

A Comparative Evaluation of Teaching English in The Unit Credit System and The Conventional System in Kuwait Secondary Schools With Regard to Contact Time

Dr. Abdulla Dannan

College of Education, Kuwait University

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to evaluate comparatively the achievements of secondary students in English in the Conventional System (CS) and the Unit Credit System (UCS) Schools. It is composed of an introduction and three parts.

The introduction is concerned with the main differences between the two systems, most important of which deal with self-learning and the amount of contact hours. It also discusses related literature which is mostly concerned with student autonomy in learning a foreign language.

The first part describes the procedure. This includes the sample, the tool, test validity and reliability, implementation, and statistical analysis. The sample consisted of first year secondary students: two CS schools (one for boys and one for girls) and two UCS schools (one for boys and one for girls) in two very close areas on the borderline of Kuwait City. The tool used was a test designed by the writer and built on the material of the textbook in the light of its stated objectives. The test was examined and it proved to be valid and reliable. The T-test was used for comparing the scores of the two groups.

The second part is concerned with the results and discussions. The study shows that there are no statistically significant differences between the achievements of the students in both systems.

In the third part, the writer concludes that more contact time in the CS schools does not necessarily mean more learning. Accordingly, he thinks that experiments on the student autonomy in learning English are worthwhile doing in an attempt to realize maximum amount of learning in minimum class hours.

Introduction

0.1 Background

The Unit Credit System (UCS)* was applied for the first time in Kuwait secondary schools in 1978. It started with one school for boys and, within three years, the number quickly mounted to six schools: three for boys and three for girls, all of which were meant to be experimental. Evaluation of the efficiency of the new system was necessary to decide upon its extension or cancellation. The first evaluation committee started its work in April 1979 (Report of the First Evaluation Committee of the UCS). Three evaluation committees followed in the subsequent three years in which the author was a member. Evaluation dealt with problems of training teachers, registration, libraries, manpower, guidance, supervision, expenses, examinations, sections, compulsory and optional courses, and the views of all those who are closely concerned with the system: headmasters supervisors, teachers, and students (see report of evaluation committees, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982). None of the reports mentioned above dealt with the achievement of students of the UCS as compared with the achievement of students of the conventional system (CS). Investigations in this area are therefore needed to reveal whether the new system has fulfilled its goals.

0.2 Statement of the Problem

One of the main differences between the UCS and the CS is the number of contact hours allotted to courses in the curriculum. Contact hours in the UCS are fewer than those allotted to the same courses in the CS. For example, students of the UCS take a compulsory English language course,* which is No. 10 (see Student's Guide for UCS, 1979-1980, pp. 41-63). Three contacts hours per week (50 minutes each) are allotted to this course during one semester, which lasts for 15 weeks. The material used is the first

*This system is followed in the USA secondary schools and universities. It started to spread in many other countries. It differs from the conventional system, which is being used in Kuwait and all Arab countries, in many ways. The school year is usually divided into two semesters of 15 weeks each. During the semester, the student is allowed to take a limited number of courses in which he is examined by the end of the semester. He has to finish a certain number of courses (credit hours) to be awarded his secondary certificate. Necessary knowledge in different disciplines is given in the form of compulsory courses. Other courses are optional, depending on the field of the student's speciality. The amount of contact hours, which are usually equivalent to the credit hours, vary from one course to another. Each semester, the student has to finish a minimum number of courses. He is also allowed to take a limited maximum number of courses.

*All sections take four compulsory English courses; these are Nos. 10, 20, 30, and 40.

six units of the Crescent English Course Book 5 (Evans et al., 1983). This means that the students spend a total amount of 2250 minutes (45 contact hours x 50 minutes) with their teachers to cover all the required assignments of this course (examination periods are included). In comparison, students of the CS in the first secondary class take the same amount of material (the first six units from Book 5) in the first session of the school year (also 15 weeks), spending 6 periods (45 minutes each) per week (English Language Syllabus for the Secondary Stage, 1984-1985, p. 9). This means that they spend a total amount of 4050 minutes (90 contact hours x 45 minutes) with their teachers, which is almost as much as double the time in the UCS. Notice that the number of periods in the CS is actually double the number in the UCS. Students of the UCS are supposed to compensate for this big difference in contact hours by self-education, one of the main principles on which the UCS is based (Final Report of the UCS Committee, 1977, p. 12).

