CHAPTER V – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The primary objective of the present study was to compare overall learning in terms of revised blooms taxonomy between the ancient and modern schooling systems. Learning was measured in two disciplines i.e. Sanskrit and Mathematics; through a tool developed by the researcher in consultation with subject experts. Also, to ascertain the factors that could contribute to the probable differences in learning between the two schooling systems, additional objectives were made. These involved comparing differences in the learning styles used by the learners of the two schooling systems, and as well as comparing differences in the pedagogy used in the form of understanding and implementation of differentiated instruction by the teachers of the two schooling systems.

The sample constituted 95 tenth grade students from the ancient schooling system and 115 tenth grade students from the modern schooling system. Their learning was assessed using the test developed by the researcher in line with the dimensions of the revised blooms taxonomy on both Sanskrit as well as mathematics. Learning styles were measured using the VARK inventory by Fleming (2009). The sample of the teachers drawn for this study consisted of 4 mathematics teachers and 3 Sanskrit teachers from the ancient schooling system and 4 mathematics teachers and 2 Sanskrit teachers from the modern schooling system. Pedagogical differences were measured using the Understanding and Implementation of Differentiated Instruction Survey. (Tomlinson 2001)
The obtained data on the above variables were subjected to appropriate non-parametric, quantitative and in-depth qualitative item analyses of the responses in order to test for the differences and verification of the hypotheses.

The findings revealed that learning in terms of all the dimensions of the revised bloom's taxonomy is better in the ancient schooling system than the modern schooling system, regardless of the discipline i.e. Mathematics or Sanskrit. In order to account for the differences in the learners, their learning styles were compared which showed no significant difference. Lastly, pedagogical differences showed that excepting the dimension of content, on the dimensions of student interest, assessment, lesson planning, process and product the teachers of the ancient schooling system have reported higher understanding and implementation of differentiated instruction strategies than the teachers of the modern schooling system.

Based on the above findings of the present study; the following conclusions are derived:

**Conclusions**

1. The main aim of the study being comparison of learning between the ancient and modern schooling systems have found better learning across all the dimensions of the revised bloom's taxonomy in the students of the ancient schooling system; which implies that learning is not restricted to rote or not limited to marks/grades and higher complex levels of learning such as evaluating, creating, metacognition are fostered in the format of the ancient schooling system which is less in the modern schooling system.
2. Learning measured on the basis of the revised blooms taxonomy proved to be a satisfactory measure and yielded answers relevant to the research question; though testing of learning on the basis other models could throw light on other aspects.

3. Learning was compared on mathematics and Sanskrit separately in which significant differences were found between the two schooling systems on both the disciplines i.e. the findings between the two disciplines as such did not vary; hence validates the extension of the findings on overall learning.

4. The students of both the schooling systems have not found differences in their learning styles; thus implying a similar learner profile across the two systems; despite which differences in learning are obtained which attributes the differences in the nature of the schooling system itself amongst other aspects.

5. Lastly, an important aspect of the schooling system is the pedagogy followed; which greatly impacts the quality of learning— wherein the hypothesis could not be verified however differences are found across most of the dimensions— higher use of differentiated instruction was reported and found in the ancient schooling system which seems to be the factor promoting better learning in the students of the ancient schooling system.

**Implications**

1. The use of the Revised Blooms taxonomy in assessing learning was justified in the present study as the findings obtained on the two disciplines did not vary thus also justifying its extension towards differences in overall learning.
2. Learning is not restricted to rote or not limited to marks/grades and higher complex levels of learning such as evaluating, creating, metacognition are fostered in the format of the ancient schooling system which is less in the modern schooling system.

3. Thus, Ancient schooling system facilitates better learning and learning at complex levels as per the hierarchy of Revised Blooms Taxonomy

4. The assessment of learning styles have revealed that the profile of the learners do not show significant differences despite differences in the nature of the schooling systems

5. Higher use of Differentiated instruction is observed in the Ancient schooling system thus implying that the pedagogy followed in the ancient system is individualistic and thereby fostering better learning.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. Homogeneity of sample was not maintained in terms of gender and age differences – which however are due to inherent nature of the system of education.

2. The comparison of learning has been tested using non-parametric tests due to the nature of the sample and the nature of the data obtained.

3. Learning being restricted to revised blooms taxonomy – is measured only in two disciplines – Sanskrit grammar and mathematics.

4. Sample size was less due to limited availability of sample that adhered to inclusion and exclusion criteria of sampling.
5. In the modern system of schooling, the sample is restricted to Karnataka State Education Board.

6. The results obtained could have been influenced by group administration of the tests.

7. Corroborative support for the findings is restricted to expert validation and not empirical evidences.

8. Pedagogy being a supportive factor for learning could not be compared and tested statistically; restricting the validation of its findings to informal interview, observations and secondary sources of data.

**Suggestions for future research**

1. Homogeneity of the sample could be subjected to a controlled experimentation or matching and comparison can be done or can be done using case study method if experimentation is not viable.

2. Learning could also be measured in other theoretical perspectives and can be measured in other disciplines as well.

3. The sample framework could be broadened so as to increase availability of sample that can be subjected to study.

4. Rigorous test construction methods can be adopted to develop tools on similar or other modules that can be intended for general use and enhance its scope.

5. Further empirical research in this area can be expected in the future with this area having potential heuristic value that can initiate meta-analytical reviews also.
6. Systems of education can be compared on other aspects of holistic learning including personality, values, workmanship and so on and measures to integrate the best features of both could also be tested.

7. Integrative assessment of all the dynamics of the education system namely the learners, teachers, parents, management authorities on various aspects can throw more light.