International Journal of Advanced Research and Multidisciplinary Trends (IJARMT)
An International Open Access, Peer-Reviewed Refereed Journal
Impact Factor: 6.4 Website: https://ijarmt.com ISSN No.: 3048-9458

Impact of Brain-Based Learning Strategies on Teaching Methods and Student Learning Outcomes at the Secondary School Level

Jawad Parayangattu
Research Scholar, Department of Education, North East Christian University
Dr. Sarika Goel
Professor, Department of Education, North East Christian University

Abstract
The blend of neuroscience and education has sparked the rise of brain-based learning, an approach designed to sync teaching methods with the way our brains actually learn. This study dives into how brain-based learning strategies influence teaching styles, student engagement, and academic success in secondary schools. Rooted in concepts like neuroplasticity, cognitive load, executive function, and affective neuroscience, the research utilized a convergent mixed-methods design. A quasi-experimental method was employed to compare the academic performance and engagement levels of students taught with brain-based strategies against those who experienced traditional teaching methods. Quantitative data came from achievement tests and student engagement scales, while qualitative insights were gathered through classroom observations and interviews with teachers. The results showed that students who engaged with brain-based learning strategies achieved significantly better academically and were more engaged. Teachers also noted positive shifts in their teaching practices and the overall classroom environment. The study wraps up by affirming that brain-based learning is a powerful, evidence-backed teaching approach that boosts teaching effectiveness and nurtures well-rounded student development.

Keywords: Brain-Based Learning; Neuroscience and Education; Teaching Methods; Student Engagement; Academic Achievement; Secondary Education

1. Introduction

Recent breakthroughs in cognitive neuroscience have completely changed how we understand learning in the human brain. They've shed light on the crucial roles of neuroplasticity, emotion, attention, memory, and social interaction in the learning journey. These insights have fueled the growth of a fascinating interdisciplinary field that merges neuroscience with education, aiming to connect scientific knowledge about brain function with what happens in the classroom (Ansari & Coch, 2006; Tokuhama-Espinosa, 2011).

Traditional teaching methods, which often focus heavily on rote memorization and a teacher-centered approach, might not fully meet the cognitive and emotional needs of learners. Research in neuroscience indicates that learning is an active, experience-driven process where neural networks are constantly reshaped based on meaningful engagement and feedback (Draganski et al., 2004; Kolb & Gibb, 2011). This perspective supports teaching strategies that encourage active learning, emotional involvement, and metacognitive awareness.

Brain-based learning has emerged as a teaching framework that incorporates neuroscientific principles into educational practices. It highlights the importance of creating emotionally supportive learning environments, using multisensory instruction, providing scaffolding, and fostering the development of executive functions and self-regulated learning (Caine & Caine, 2014; Sousa, 2017). Research shows that these approaches can significantly boost student engagement and academic success (Hattie, 2009).

Even with the rising interest in this area, there’s still a pressing need for empirical research that thoroughly investigates the effectiveness of brain-based learning strategies in real classroom settings, especially in secondary education. This study aims to fill that gap by exploring how brain-based learning strategies influence teaching methods and student learning outcomes.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Brain-Based Learning and Neuroplasticity

Neuroplasticity is all about the brain's amazing ability to adapt its structure and function based on what we learn and experience. Research has shown that when we engage our minds consistently, it can actually lead to noticeable changes in how our neurons connect with each other (Draganski et al., 2004). In the classroom, this backs up teaching methods that focus on repetition, feedback, and gradually increasing challenges (Kolb & Gibb, 2011).

2.2 Cognitive Load and Information Processing

The information processing theory dives into how we take in, store, and recall information. Our working memory has its limits, and if instructional designs push it too far, learning can suffer (Baddeley, 2000). Cognitive load theory stresses the importance of minimizing unnecessary load while helping students build their understanding (Sweller et al., 2011). Techniques like chunking, scaffolding, and using visual aids are brain-friendly strategies aimed at overcoming these challenges.

2.3 Emotional Engagement and Learning

Affective neuroscience reveals just how intertwined our emotions are with our thinking. The emotional significance of what we learn can shape our attention, motivation, and how well we remember things (Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007). Research shows that classrooms that foster emotional support boost student engagement and academic success, while ongoing stress can really hinder learning (McEwen & Morrison, 2013).