Teachers of English in the UCS think that it is necessary to add contact hours allotted to English courses by two periods per week (personal contact). They doubt if their students would make the required effort to master the material, which the teacher does not explain or cover thoroughly due to lack of teaching hours. So the problem to be investigated is clearly the following:

Does the number of contact hours cause any significant difference between the achievement of the UCS students and the CS students in English?

It should be pointed out that the teachers of English in both systems have the same training and qualifications with regard to teaching English. They also apply the same method and techniques described in the book they use. The number of students in the classes of both systems is 20-25. They also have similar social background (see 1.1 below).

0.3 Aim

The aim of this research is to :

- Cast light on the achievements of students in English in both systems.
- Investigate whether the UCS systems has fulfilled its aims in establishing self-education habits among students.

0.4 Related Literature

Language teaching versus language learning has recently become a very important area of research in the field of foreign language education. In 1971, Carroll wrote "how much opportunity for learning does the teacher give, and what are the consequences of various rates of presentation? No research related to this question seems to have been done in the foreign language field, but it is an important question for research to answer." (Carroll 1971, in Gage (ed.) 1971, p. 1085). Previous to Carroll's important remark, Gatenby had pointed out that "all over the world today the study of a modern foreign language is part of the secondary education course, and all over the world there is more failure than success in the learning of English, French, German, or whatever the language may be (Gatenby 1948, quoted in Showstack 1982, p. 179). Kennedy (1969, quoted in Hawkins 1981, p. 203) observed that "only a handful of those taught a foreign language in the classroom ever seem to reach a very high level of proficiency in that language, regardless of the method of instruction used." In an exciting article, Showstack (1982, p. 187) pointed out that "although language classes may be the most efficient way to **teach** a language, or even to study it, they are not the most efficient way to **learn** a language." Similar remarks are found in the articles of Hale, T.M., Hosseine-Fatemi, A. and Oller, J.W. Jr (1980).

Related to the effectiveness of classroom teaching and learning is the time allotted to the foreign language education in the curriculum. Anthony (1963, p.65) says, "The place of English in the curriculum and the time available are not unimportant. "Foreign language experts are still discussing this question of time. The "immersion" methods pioneered in the services in war-time are adopted by some researchers. Hawkins (1981, p. 273) says that "what is required is uninterrupted periods of immersion." This immersion is of course difficult or even impossible to provide in schools where different disciplines demand more time allocations. Other researchers go to the extreme and suggesting a language learning program which "might more closely resemble an out-patient medical clinic or a physical education program than a present-day language school" (Showstack 1982, p. 187). Others think that weakness in foreign language acquisition is attributed to "unsuitable timetabling." Hawkins (1981, p.24) quotes Her Majesty's Inspectate survey (1977) which lists "unsuitable timetabling" among the shortcomings which adversely affected pupils' work. It mentions that "the time allocation was 'inadequate' in half of the schools in the first year (i.e. less than 4x40 minutes weekly) and the second and the third years

were even less well provided." Obviously, the survey suggests more class hours to be allotted to the foreign language.

A new trend which can be called "student autonomy in the learning of a foreign language" is coming into light. Researchers are now trying to describe the learning strategies of language learners. Dickenson and Carver (1980, pp. 2-3) suggest techniques "through which pupils can be prepared for autonomy" and discuss "why it is that learners find it difficult to become autonomous in language learning." They mention the need of the pupils to know "how to learn" in order to develop "self-confidence," which changes their "attitudes towards aspects of language learning."

Related to students' autonomy in learning a foreign language is, of course, the number of contact hours they should spend with their teacher. The more autonomy students achieve, the less contact hours they need. This, in fact, is what is supposed to occur in the UCS schools in Kuwait. This notion is also emphasized by Armanet and Obese-jecty (1918, p. 24), who carried out an experiment that placed "the emphasis on the student," and which resulted in a total amount of work done by the students "much greater than could be the case in a traditional language course."

Although the studies mentioned above deal with autonomy and self-learning, none of them compares achievements in language acquisition on the basis of contact hours. In this research the writer studies the influence of the amount of contact time on second language acquisition in two different school systems that adopt the same method and use the same material.

