



Should Archaeology be taught in a separated new subject in secondary school curriculum? Investigate on Teachers' perceptions.

B.M. Senevirathna Bandara¹

සාරාංශය

පුරාවිද්‍යාව ඉතාමත් ජනප්‍රිය විෂය කේන්ද්‍රයකි. ලෝකය පුරාම ඒවාගේම එහි වැදගත්කම වසරින් වසර ඉහල යනවා. එයට හේතුව පුරාවිද්‍යාව මගින් අපේ වටිනා ඉතිහාසය නූතන ලෝකයට විවෘත කිරීමයි. නමුත් ශ්‍රී ලංකාවේ අධ්‍යාපන පද්ධතිය සලකන විට එම විෂය පාසල් පද්ධතිය තුළ උගන්වනු නොලැබේ. එම විෂය සංඛාරය ඉතිහාසය විෂය තුළ අන්තර්ගත කර ද්විතීක විෂය මාලාව තුළ ඉගැන්වීම සිදුවේ. සමහර අධ්‍යාපනඥයින් විෂ්වාස කරන්නේ එම විෂය වෙනම විෂයක් ලෙස ඉගැන්වීම වඩාත් යෝග්‍ය බවයි. මෙම පර්යේෂණය තුළින් සිදුකලේ පශ්චාත් උපාධි ඩිප්ලෝමා පාඨමාලාව හදාරන ගුරුවරුන් 100ක පිරිසකගෙන් එම විෂය පිළිබඳව ප්‍රශ්නාවලියක් මගින් අදහස් විමසීමයි. ක්‍රමවේදය වූයේ ප්‍රමාණාත්මක පර්යේෂණ ප්‍රවේශයයි. පර්යේෂණ ක්‍රමය ලෙස සමීක්ෂණ ක්‍රමය භාවිතා කරන ලදී. පර්යේෂණය තුළින් අනාවරණය වූයේ වැඩි ගුරුවරුන් පිරිසක් මෙම විෂය වෙනමම විෂයක් ලෙස ඉගැන්වීම යෝග්‍ය බව ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලදී. ඔවුන්ගෙන් වැඩි පිරිසක් ප්‍රකාශ කලේ මෙම විෂය (පුරාවිද්‍යාව) ඉගැන්වීම 6 - 11 ශ්‍රේණිවලට වඩාත් සුදුසු බවයි. නව විෂය කුමන නමකින් හැඳින්වීම සුදුසුද යන්න ඇසුවිට සහභාගී වූවන්ගෙන් 43%ක් ප්‍රකාශ කලේ එහි නම විය යුත්තේ “පුරාවිද්‍යාව” තවද

¹ Department of Humanities, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Mihintale. bandarabms@gmail.com

ගුරුවරුන් 41% දෙනෙකුගේ අදහස වූයේ එහි නම විය යුත්තේ “උරුමය පිළිබඳ අධ්‍යයනය” ලෙසයි. මීට අමතරව වැඩි ප්‍රතිශතයක් ප්‍රකාශ කළේ මෙම විෂය ඉගැන්වීම සඳහා උපාධිධාරී ගුරුවරුන් යෙදවිය යුතු බවයි.

මුඛ්‍ය පද: පුරාවිද්‍යාව, උරුම කළමනාකරණය, ද්විතීයික පාසල් පද්ධතිය

Introduction

Archaeology is a main subject discipline and it has a long history in education field. History is also a main subject and it is taught all over two hundred years in world education system as well as Sri Lankan education system. Both History and Archaeology subjects are very important in education sector because the above two subjects contribute to make successful and effective persons, who are able to understand the values of heritage, which we have had from ancient proud civilians in the country. In addition, some people believe that History and Archaeology are two sides of the coin. Although Archaeology is not taught in school education system in the country, Archaeology is taught as a main subject or a specialized subject in the University education. Further, some components of this subject are included in History subject, under such a situation main research problem was why Archaeology is not taught as a separate main subject?

Archaeology is the single most powerful tool to know, understand, and explain the entire human saga from our earliest ancestors to modern society. History is also a very important subject in the education system in Sri Lanka, hence some people believe that, Archaeology need to be separated from the History discipline and separately two subjects should be developed in the secondary school system in Sri Lanka. In this new school environment, there is increasing recognition of the importance of Archaeology subject as a subject for secondary education system in Sri Lanka.