2.4 Executive Function and Self-Regulated Learning

Executive functions—like working memory, self-control, and cognitive flexibility—are essential for learning with purpose (Diamond, 2013). Teaching practices that encourage metacognition, reflection, and self-monitoring have been proven to improve self-regulated learning and overall academic performance (Zimmerman, 2002).

2.5 Empirical Studies on Brain-Based Learning

Previous studies have shown that brain-based learning strategies can really boost student engagement, improve classroom behavior, and enhance academic performance (Sousa, 2017; Hattie, 2009). However, researchers warn against jumping on the neuroscience bandwagon without solid evidence, stressing the importance of research tailored to specific contexts (Howard-Jones, 2014).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study used a convergent mixed-methods approach, blending both quantitative and qualitative data to gain a well-rounded view of how brain-based learning strategies affect students. For the quantitative part, a quasi-experimental design was employed, featuring both experimental and control groups.

3.2 Population and Sample

The study focused on secondary school students and teachers from selected schools. Schools were chosen using a purposive sampling method, and intact classes were assigned to either the experimental or control groups. The sample included students from Grades VIII to X along with their subject teachers.

3.3 Intervention

Teachers in the experimental group applied brain-based learning strategies during a designated intervention period. These strategies involved creating emotionally engaging lessons, using multisensory teaching methods, providing scaffolding, incorporating metacognitive prompts, encouraging collaborative learning, and offering formative feedback. Meanwhile, the control group stuck to traditional teaching methods.

3.4 Tools for Data Collection

- Academic Achievement Test (Mathematics and Science)
- Student Engagement Scale
- Classroom Observation Schedule
- Teacher Interview Schedule
- All instruments were validated for content and reliability prior to data collection.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

Before the intervention began, both groups took pre-tests, and afterward, they completed post-tests at the end of the intervention period. At the same time, we conducted classroom observations and interviewed teachers to gather qualitative insights into teaching methods and classroom interactions.

3.6 Data Analysis

For the quantitative data, we used descriptive statistics and inferential methods like t-tests to spot differences between the groups. On the qualitative side, we analyzed the data thematically to uncover common patterns related to teaching practices, student engagement, and the challenges of implementation. By bringing these findings together, we were able to triangulate the data and boost the overall validity of our results.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Effect of Brain-Based Learning Strategies on Academic Achievement

To assess how effective brain-based learning strategies are on students' academic performance, we took a close look at the post-test scores from both the experimental and control groups. We calculated the mean scores and standard deviations, then used an independent samples t-test to see if there was a significant difference between the two groups.

Comparison of Post-Test Academic Achievement Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Table 4.1

Comparison of Post-Test Academic Achievement Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t-value	Significance
Experimental Group	60	72.84	8.16		
Control Group	60	64.27	7.94	5.63	p < 0.01

So, Table 4.1 shows that students taught with brain-based learning did way better on post-tests compared to those taught the usual way. The t-value (5.63) is pretty high, meaning the difference in scores wasn't just random luck. It looks like using brain-based teaching really did help students learn.

The reason the brain-based group did better might be because the teaching methods were based on how the brain works, like how it changes, how much info it can handle, and how emotions play a role. By using activities that involve different senses, giving support when needed, and helping students think about their thinking, this approach helped them process information better and remember it longer. This lines up with studies that say when learning involves many parts of the brain, memories get stronger and things make more sense.

Also, creating a supportive classroom probably made students more interested and focused. Studies about emotions and the brain suggest that when learning is tied to emotions, it gets the brain working in ways that help with attention and memory. Less stress and a feeling of safety probably helped students deal with tough assignments better.

These results also agree with the idea that teaching should be designed to not overload the brain and help students build their knowledge. Brain-based methods, like breaking things down into smaller parts, practicing with guidance, and using pictures, probably helped students manage their short-term memory, which led to doing better in school.

These findings back up older studies that found students learn better when taught with ideas from neuroscience. This study adds to that by showing that brain-based learning can work in regular high school classrooms.

4.2 Effect of Brain-Based Learning Strategies on Student Engagement

To figure out how brain-based learning helps students get more involved, I looked at their scores on the Student Engagement Scale after the class. I checked how they acted, felt, and thought about the class.