0.5. Delimitations of the Study

This study is limited to the following:

- a. Kuwaiti students: boys and girls.
- b. First year secondary students in both UCS and CS.
- c. The first semester of the school year, which usually lasts for 15 weeks (between September 15th and December 30th).
- d. The first 6 units of Crescent English Course, Book 5.

1. Procedure

1.1 The Sample

The sample consisted of first year secondary Kuwaiti students of four schools located in two very close areas of Kuwait City: Shamiyya and Kifan. The schools are:

- Al-Jaza'er Secondary School for Girls (UCS)
- Kifan Secondary School for Girls (CS)
- Kifan Secondary School for Boys (UCS)
- Al-Shamiyya School for Boys (CS)

The following table shows the number of students who took the tests in the four schools.

Table 1
Numbers of the Sample in the Four Schools

Name of School	Type of School	No. of Students Taking Test
Al-Jaza'er (girls)	UCS	91
Kifan (boys)	UCS	96
Total	UCS	187
Kifan (girls)	CS	94
Al-Shamiyya (boys)	CS	80
Total	CS	174

1.2. The Tool

The tool was a test designed by the writer and built on the first six units of the textbook.

1.2.1. Test Validity

a. Content validity

To insure content validity the writer analyzed the contents of the six units and built the test so as to reflect the aims mentioned at the beginning of each unit and represent the new vocabulary, structures, or skills the students should learn (Evans, Teacher's book 1983, p. 9). These were the steps followed :

- (i) The aims of each unit were stated.
- (ii) The new vocabulary was collected and listed. It mounted to 235 words. It was divided two groups: active vocabulary (129 words) and passive vocabulary (106 words).
- (iii) The language function elements were collected and listed. They mounted to ten functions such as : warning, guessing, complaining ...etc.
- (iv) The reading material of the units was analyzed and the main ideas were spotted and listed.
- (v) The listening comprehension material was analyzed. It contained dialogues to be performed, reports about events to be retold, and specific information to be noted down.
- (vi) The structures the students should learn were also listed. They included the present and past simple tenses, past perfect, present perfect, past continuous, future time (will ... going to), first conditional (ifwill), superlatives, comparative structures, question words, and comparative structures.
- (vii) The language elements and skills in which the students were usually examined were surveyed (Kuwait Ministry of Education, Distribution of Items and Marks, 1984/1985). Their examinations consisted of oral and written part. The oral part included listening comprehension and oral class activities. The written part included vocabulary, reading comprehension, language function, structures, subject matter (content of the reading passages), summary making, composition and translation.

b. Test design

The test was then designed in accordance with the above mentioned analyses and investigations. It comprised the following language elements and skills :

- (i) Vocabulary (20 items).
- (ii) Language function (20 items).
- (iii) Set book (subject matter) 10 items).
- (iv) Listening comprehension (unseen before; 10 items).
- v) Reading comprehension (unseen before; 10 items).

As can be noticed the author did not include composition, summary making or translation for two reasons. First, because it is difficult to evaluate them objectively. Second, because the test will take longer time, in which case cooperation of the testees, teachers, and administrators will not be guaranteed.

(i) Vocabulary (Voc.). The vocabulary part contains 20 items classified into two groups of 10 items each :

- The group labelled "active vocabulary" in the teacher's book (Evans, 1983, p.11). Words of this group have to be provided by testees from memory.
- The group labelled "passive vocabulary" in the teacher's book (Evans, 1983, p.11). Words of this group are underlined and the testees have to choose the meaning of this word from given choices.

The author arranged the words according to their occurrence in the units and chose the words that bore Nos. 10, 20, 30 etc.

(ii) Language function (LF). The language function part contains 20 items classified into three groups :

- 10 items of the multiple choice type (language function).
- 5 items with spaces to be filled with phrases from the memory (language function).
- 5 items of the multiple choice type (language structure).

Almost all language function and language structure elements that occur in the first six unit are covered in this part of the test.

(iii) Set Books (SB) (subject matter). Questions of this part are taken from the material given in the set books. Ten questions are asked, most of

which are put in the form of sentences to be completed. All questions are of the multiple choice type.