Archaeology is the closest thing to time travel. Observation on the surface of the soil and clues from beneath the soil enable us to imagine we are mingling with people of the past sometimes the distant of the past we learn about these people in a very intimate way, how they lived, how they coped in sometimes difficult environment, and perhaps gain

something about humanity that has been missed or not fully appreciated. Sometimes, Archaeology contributes historic accounts for the material artifacts carry, no biases, unlike the accounts of humans. There is no argument History subject must need to teach is secondary school syllabi because without better historical awareness civilian of the country they will not to be proud disciplinary people in the country. Considering the syllabi of History some extended archaeological facts and information are included, however Archaeology contends of the History if separate as a main subject as Archaeology it would be developed more than now. In addition, Archaeology supports in many ways to enhance holistic education in schools. Archaeology is eclectic and brings together the best efforts of geologist, historians, social scientists of various persuasions, chemists, ecologists, pathologists and many others (Charlotte A. Smith; 2001).

Sri Lanka is rich in archaeological sites all over the country and we have important and valuable archaeological sites, especially Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa, Kandy, Southern country, even Northern of the country. Therefore, all civilians of the country, who should have sufficient knowledge, skills and attitudes of prevention of archaeological sites in the country. This education can be given through the separate syllabus of Archaeology.

Archaeology is potential for fostering more intelligent, involved, global citizens is considerable. In classrooms, learning about Archaeology helps students upgrade various skills across many disciplines including critical thinking. Further, Archaeology can be readily included in a comprehensive curriculum for Social Sciences, History, Mathematics, Environmental Studies and Arts, moreover, archaeological findings provide a framework for questing about Statistics, Economics, Politics, cultural geography, Ecology, and Agricultural practices. Next important reason is preservation of the archaeological sites in the country, this preservation concepts need to be spreader in the society the country, otherwise valuable archaeological sites could be destroyed by the people of the society. Therefore, archaeological knowledge need to be developed among the people of the Country. This preservation knowledge and competencies could be important to students also.

In addition, preservation knowledge of Archaeology is important in many ways, some of them are;

1. Preservation to create jobs through preservation and interpretive projects, e.g. cultural triangular.
2. Preservation enhances property values in historical districts, e.g. Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa, and Kandy.
3. Preservation revitalizes ones stagnant communities
4. Heritage sites are becoming increasingly popular with tourist destinations.

Background of the problem

According to lone-time experiences in education sector as a teacher, as an In-Service Advisor (ISA), as an Assistant Director of Education (ADE), as a Project Officer of National Institute of Education (NIE), Lecturer of Peradeniya University, Senior Lecturer and a Director of NIE, and Senior Lecturer of Rajarata University, I realized that History subject is taught as a separated and main subject in the secondary education system in school system in the country. Although Archaeology is the same value subject, but it is not taught in school system as a main subject, as a result this investigation was conducted to seek current situation of Archaeological education.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the proposed study is to investigate the teachers' perceptions on Archaeology subject for the secondary school system. In particular, study focuses on the following sub objectives;

- To review the nature of existing Archaeology and History subject related domains in secondary school syllabi
- To understand teachers' perceptions on separation of Archaeology component as a separate subject from the History subject in secondary level

- To study more suitable grades to teach Archaeology in secondary schools
- To identify recommendations for the improvement of students' Archaeological knowledge in secondary level

Questions of the study included seven questions to full file the four objectives of the study

Methodology of the study

Quantitative approach was selected to drive this research because quantitative data will be better to understand wider ranger ideas of the teachers of the system. A questionnaire was used as a data collecting instrument to collect quantitative data, however the questionnaire comprised some open-ended questions to get some extend qualitative data also.

The sample of the study

The sample of the study was 100 graduate teachers from Postgraduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) program (2015/2016) of Rajarata University of Sri Lanka and every participant responded to the questionnaire (N=100). The sample represented many districts, many Educational zones and many Governments and private schools and pirivens, even schools of the participants' are included in National, secondary, and primary. Further sample was included both male and female teachers and teachers' age range was 26 years to 51years.

Limitations of the study

The sample was not represented all geographical parts of the country, (teachers of the southern province of the Country were not represented) purposive sampling methods was used because time duration for the study was limited. This study basically focused to gather quantitative data through a questionnaire.

Analysis of the data

The questionnaire had seven questions in different angles and teachers were given opportunities to provide answers on the questionnaire and the questionnaire based on to collect data to fulfill four objectives of the study.

1st and 2nd questions were based on to get data, which were related to whether Archaeology component is separated or not from History subject. 60 percent participants believed that Archaeology subject should be separated from History subject and they provided reasons as after separation Archaeology can be taught deeply and broadly. In addition some answers of open-ended indicated that Archaeology should be separated, because in the University level Archaeology is a main subject therefore in the school level also Archaeology should be taught separately. 3rd question asked more appropriate grades in secondary schools to teach Archaeology subject, as a result majority of participants mentioned suitable grades are 12-13 (Advanced level). The result of 3rd question are given below in Table 01;

Table: 01 teachers' responds of 3rd question

	grades		percentage
01	1-5	primary	06
02	6-11	Junior secondary	33
03	12-13	Senior secondary	58
04	1-13	All grades	03

4th question focuses on collecting information about teachers, who should teach this subject in school level and data say majority of participant like that Archaeology should be taught by graduate teachers, who leant Archaeology in the University.

