and their capability of learning belongs to the lower level than it is required according to the general standards. In every country there is a problem with academic backward children and pedagogues work hard to create effective methods of teaching and improvement the chances for children to receive normal education.

There are many factors which influence the problem of the child's academic backwardness and they depend to the physical, genetic, psychological, social, economic and other fields. The first factor which can influence the child's learning abilities is a disease or physical injures of the essential organs, primarily the brain. If the child has fallen ill with something and takes medicine for the disease, they can have a negative impact on their intellectual abilities. Academic backward children are the children who require specific approach towards education and the students are able to improve their knowledge on the issues and study the problem from all sides. It is better to reveal the problem on child backwardness on the definite example suggested by the professors and a case study will be a magnificent experience for every young professional. One should learn about the child as much as possible and find out about the causes of their backwardness and evaluate its effect on the quality of his education. (ASERT report 2015). Enlight of these facts the present study was conducted with the following objectives.

1. To identify and enroll academically backward rural school students for providing intervention to them for reducing academic backwardness
2. To find out the problems of academic backwardness of enrolled rural school students
3. To implement the intervention for reducing academic backwardness of rural school students
4. To study the effects of implemented intervention for reducing academic backwardness of rural school

METHODOLOGY

A sample of purposively selected 300 rural school students from operational villages of AICRP-Home Science namely Pokharni, Daithana, Dharmapuri and Takli (Kumbhkaran) of Parbhani district were selected and categorized on the basis of their academic grade

cards issued by their respective schools. Further these enrolled students were categorized based on the cut of points decided by Education Department (MS) i.e. D grade for 34-40% marks as poor and E grade for 21-34% marks as very poor grades. Out of 300 rural academically backward school students, 150 of them were considered as control group students (Gr I) and remaining of them as experimental group students (Gr II). Seventy-five girls and 75 boys were enrolled in both the groups, who were studying in 7th, 8th and 9th std in the schools of Pokharni, Daithana, Takli and Dharmapuri of Parbhani district. Prior to the implementation, both the groups school students' Socio economic status was assessed by using Revised Socio economic status scale developed by Kuppuswamy. In addition to it their academic associated problems, home associated problems and health associated problems were assessed by using checklists on 'Problems associated with academic backwardness' developed by AICRP-HD. Their growth quotient (GQ) was assessed by considering their three anthropometric measurements i.e. height, weight and head circumference as per the standard procedure. Their intelligent quotient (IQ) was assessed by administering Standard Progressive Matrices (SPM) developed by Ravens, J.H. Courl and J. Ravens.

To reduce problems associated with academic backwardness, the experimental group (Gr II) rural school students were provided intervention by including various types of need based lectures, workshops, reading, writing and arithmetic assignments and also they were encouraged to develop more interest in studies by providing interesting play way methods of learning, insisted to complete academic tasks and also their routine. Besides these, the group discussions were organized with concern teachers and Headmasters of respective schools.

To reduce their home associated problems, parent education programmes such as home visits, lectures and workshops were organized. Books related to adolescents self care and mothers role in developing children i.e. Mazi Kalji Mich Ghenar, Saksham Aai Vhyacha Mala and Kautombic Natesambandh developed by Department of Human Development & Family Studies were exhibited and were sold to the mothers of academically backward school students of experimental group (Gr II).

For reduction of their health associated problems, health check-ups at free of cost were organized in collaboration with Primary Health Centers of respective villages and provided supplementary tablets like calcium, ferrous sulphate, multivitamins and B

complex tablets to academically backward school students of experimental group (Gr II). Various lectures on significance of health care, hygiene, self care, balanced diet were organized with the help of experts.

On the other hand, the control group academically backward school students were not provided with above cited intervention except having their routine activities at their respective schools and homes. After implementing this intervention for a period of nine months, control group (Gr I) and experimental groups' (Gr II) academically backward rural school students' problems of their academic backwardness, growth quotient (GQ), intelligent quotient (IQ) were reassessed for studying the effects of intervention provided to academically backward rural school students of experimental group (Gr II). The collected data were pooled, tabulated, statistically analyzed and discussed.