(iv) Listening comprehension (LC). The passage used in the test was taken from Heaton and Method (1973, pp. 5-7). This book is not used as a textbook in either of the four schools of the experiment. Ten questions are asked, all of the multiple choice type.

(v) Reading Comprehension (RD). The passage used in the text was taken from David (1971, pp. 1-3). This book is not used as a textbook in either of the schools in which the test was administered. Ten questions were asked, all of which are of the multiple choice type.

The test was put in the form of two papers: Paper I contained vocabulary and language function, and Paper II contained listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and set books. Each took the students one whole period (45 minutes) to answer. (45 minutes) to answer. Each item was considered equal to one score, so the full mark on the test was 70.

In addition to the steps and strategies mentioned, the writer consulted two inspectors of English and four senior masters and mistresses working in the UCS and CS schools. All of them agreed that the contents of the test represented the vocabulary, language functions, structures, and skills which the first six units of book contained. They also agreed that the weight given to each part of the test corresponded with the emphases given to that part during the session in both of the systems.

C. Item validity* (item discrimination index). The steps followed in estimating the item validity of the test were those described by Lado (1967, pp. 349-354). The test was administered to a representative sample of students. The sample consisted of four classes (about 30 students each) randomly chosen from the four schools mentioned above. Those classes had already finished the first six units of the Crescent English Course, Book 5. The number of the same was 107 students. The test was administered in the presence of the writer. All the students were permitted to try every item. Five papers of non-Kuwaiti students were omitted. Two other papers were chosen randomly and omitted, so 100 papers were left.

The item discrimination index was calculated by finding the difference between the difficulty index of each item of the top and bottom 27 papers.

* Item discrimination $\times H - L$, where $H \times$ correct answers in the higher 27 percent, $L \times$ correct answers in the lower 27 percent, $N \times$ size of the 27 percent.

Table 2 shows the discrimination index and the standard deviation of each item. In Table 3, the test items are classified according to the range of discrimination index.

Since only two items have a discrimination index of less than 0.20 (one is 0.19 and the other is 0.17) and, at the same time, 17 items have a discrimination index of more than 0.60 and the other items are divided almost evenly between the higher and the lower middle areas, all of the test items were considered valid.

1.2.2. Test Reliability. The split-half method was adopted to calculate the reliability coefficient of the whole test. The steps followed were the same as described by Lado (1967, p. 335). The odd and even items were the two halves. The correlation between the two halves was computed by applying the following formula (Guilford, 1956, p. 141):

$$R_{XY} = \frac{[N \cdot \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)]^2}{(N \cdot \sum Y^2 - (\sum X)^2)(N \cdot \sum X^2 - (\sum Y)^2)}$$

Table 2

Discrimination indices and Standard Deviations of Test-Items

Test-item No.	Discrimination indices	Standard deviations	Test-item No.	Discrimination indices	Standard deviations
1	0.22	0.44	41	0.52	0.48
2	0.71	0.50	42	0.33	0.43
3	0.64	0.45	43	0.37	0.38
4	0.89	0.47	44	0.22	0.46
5	0.67	0.50	45	0.51	0.49
6	0.22	0.42	46	0.48	0.49
7	0.45	0.50	47	0.44	0.41
8	0.70	0.47	48	0.34	0.50
9	0.89	0.47	49	0.43	0.44

Table 2
Discrimination indices and Standard Deviations of Test-Items

Test-item No.	Discrimination indices	Standard deviations	Test-item No.	Discrimination indices	Standard deviations
10	0.74	0.49	50	0.26	0.41
11	0.26	0.40	51	0.15	0.41
12	0.56	0.48	52	0.62	0.50
13	0.22	0.42	53	0.40	0.50
14	0.67	0.50	54	0.52	0.44
15	0.37	0.46	55	0.51	0.50
16	0.48	0.49	56	0.44	0.45
17	0.19	0.41	57	0.54	0.50
18	0.45	0.45	58	0.36	0.45
19	0.26	0.39	59	0.40	0.49
20	0.22	0.50	60	0.55	0.49
21	0.29	0.35	61	0.49	0.48
22	0.26	0.46	62	0.48	0.42
23	0.20	0.39	63	0.26	0.38
24	0.45	0.46	64	0.56	0.46
25	0.49	0.50	65	0.45	0.49
26	0.37	0.41	66	0.38	0.49
27	0.71	0.48	67	0.22	0.41
28	0.37	0.49	68	0.22	0.50
29	0.71	0.46	69	0.33	0.44
30	0.23	0.49	70	0.22	0.41
31	0.60	0.50			
32	0.74	0.48			
33	0.85	0.50			
34	0.74	0.46			
35	0.93	0.50			
36	0.26	0.35			
37	0.48	0.48			
38	0.30	0.50			
39	0.70	0.50			
40	0.33	0.45			