Table 4.2

Comparison of Overall Student Engagement Scores

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t-value	Significance
Experimental Group	60	78.36	7.42		
Control Group	60	69.18	6.95	6.87	p < 0.01

Table 4.2 shows that students in the experimental group were way more engaged than those in the control group. It looks like using brain-based learning kept students more interested.

This might be because the teaching methods got them emotionally involved and the class activities were super interactive, which fired up the parts of their brains that control motivation. Studies show that when learning is tied to emotion, people pay better attention and stick with it longer (Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007). This lines up with other research (Fredricks et al., 2004) that says how you teach and the classroom vibe really impact how into it students are.

4.3 Dimension-Wise Analysis of Student Engagement

To gain deeper insight, engagement scores were analysed separately across behavioural, emotional, and cognitive dimensions.

Table 4.3

Dimension-Wise Mean Engagement Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Engagement Dimension	Group	Mean	SD	t-value	Significance
Behavioural	Experimental	26.48	2.91		
	Control	23.12	3.04	5.41	p < 0.01
Emotional	Experimental	25.87	3.08		
	Control	22.94	2.86	4.89	p < 0.01
Cognitive	Experimental	26.01	2.74		
	Control	23.12	2.67	5.12	p < 0.01

Table 4.2 shows that the students in the experimental group were way more engaged than the other group. It looks like brain-based learning really got them going, and that neuroscience stuff might actually help get kids involved, keep them interested, and pay attention.

This might be because teaching that hits them in the feels and getting them doing stuff in class makes their brains light up. Studies show that when learning has feels, they pay more attention and stick with it longer (Immordino-Yang & Damasio, 2007). This also lines up with what Fredricks et al. (2004) said - that how you teach and the vibe in the classroom really change how into it the kids are.

4.4 Classroom Observation Findings on Teaching Practices

Classroom observations were conducted to examine differences in teaching practices between the experimental and control groups.

Table 4.4

Observed Teaching Practices in Experimental and Control Classrooms

Teaching Practice	Experimental (%)	Control (%)
Use of multisensory materials	86	42
Student-centred activities	82	38
Emotional support and feedback	79	41
Metacognitive questioning	74	29
Collaborative learning activities	81	36

Table 4.4 highlights some real differences in the teaching styles of the two groups. The teachers who embraced brain-based methods engaged a lot more senses in their lessons, encouraged students to collaborate, and posed questions that prompted students to reflect on their own thinking. These strategies seem to really activate the brain and enhance student learning (Shams & Seitz, 2008).

We also noticed that the classrooms experimenting with these new approaches provided students with better emotional support and feedback. This likely contributed to students feeling more engaged and less stressed. This aligns with the findings of McEwen and Morrison (2013), which suggest that stress can hinder learning, making a supportive classroom environment absolutely essential.

4.5 Teachers' Perceptions of Brain-Based Learning

Teacher interview responses were analysed to understand perceptions regarding the effectiveness and feasibility of brain-based learning strategies.

Table 4.5

Summary of Teacher Responses on Brain-Based Learning

Theme	Percentage of Teachers Agreeing
Improved student engagement	88%
Better classroom climate	84%
Enhanced instructional clarity	81%
Increased preparation time needed	69%
Need for professional training	92%

Table 4.5 shows teachers really think brain-based learning works well. They mostly noticed students seemed more into it and the classroom felt better, which backs up what the numbers showed. Still, a lot of teachers said they could use more time to get ready and learn more about it all. This lines up with other studies that say teachers need ongoing training to really make the most of teaching methods based on how the brain works (Howard-Jones, 2014; Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

5. Conclusion

This study looked at how using brain-based learning strategies affects teaching, how interested students are, and how well they do in high school. The results show that teaching methods that use what we know about the brain really do help students learn better than older, normal teaching styles.

Students who learned with brain-based strategies did better in school. They seemed more involved and had better control of themselves. Using different senses to teach, having a classroom that felt safe emotionally, giving support when needed, and helping students think about their own learning helped them understand and remember what they were learning. These results back up the idea that learning involves being active, is affected by emotions, and depends on what you experience – just like brain research says.