FINDINGS

Table 1 (** Make New one) (Check) Table 1 indicates that majority of the selected rural school students belonged to low socio economic status group 67.3 per cent and remaining i.e. 32.6% belonged to low middle socio economic status. Sixty six per cent of them belonged to nuclear type of family while remaining were belonged to joint family. Relatively a higher percentages of their mothers & fathers were just literate (54% and 51.0%) respectively and others are upto primary educated only. Out of 150 sample, 33.3 per cent of each belonged to Std 7th, 8th & 9th standards. Majority of the sample i.e. 72.0 per cent were second born.

Table 2 indicate comparison between academic grades of academically rural school students. Irrespective of the experimental groups about 41- 42% rural school students were found to be under the category of D grade. While remaining 57-58 per cent of them were recorded to be under the category of E grade. There was no significant differences were recorded with regard to the grades and percentages of marks of academically backward rural school students.

The results of the study indicate from table 3 that the mean scores of the enlisted problems reported by the rural school students associated with their academic backwardness in both the experimental groups ranged between 13 ± 1.40 and 126 ± 1.28 prior to initiation of the intervention. After receiving intervention for a period of 9 months, the enlisted problems reported by the experimental group (Gr II) rural school

students were reduced in the range between 11 ± 1.49 and 110 ± 16 . Whereas after post testing no drastic changes were recorded with regard to the enlisted problems reported by the control group students associated with their academic backwardness on the whole, highly significant differences were recorded in reducing the enlisted problems reported by the experimental group students except with respect to having biased teachers and noisy surroundings in schools.

Overall the mean scores of home associated problems reported by the rural school students associated with their academic backwardness in both the experimental groups ranged between 48 ± 1.05 and 135 ± 0.72 before the initiation of intervention. After providing intervention for a period of 9 months the mean scores of health associated problems were found to be reduced in the range between 30 ± 0.75 and 125 ± 0.83 in the experimental groups. There were no reduction in reported problems found by control group students. Highly significant differences were recorded in reducing the enlisted problems reported by the experimental group students except with regard to uneducated parents and ill health of family members.

It is clear from table 5 that, the mean scores of the health problems reported by the rural school students associated with their academic backwardness in both the experimental groups ranged between 31 ± 0.82 and 120 ± 0.70 before the initiation of intervention. After implementing intervention, the mean scores of the health problems reported by the rural school students associated with their academic backwardness were observed to be reduced in the ranged between 20 ± 0.34 and 95 ± 0.76 in the experimental groups. The finding indicate that long duration intervention helps in highly significantly reducing health associated problems of experimental group (Gr-II) academically backward school students. No reduction were found in health associated problems of control group (Gr-I) students.

Table 6 reveals about comparison of control and experimental groups academically backward rural school students based on their growth quotient irrespective of the experimental groups about 75-76 per cent of the rural school students were categorized in the ranged of 80-85 growth quotient i. e. fair growth followed by the respondents in good (10-11 %), poor (10 % each) and very good (2-3 %) categories before the initiation of the intervention. However, no significant differences were recorded with

regard to their growth quotient after providing intervention for a period of 9 month to the experimental group rural school students.

Table 7 denotes about comparison of control and experimental groups academically backward rural school students based on their intelligence quotient. Irrespective of the experimental groups it was recorded that considerably a higher (84%) percentage categorized of the academic backward rural students were as below normal with regarded to their intelligence quotient while remaining 15-16 % of them were assessed to be in the normal categories of intelligence quotient before the implementation of intervention. However, no significant differences were recorded with regard to their intelligent quotient after providing intervention for a period of 9 month to the experimental group rural school students.

CONCLUSION

Intervention provided to the rural academic backwardness school students was found to be significantly useful for reducing rural school student problems associated with their academic backwardness.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous 2013 Education Department (M.S.) Classification of Academic Achievement of school students
- AICRP-CD component () Checklist to asses academic associated problems, home associated problems and health associated problems ,
- Kuppuswamy (), Revised Socio economic status scale
- NCHS standard, Anthropometric measurements
- Ravens, J.H. Courl and J. Ravens, Standard Progressive Matrics (SPM)