Table 3

Number of test-items	Range of discrimination indices	Percentage of total
17	more than 0.60	24
23	0.40 — 0.59	33
28	0.20 — 0.39	40
2	0.17 — 0.19	3

where,

r_{xy} = the square of the correlation of the scores on the two halves of the test.

N = the number of students in the sample.

X = the sum of X scores.

The Spearman-Brown formula was used to compute the reliability of the entire test. The formula is :

$$r_{11} = \frac{2r_{1/2 \ 1/2}}{(1 + r_{1/2 \ 1/2})}$$

where,

r_{11} = the obtained reliability coefficient of the entire test.

$r_{1/2 \ 1/2}$

= the obtained reliability of half the test.

The reliability of the whole test was 0.98.

1.3 Implementation

The test was administered to students of the UCS and CS schools twice (see 1.1). The first (pre-test) was given at the beginning of the fall between the 23rd and 30th of September 1984. The aim was to make sure of how much the students in both systems know about the six units they were going to study during the first semester. Some of them might have

studied parts of the book during their summer vacation. The second (post-test) was given at the end of the semester between the 23rd and 30th of December 1984. The aim was to know the amount of learning the students of the two systems gained.

Teaching took place in the schools of both systems as usual. No special or additional instructions were given to teachers except those which inspectors normally give during their routine visits.

The students of each school took the test in a double period of 90 minutes. The author was always there to answer inquiries. The students were given enough time to try each item. They were told that writing their names on the test paper was optional, and at the same time were encouraged to do their best.

The test papers were scored. Each correct answer on each item deserved one score. The complete mark of the five parts was 70.

1.4 Statistical Analysis

The score lists of the tests were analyzed by the Kuwait University Computer Center with regard to groups, number of cases, means, standard deviation, T-test, and level of significance. The scores were compared using T-test (Walpole 1968, p. 228).

$$T = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum D_1^2 + \sum D_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

where

M_1 = mean of the first group.

M_2 = mean of the second group.

D_1^2 = square difference of the first group.

D_2^2 = square difference of the second group.

n_1 = size of the first group.

n_2 = size of the second group.

2. Results and Discussion

The results are shown in tables in which the mean scores, the standard deviations and the T-values appear. The level of significance is shown at the bottom of each table in percentage terms. The 5% level is regarded as significant.

The tables are arranged in the following order :

a. Girls' Schools

- Pre-test : UCS vs. CS.
- CS : pre-test vs. post-test.
- UCS : pre-test vs. post-test.
- Post-test : UCS vs. CS.

b. Boys' Schools

- Pre-test : UCS vs. CS.
- CS : pre-test vs. post-test.
- UCS : pre-test vs. post-test.
- Post-test : UCS vs. CS.

c. Girls' and Boys' Schools (together)

- Pre-test : UCS vs. CS.
- CS : pre-test vs. post-test.
- UCS : pre-test vs. post-test.
- Post-test : UCS vs. CS.

2.1. Girls' Schools

2.1.1. Pre-test: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of UCS and CS Students.

Variable	UCS group (girls)			CS group (girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	90	19.58	6.56	92	18.37	4.88	1.41

(not significant)

Since no statistical significance is recorded at the 0.05 level we can say that there is no difference between the girls in the two systems as far as knowledge of the first six units of Book 5 is concerned. A comparison of their achievements will be valid at the end of the semester. Accordingly, any difference detected later could be the result of learning or teaching.

2.1.2. CS Schools: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the CS Girls' School in the Pre-test and the Post-test

Variable	CS group, pre-test (girls)			CS group, post-test (girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	92	18.40	4.90	94	24.30	8.7	5.68

(significant at the 0.0001 level)

This table indicates that there is an obvious difference between the achievements of the girls of the CS system at the beginning and the end of the semester. This difference is due to learning that occurred during that time.