5th question of the questionnaire asked which name would be more appropriate for the new subject (Archaeology component that taken from the History subject) and the result are mentioned below;

Table: 02 teachers' responds of 5th question

	Proposed name	percentage
01	Archaeology	43
02	Heritage Study	41
03	Heritage and Cultural Study	11
04	Archaeology and Heritage	05
05	Other.....	00

Sixth question was based on to collect qualitative data accordingly future impact of Archaeology teaching in the schools on the people of the society. The data were categorized in different five themes. After completion Archaeology education people will be able to;

1. Develop positive attitudes to preserve and conservation the valuable Archaeological sites in the country.
2. Believe Archaeological sites are important resources to realize our past heritage.
3. Understand the Archaeological sites are effective educational tools for teachers and students.
4. Describe that Archaeological sites are highly important to enhance tourism in the country.
5. Analyze the relationship between Archaeology and ancient Irrigation system in the country

Final question of the questionnaire is related to realize teachers' ideas about teaching of Archaeology in schools, therefore this question was focused on to understand attitudes of the participants. It comprised seven statements and teachers had to select their selections from Five Likert scale regarding each statement. The summary of the teachers responded are, majority teachers highly agreed to introduce

Archaeology as a subject in school system, they highly agreed and believe that statement

statement	highly agreed	agreed	neutral	disagreed	highly disagreed
Archaeology should teach in schools as a main subject	06%	58%	31%	05%	non
after teaching Archaeology, consequently students' positive attitudes of archaeological and heritage are developed	40%	57%	03%	non	non
As an optional subject Archaeology should be taught in Postgraduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) program	04%	34%	38%	15%	9%
If that Archaeology is included in school curriculum as a new subject the time and space for other new technical subjects would be reduced	22%	43%	20%	15%	non
Archaeology subject should teach in schools which in archaeological site/districts only	1%	8%	4%	11%	76%
If we over concerned/emphasis about Archaeology that would be a bad effect to archaeological ruins, historical sites in Sri Lanka	11%	08%	2%	64%	15%
The society should compel to conserve valuable archaeological/historical sites through knowledge of Archaeology and heritage which acquire from the school education	63%	22%	13%	02%	non

Conclusion

The findings of the study have been very enlightening to us in formulating guidelines for forming a new subject as Archaeology in the school education system in Sri Lanka. Further findings proved that the new subject should be generated by separating current History subject in the system and then both subjects need to be developed separately composing the contents of the subjects.

Further the findings of the investigation shows new Archaeology subject will be taught grade 6-11 or grade 12-13 and teachers for teaching Archaeology should be graduates with Archaeology as main subject. In addition, data confirmations the name of the new Archaeology subject in the school Education system would be Archaeology.

The findings of the study could be used in education sector when making policies overtime reforming stages in the system in the country.

References

- Charlotte A. Smith.,(2001), *Georgia's hidden heritage risk.*, vol, 29, number 1 May 2001, the Society for Georgia Archaeology.
- Deraniyagala, S.U., (1992). *The Prehistory of Sri Lanka, an ecological perspective*, vol. I & II, Colombo: Archaeological Survey of Sri Lanka
- Ministry of Education. (2006). *History grade 10 teachers' handbook*, Department of Education Publication, Colombo.
- MOE (2004b). *The Development of Education: National Report. Ministry of Education*, Sri Lanka. Colombo.<http://www.ibe.unesco.org//International/ICE47/Englishreports/Srilanka.pdf>
- MOE (2005). *Education for Economic Development and Prosperity*. Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka. Colombo.
- MOE (2005). *Census Report*. Ministry of Education. Colombo.

MOE (2007). *Historical Overview of Education in Sri Lanka*. Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka. Colombo.

<http://www.moe.lk/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpa...>

NIE (2007). *General Information*. National Institute of Education-Sri Lanka.

Rambukwella1, C. (2015) *Archaeological Landscape of the Lower Montane Region of Sri Lanka: Socio-cultural Aspects of Archaeological Sites*; South Asia Culture, History & Heritage.

Tulloch, M. & Meyenn, R. (1992). *Quantitative Research in Education*. Darwin, National Library of Australia

Twining, P. (2007). *Educational research methodology- looking back and moving forward*. Open University, UK. Walton Hall.