	Percentages of respondents n-300	
--	---	--

Background variables	Control group students (Gr-1) n-150	Experimental group students (Gr-II) n-150	Z values
Types of family			
Nuclear	64.66 (97)	66 (99)	1.30 ^{NS}
Joint	35.33(53)	34 (51)	1.38 ^{NS}
Sizes of Family			
Small (1-4)	12.6 (19)	14 (21)	0.10 ^{NS}
Medium (5-8)	69.3 (104)	68 (102)	0.52 ^{NS}
Large (>9)	18 (27)	18 (27)	0.13 ^{NS}
Education of the sample			
7 th	33.3 (50)	33.3 (50)	--
8 th	33.3 (50)	33.3 (50)	--
9 th	33.3 (50)	33.3 (50)	--
Gender			
Female	50 (75)	50 (75)	--
Male	50 (75)	50 (75)	--
Ordinal position			
First born	30.66 (46)	32 (48)	1.27 ^{NS}
Second born	48.66 (73)	48 (72)	0.67 ^{NS}
Third born	12 (18)	12 (18)	-
Forth born	8.66 (13)	8 (12)	0.72 ^{NS}
Maternal education			
Just literates	62.66 (94)	60 (90)	0.46 ^{NS}
Primary educated	26.66 (40)	28 (42)	0.21 ^{NS}
High school educated	13.33 (20)	12 (18)	0.09 ^{NS}
Paternal education			
Just literates	60 (90)	58 (87)	0.44 ^{NS}
Primary educated	28 (42)	27.33 (41)	0.21 ^{NS}
High school educated	12.66 (19)	14.66 (22)	0.11 ^{NS}
Socio-economic status			
Low	94.66 (142)	95.33 (143)	0.44 ^{NS}
Middle	05.33 (8)	04.66 (7)	0.37 ^{NS}

Table1 Background variables of academically backward rural school students of control and experimental groups

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages

NS – Non significant

Table 2 Comparison between academic grades of the academically backward rural school students

Academic Grades	Percentages of respondents n-300		Z values
	Control group students (Gr-I) n-150	Experimental group students (Gr-II) n-150	
D grade (34-40% marks)	41.33 (62)	42.66 (64)	0.27 ^{NS}
E grade (21-33% marks)	58.66 (88)	57.33 (86)	0.20 ^{NS}

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages

NS – Non significant

Table 3 Comparisons of the problems reported by the rural school students associated with their academic backwardness before and after implementation of intervention

Problems reported by the students associated	Means of control group (Gr I) students (n-150)	Means of experimental group (Gr II) students (n-150)	Z values
--	--	--	----------