2.1.3. UCS Schools: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS Girls' School in the Pre-test and the Post-test

Variable	UCS group, pre-test (girls)			UCS group, post-test (girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	90	19.58	6.56	89	22.55	8.72	-2.58

(significant at the 0.011 level)

This table indicates that there is a significant difference between the achievement scores in the pre-test and the post-test. This difference is due to gain the UCS girls achieved by the end of the semester.

2.1.4. Post-test: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS and CS students.

Variable	UCS group (girls)			CS group (girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	89	22.55	8.72	94	24.27	8.70	-1.33

(not significant)

This table shows that there are no significant differences between the achievements of the girls of both systems. Notice that, although the CS girls take more periods of English per week, their achievements do not significantly differ from those of the UCS girls.

2.2. Boys' Schools

2.2.1. Pre-test: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS and CS Students.

Variable	uCS group (boys)			CS group (boys)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	95	16.71	7.56	76	15.62	5.93	1.03

(not significant)

This table indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the boys in both systems. This means that the knowledge of both groups in Book 5 does not differ at the beginning of the semester.

2.2.2. CS Schools: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores for the CS Boys' School in the Pre-test and the post-test.

Variable	CS group, pre-test (boys)			CS group, post-test (boys)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	76	15.62	5.93	79	28.53	4.89	-14.81

(significant at the 0.0001 level)

The difference between the scores in the pre-test and the post-test is obvious. The boys of the CS achieved considerable gain by the end of the semester. This is due to learning during that time.

2.2.3. UCS-Schools: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS Boys' Schools in the Pre-test and the Post-test

Variable	UCS group, pre-test (boys)			UCS group, post-test (boys)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	95	16.71	7.56	86	28.02	8.76	-9.33

(significant at the 0.0001 level)

This table shows that there is a significant difference between the pretest and the post-test. The UCS boys scored higher in the post-test, which means that learning occurred during the semester.

2.2.4. Post-test: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of UCS and CS Students

Variable	UCS group (boys)			CS group (boys)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	86	28.02	8.76	79	28.53	4.89	-0.45

(not significant)

This table shows that there is no significant difference between the scores of the UCS and the CS boys by the end of the semester. This means that there is no difference between the amount of learning achieved in both systems even though contact time in the CS system is almost double that in the UCS system.

2.3. Girls' Schools and Boys' Schools

2.3.1. Pre-test: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS and CS Students.

Variable	UCS group (boys & girls)			CS group (boys & girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	185	18.10	7.22	168	17.13	5.54	1.42

(not significant)

This table indicates that both boys and girls in the two systems do not significantly differ in their knowledge of Book 5 at the beginning of the semester.

2.3.2. CS Schools: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the CS Boys' and Girls' Schools in the Pre-test and the Post-test.

Variable	CS group, pre-test (boys & girls)			CS group, post-test (boys & girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	168	17.13	5.54	173	26.21	7.51	-12.69

(significant at the 0.0001 level)

It is obvious that scores in the post-test are significantly higher than those in the pre-test. This is due to the gain the boys and girls of the CS achieved by the end of the semester.

2.3.3. UCS Schools: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS Boys' and Girls' Schools in the Pre-test and the Post-test.

Variable	UCS group, pre-test (boys & girls)			UCS group, post-test (boys & girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	185	18.10	7.22	175	25.24	9.14	-8.25

(Significant at the 0.0001 level)

The results show that the post-test scores are significantly higher than the pre-test scores. This means that the boys and girls of the UCS achieved a significant amount of learning by the end of the semester.

2.3.4. Post-test: Mean Differences Between Achievement Scores of the UCS and CS students.

Variable	UCS group (boys & girls)			CS group (boys & girls)			T
	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	
All tests: Papers I&II	175	25.24	9.14	173	26.21	7.51	-1.09

(not significant)

This table indicates that there is no significant difference between the achievements of the UCS and CS students by the end of the semester. This means that more contact hours in the CS schools do not result in more learning than that in the UCS schools. The most probable reason is that students of the UCS make more effort to compensate for the lack of contact time.