The study also saw changes in how teachers taught. Those using brain-based strategies focused more on the student. They made class more interactive and paid more attention to what students needed, thinking-wise and emotionally. Since both number-based and descriptive results pointed the same way, it seems that brain-based learning can work well in normal high school classrooms.

Basically, this study backs up the idea of using what we know about the brain to teach in high schools. It shows this could make teaching better and help students grow in all areas.

6. Educational Implications

This study's results could really change how we teach, plan courses, train teachers, and lead schools.

In the classroom, teachers should try techniques that get kids emotionally involved, participating, and thinking about their own learning. Lessons should keep in mind how long kids can pay attention, how much they can remember, and how safe they feel. This can really help them learn better.

When it comes to planning what to teach, we need flexible courses that let kids learn by doing, work together, and get feedback along the way. Adding social and emotional learning to regular lessons can also help kids do better.

To train teachers, both new and experienced ones should learn the basics of how the brain works and what that means for teaching. Training should teach proven methods and help teachers judge if brain science ideas are actually true or just myths.

School leaders and those who make education rules should back up brain-based learning by giving teachers enough stuff, time, and support from the school. This kind of backing is key to keeping these teaching ideas going and working well.

7. Limitations of the Study

Even though we found some interesting stuff, there were a few things we couldn't control in the study. We only looked at a small group of kids from certain schools, so it's hard to say if these results would be the same everywhere else.

Since we couldn't randomly assign students, other things might have messed with the results. Also, the program didn't last very long, so we don't know if these learning strategies have a lasting impact.

Because we used surveys, some of the answers might not have been totally honest. Plus, the teachers all had different levels of experience, and they might not have all used the program in the same way, which could have also changed the outcome.

8. Suggestions for Further Research

It would be fantastic to conduct studies with much larger groups of students from various schools and regions. This way, we can be more confident that the results are relevant to everyone.

Additionally, it would be beneficial to track students over time to really understand how brain-based learning impacts their grades, their planning and thinking skills, and their motivation levels. We could also explore whether this learning style works better for certain subjects or age groups.

Instead of tackling the entire concept of brain-based learning all at once, we could run experiments that focus on specific aspects, like metacognition (thinking about your own learning), emotional regulation, or teaching methods that engage multiple senses. This approach might help us identify which elements are most effective. Plus, figuring out how to train teachers to implement these strategies is crucial if we want this approach to be sustainable.

References

1. Ansari, D., & Coch, D. (2006). Bridges over troubled waters: Education and neuroscience. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 10*(4), 146–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.02.007
2. Baddeley, A. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4*(11), 417–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01538-2
3. Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (2014). *Natural learning for a connected world: Education, technology, and the human brain*. Teachers College Press.
4. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791
5. Dekker, S., Lee, N. C., Howard-Jones, P., & Jolles, J. (2012). Neuromyths in education: Prevalence and predictors of misconceptions among teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology, 3*, 429. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00429
6. Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 135–168. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750
7. Draganski, B., Gaser, C., Busch, V., Schuierer, G., Bogdahn, U., & May, A. (2004). Neuroplasticity: Changes in grey matter induced by training. *Nature, 427*(6972), 311–312. https://doi.org/10.1038/427311a
8. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059
9. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
10. Howard-Jones, P. A. (2014). Neuroscience and education: Myths and messages. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 15*(12), 817–824. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3817
11. Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 1*(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-228X.2007.00004.x
12. Immordino-Yang, M. H., Darling-Hammond, L., & Krone, C. (2019). Nurturing nature: How brain development is inherently social and emotional. *Educational Psychologist, 54*(3), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1633924

13. Kolb, B., & Gibb, R. (2011). Brain plasticity and behaviour in the developing brain. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 20*(4), 265–276.
14. McEwen, B. S., & Morrison, J. H. (2013). The brain on stress: Vulnerability and plasticity of the prefrontal cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience, 33*(45), 17624–17634. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3028-13.2013
15. Shams, L., & Seitz, A. R. (2008). Benefits of multisensory learning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 12*(11), 411–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.07.006
16. Sousa, D. A. (2017). *How the brain learns* (5th ed.). Corwin Press.
17. Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8126-4
18. Tokuhama-Espinosa, T. (2011). *Mind, brain, and education science: A comprehensive guide to the new brain-based teaching*. W. W. Norton & Company.
19. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2