	Pre test Mean $\pm$ SD (a)	Post test Mean $\pm$ SD (b)	Z values	Pre test Mean $\pm$ SD (c)	Post test Mean $\pm$ SD (d)	Z values	a Vs c	b Vs d
Home associated problems	Pre test	Post test		Pre test	Post test			
In availability of remedial classes	126 $\pm$ 1.28	126 $\pm$ 1.28	--	126 $\pm$ 1.28	140 $\pm$ 1.31	1.17 ^{NS}	--	09.30**
Inability to complete academic tasks	117 $\pm$ 0.71	116 $\pm$ 0.71	0.61 ^{NS}	115 $\pm$ 0.72	88 $\pm$ 0.77	2.30*	1.31 ^{NS}	14.51**
Strong dislikes for few subjects	117 $\pm$ 1.15	116 $\pm$ 1.15	0.45 ^{NS}	116 $\pm$ 1.15	110 $\pm$ 1.16	0.46 ^{NS}	0.66 ^{NS}	04.38**
Poor attention span & comprehension	116 $\pm$ 0.45	116 $\pm$ 0.45	--	115 $\pm$ 0.46	101 $\pm$ 0.51	1.12 ^{NS}	0.66 ^{NS}	08.69**
Irregular study habits	114 $\pm$ 0.54	112 $\pm$ 0.54	1.30 ^{NS}	112 $\pm$ 0.55	82 $\pm$ 0.61	2.66**	1.30 ^{NS}	15.30**
Inability to grasp the teachings in classrooms	107 $\pm$ 0.88	105 $\pm$ 0.88	1.30 ^{NS}	106 $\pm$ 0.88	98 $\pm$ 0.89	0.68 ^{NS}	0.66 ^{NS}	05.49**
Dislike toward studies	103 $\pm$ 0.82	102 $\pm$ 0.82	0.54 ^{NS}	102 $\pm$ 0.82	83 $\pm$ 0.84	1.78 ^{NS}	0.66 ^{NS}	10.72**
Boring teaching methods	103 $\pm$ 0.95	103 $\pm$ 0.95	--	102 $\pm$ 8.41	97 $\pm$ 0.96	0.43 ^{NS}	0.66 ^{NS}	03.76**
Feel study as burden	102 $\pm$ 0.69	102 $\pm$ 0.69	--	102 $\pm$ 0.69	85 $\pm$ 0.72	1.58 ^{NS}	--	09.43**
Slow writing speed	95 $\pm$ 0.45	95 $\pm$ 0.45	--	95 $\pm$ 0.49	60 $\pm$ 0.50	3.85**	--	14.66**
Feel some subjects are tough	102 $\pm$ 1.25	102 $\pm$ 1.25	--	101 $\pm$ 1.25	97 $\pm$ 1.26	0.35 ^{NS}	0.66 ^{NS}	03.16**
Inability to write answers in the exams	101 $\pm$ 0.46	101 $\pm$ 0.46	--	102 $\pm$ 0.46	95 $\pm$ 0.48	0.61 ^{NS}	0.67 ^{NS}	03.76**
Poor relationships with classmates	80 $\pm$ 0.57	79 $\pm$ 0.57	0.90 ^{NS}	81 $\pm$ 0.57	56 $\pm$ 0.56	3.16**	0.67 ^{NS}	11.09**
Improper voice of teachers	74 $\pm$ 1.13	74 $\pm$ 1.13	--	74 $\pm$ 1.13	50 $\pm$ 1.13	3.3	--	10.00**
Biased teachers	49 $\pm$ 1.05	49 $\pm$ 1.05	--	48 $\pm$ 1.05	48 $\pm$ 1.05	NS	0.65 ^{NS}	00.65 ^{NS}
Noisy surrounding in schools	25 $\pm$ 1.49	25 $\pm$ 1.49	--	25 $\pm$ 1.49	25 $\pm$ 1.49	--	--	--
Inability to read text on writing boards	13 $\pm$ 1.40	13 $\pm$ 1.40	--	19 $\pm$ 1.39	11 $\pm$ 1.49	4.69**	1.11 ^{NS}	05.96**

*- Significant at 0.05 level **- Significant at 0.01 level NS – Non significant

Table 4 Comparisons of home associated problems reported by the rural school students for having backwardness before and after implementation of intervention

n- 300

	(a)	(b)		(c)	(d)			
No support from family in studies	135 $\pm$ 0.72	135 $\pm$ 0.72	--	135 $\pm$ 0.72	95 $\pm$ 0.83	37.98**	--	37.98**
Uneducated parents	125 $\pm$ 0.83	125 $\pm$ 0.83	--	125 $\pm$ 0.83	125 $\pm$ 0.83	--	--	Z values --
Health associated		Control Group (n=150)			Experimental Group (n=150)			
Heavy responsibilities of domestic chores	116 $\pm$ 0.49	114 $\pm$ 0.50	1.31 ^{NS}	115 $\pm$ 0.49	97 $\pm$ 0.55	14.24**	0.66 ^{NS}	13.33**
Improper facilities for studies at home	111 $\pm$ 0.55	111 $\pm$ 0.55	--	110 $\pm$ 0.56	95 $\pm$ 0.59	11.59**	0.66 ^{NS}	12.47**
No value and motivation for education in family	108 $\pm$ 0.62	108 $\pm$ 0.62	--	108 $\pm$ 0.62	80 $\pm$ 0.66	25.26**	--	25.26**
Non conducive home environment	105 $\pm$ 0.45	105 $\pm$ 0.45	--	104 $\pm$ 0.46	70 $\pm$ 0.50	33.79**	0.66 ^{NS}	35.12**
Responsibilities for caring younger siblings	104 $\pm$ 0.68	104 $\pm$ 0.68	--	104 $\pm$ 0.68	100 $\pm$ 0.69	2.77**	--	2.77**
Involvement in work with family members for earning	94 $\pm$ 0.49	94 $\pm$ 0.49	--	94 $\pm$ 0.49	80 $\pm$ 0.51	10.79**	--	10.98**
Interruptions in studies due to parental occupation	90 $\pm$ 0.52	90 $\pm$ 0.52	--	90 $\pm$ 0.52	85 $\pm$ 0.53	3.53**	--	3.53**
Conflicts in family	85 $\pm$ 0.98	85 $\pm$ 0.98	--	85 $\pm$ 0.98	80 $\pm$ 0.98	3.54**	--	3.54**
Disinterest of parents in child studies	76 $\pm$ 0.79	76 $\pm$ 0.79	--	75 $\pm$ 0.79	30 $\pm$ 0.75	76.17**	0.65 ^{NS}	78.91**
Ill health of family members	50 $\pm$ 1.06	50 $\pm$ 1.06	--	48 $\pm$ 1.05	48 $\pm$ 1.05	1.38 ^{NS}	--	1.38 ^{NS}