3. Conclusion and Recommendations

3.1 Conclusion

The results of this research lead to the following conclusions in the field of teaching English in Kuwait:

- a. More contact time in the CS does not necessarily mean more

- learning, although it might mean more teaching.
- b. Students of the UCS are most probably able to compensate for the difference in contact hours by making individual effort and developing self-learning strategy, which proved to be successful.
 - c. The UCS, in general, is more likely to help students develop self-learning because:
 - It forces teachers who do not usually have confidence in the abilities of their students to leave part of the lesson as a home assignment.
 - the timetable of the student of the UCS provides him with free hours to spend in the library or to refresh his mind, whereas the student of the CS spends all the school day in the classroom with two breaks of 20 minutes each.

3.2. Recommendations:

The writer would like to recommend the following:

- a. Keep the amount of contact time for teaching English course No. 10 in the UCS as it is.
- b. Start an experiment in one of the CS schools in which the number of contact hours allotted to Book 5 during the school year is reduced to 4 hours per week.
- c. Build an individual learning program and apply it in secondary schools in an attempt to establish student 'autonomy' in learning English.

References

- al-Rifa'i, Suad, "Unit credit system in the secondary stage in its fourth year", **Usbu' al-Tarbiya XII**, Kuwaiti Teachers Society, Kuwait, 10th-15th April, 1982 (in Arabic).
- Anthony, Edward M, "Approach, method and technique", **English Language Teaching**, 17, January 1963 (pp.63-67).
- Armanet, C. M., and Obese-jectv, K., "Towards student autonomy in the learning of English as a second language at university level", **ELT Journal**, October, 1981.
- Carroll, John B., "Research on Teaching Foreign Languages", 1971. In Gage, N.L., (ed.) **Handbook of Research on Teaching**, Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 7th. printing, 1971 (p. 1085).

- Cobb, David, **Constructive Comprehension**, Longman, London, 4th impression, 1971, (pp. 1-3).
- Dickenson, Leslie, and Carver, David, "Learning how to learn: Steps towards self-direction in foreign language learning in schools", **ELT Journal**, Vol. 35/1, October 1980 (pp. 1-7).
- Evans, Geth, O'Neill, Terry, Snow, Peter, and Weller, Lorraine, **Crescent English Course, Pupl's Book 5**, Oxford University Press, Beirut, 1983.
- , **Crescent English Course, Teacher's Book 5**, Oxford University Press, Beirut, 1983.
- Gatenby, E.V. "Reasons for failure to learn a foreign language". In W.R. Lee (ed.) **E.L.T. Selections 1**, London, Oxford University Press, 1948. Quoted in Showstack Richard, 1982 (p.179).
- Guilford, J.P., **Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education**, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1956 (p.141).
- Hale, T.M. and Budar, E.C. "Are TESOL classes the only answer?", **Modern Language Journal**, 1970, 54 (pp. 487-492). Quoted in Showstack, Richard, 1982 (p.180).
- Hawkins, Eric, **Modern Languages in the Curriculum**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.
- Heaton, J.B. , AND Method, K., **Effective Comprehension**, Longman, London, 10th impression, 1973 (pp. 5-7).
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate, **Matters for Discussion 3: Modern Languages in Comprehensive Schools**. HMSO. Quoted in Hawkins Eric, 1981, (p.24).
- Kennedy G., "Conditions for Language Learning", 1969. In Oller and Richerds (eds), 1973. Quoted in Hawkins Eric, 1981, (p.203).
- Kuwait Ministry of Education, State of Kuwait, **The Final Report of the UCS Committee**, Kuwait, 1977 (in Arabic).
- Kuwait Ministry of Education, State of Kuwait, **Report of the First Evaluation Committee of UCS**, Kuwait, 1979 (in Arabic).
- Kuwait Ministry of Education, State of Kuwait, **Student's Guide for UCS**, Kuwait 1979-1980 (in Arabic).
- Kuwait Ministry of Education, State of Kuwait, **Report of the Second Evaluation Committee of the UCS**, Kuwait, 1980 (in Arabic).
- Kuwait Ministry of Education, State of Kuwait, **Report of the Second Evaluation Committee of the UCS**, Kuwait, 1981 (in Arabic).
- Kuwait Ministry Education, State of Kuwait, **Report of the Fourth Evaluation Committee of the UCS**, Kuwait, 1982 (in Arabic).
- Kuwait Ministry of Education, ELT Inspectorate, **Evaluation in the Unit Credit System**, Kuwait, 1983.

Kuwait Ministry of Education, ELT Inspectorate, **Distribution of Items and Marks**, 1984/1985.

Kuwait Ministry of Education, State of Kuwait, **English Language Syllabus for the Secondary Stage**, Kuwait, 1984-1985.

Lado, Robert, **Language Testing**, Longman, London, 5th impression, 1967 (pp. 335-341).

Monshi-Tousi, M., Hosseine-Fatimi, A. and Oller, J.W. Jr., "English Proficiency and factors in its attainment : a case study of Iranians in the United States, **TESOL Quarterly**, 14, 1980 (pp. 365-372). Quoted in Showstack, Richard, 1982 (p.180).

Papalia, A., **Learner-Centered Language Teaching: Materials and Methods**, Rowley, Newbury House, 1976. Quoted in Showstack, 1982 (p. 187).

Showstack, Richard, "Language Teaching Versus Language Learning", **System**, vol. 10, No. 2, 1982 (pp. 179-189).

Walpole, R.E., **Introduction to Statistics**, MacMillan, New York, 1968 (p.228).

دراسة تقويمية مقارنة التعليم اللغة الانجليزية في نظام المقررات العادي في المدارس الثانوية بالكويت

د . عبدالله الدنان

كلية التربية - جامعة الكويت

ملخص البحث

يهدف هذا البحث إلى تقويم مقارن لتحصيل الطلبة في مادة اللغة الانجليزية في كل من مدارس نظام المقررات والنظام التقليدي المتبعين في المدارس الثانوية بدولة الكويت، ويشتمل على مقدمة وثلاثة أجزاء.

تحدث المقدمة عن الفروق بين النظامين وأهمها التركيز على التعلم الذاتي وتخفيض عدد الساعات الصفية في نظام المقررات، إذ يبلغ عددها في مادة اللغة الانجليزية ٣ ساعات أسبوعية بينما هي ٦ ساعات أسبوعية في النظام العادي. كما تتعرض المقدمة لأهم الدراسات السابقة والمتعلقة بالتعلم الذاتي في مجال اللغات الأجنبية فتناقشها وتبين مدى علاقتها بالبحث.

يصف الجزء الأول الاجراءات المتبعة في البحث، فيعرض الأداة، والعينة، والاختبار صدقة وثباته وتطبيقه، والمعالجات الاحصائية. وقد تكونت العينة من طلبة السنة الأولى الثانوية لأربع مدارس: اثنتان (واحدة للبنين، وأخرى للبنات) تتبعان نظام المقررات، واثنان (واحدة للبنين، وأخرى للبنات) تتبعان النظام التقليدي، وجميعها تقع في منطقتين متلاصقتين على حدود مدينة الكويت. أما الاختبار فقد قام الباحث بتصميمه من واقع الكتاب المقرر على الطلبة، وهو نفسه في النظامين، مادة وأهدافا. وقد تم التأكد من صدق الاختبار وثباته بالطرق المعروفة من احصائية وغيرها. أما مقارنة نتائج التحصيل فأتبع في قياسها واختبار «ت».

ويحتوي الجزء الثاني على النتائج وتحليلها وقد بينت الدراسة أنه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة احصائية بين تحصيل الطلبة في النظامين.

أم الجزء الثالث والأخير فيشمل خلاصة النتائج والتوصيات. وفيها يخلص المؤلف إلى أن زيادة الحصص الصفية في المدارس التقليدية لا يعني بالضرورة زيادة التعلم. فقد استطاع طلبة نظام المقررات التعويض عن الساعات الصفية ببذل مزيد من الجهد الذاتي ليصلوا بمستواهم إلى مستوى نظرائهم في النظام التقليدي. والباحث يوصي في النهاية بإجراء المزيد من الدراسات والتجارب لبناء برامج تهدف إلى تحقيق أعلى قدر من التعلم الذاتي للغة الانجليزية بأقل عدد ممكن من الساعات الصفية.