** - Significant at 0.01 level NS – Non significant

Table 5 Comparisons of health associated problems reported by the rural school students for having backwardness before and after implementation of intervention

problems	Pre test Mean $\pm$ SD (a)	Post test Mean $\pm$ SD (b)	Z values	Pre test Mean $\pm$ SD (c)	Post test Mean $\pm$ SD (d)	Z values	a Vs c	b Vs d
General weakness	95 $\pm$ 0.59	95 $\pm$ 0.59	0.66 ^{NS}	95 $\pm$ 0.59	40 $\pm$ 0.58	15.26**	0.65 ^{NS}	85.54**
Abdominal pain	67 $\pm$ 0.57	67 $\pm$ 0.57	--	65 $\pm$ 0.57	30 $\pm$ 0.50	10.61**	1.37 ^{NS}	55.88**
Headache	40 $\pm$ 0.49	40 $\pm$ 0.49	--	40 $\pm$ 0.49	15 $\pm$ 0.38	6.04**	--	45.96**
Cough and cold	31 $\pm$ 0.82	31 $\pm$ 0.82	--	31 $\pm$ 0.82	20 $\pm$ 0.79	4.65**	--	11.52**
Food aversion due to ill health	35 $\pm$ 0.69	35 $\pm$ 0.69	0.64 ^{NS}	35 $\pm$ 0.69	20 $\pm$ 0.65	5.61**	0.64 ^{NS}	16.12**
Creation of health problems due to long school distance	120 $\pm$ 0.70	120 $\pm$ 0.70	--	120 $\pm$ 0.70	95 $\pm$ 0.76	13.17**	--	21.08**
Fatigue	48 $\pm$ 0.48	48 $\pm$ 0.48	--	47 $\pm$ 0.48	21 $\pm$ 0.37	7.58**	0.68 ^{NS}	42.02**
Feel stress	42 $\pm$ 0.45	42 $\pm$ 0.45	--	41 $\pm$ 0.44	20 $\pm$ 0.34	6.69**	0.68 ^{NS}	31.44**

**- Significant at 0.01 level NS – Non significant

Table 6 Comparison of control and experimental groups academically backward rural school students based on their growth quotient

Categories & GQ ranges	Percentages of respondents (n-300)					
	Control group students (Gr-I) n-150			Experimental group students (Gr-II) n-150		
	Pre test	Post test	Z values	Pre test	Post test	Z values
Very good (90-95)	02.66 (4)	03.33 (5)	0.71 ^{NS}	03.33 (5)	05.33 (8)	0.54 ^{NS}
Good (85-90)	11.33 (17)	14.66(22)	0.75 ^{NS}	10.6 (16)	16.66 (25)	0.61 ^{NS}
Fair (80-85)	76 (114)	72.66 (109)	01.00 ^{NS}	75.33 (113)	68.66 (103)	1.09 ^{NS}
Poor (below 80)	10 (15)	09.33 (14)	01.07 ^{NS}	10.6 (16)	09.33 (14)	1.14 ^{NS}

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages

NS – Non significant

Table 7 Comparison of control and experimental groups academically backward rural school students based on their intelligence quotient

Categories & IQ ranges	Percentages of respondents (n-300)					
	Control group students (Gr-I) n-150			Experimental group students (Gr-II) n-150		
	Pre test	Post test	Z values	Pre test	Post test	Z values
Normal (101-110)	15.33 (23)	16.66 (25)	0.60 ^{NS}	16.0 (24)	17.37 (26)	0.91 ^{NS}
Below normal (90-100)	84.66 (127)	83.33 (125)	1.01 ^{NS}	84 (126)	82.66 (124)	0.01 ^{NS}

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages

NS – Non significant

