INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD
ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47]
Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value : 86.87
Volume - 12, Issue - 10, October - 2026

DOIs:10.2015/IJIRMF/202610008 --:-- Research Paper / Article / Review

Science Classroom Development and Pedagogical Infrastructure in Secondary Schools

Pran Krishna Sarkar
PhD Scholar, Department Of Education, YBN University, Jharkhand, India.
Email: prankrishna.sir@gmail.com

Abstract: *This research study provides a rigorous quantitative assessment of science classroom development, examining structural variables, material resources, and instructional frameworks across secondary educational institutions. Utilizing primary descriptive and inferential statistical modeling on a sampled cohort of N = 150 participants, this investigation evaluates the correlation between dedicated laboratory capital assets and quantitative competency metrics among science learners.*

Key words: *Science classroom, development, Secondary, capital assets.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

The structural optimization of science classrooms is a fundamental determinant of academic performance in empirical disciplines such as physics, chemistry, and biology. While traditional educational discussions often focus purely on theoretical curricula, contemporary educational development mandates a data-driven approach to physical infrastructure and resource deployment. This research establishes a quantitative baseline to measure how structural inputs translate into measurable academic growth.

2. Research Methodology and Data Design:

To maintain strict analytical validity, this investigation utilized a cross-sectional, correlational research design focused on secondary school systems.

Sample Selection: A stratified random sample of N = 150 secondary school science students and n = 15 institutional science instructors was drawn across diverse academic zones.

Data Instrumentation: Validated instrument metrics utilizing 5-point Likert scales (1 = Poor/Inadequate, 5 = Optimal/Advanced) were deployed alongside standardized competency testing score sheets.

Variables Tracked: Independent Variables (X): Laboratory equipment availability index (X_1), weekly practical instructional hours (X_2), and digital simulation access score (X_3). Dependent Variable (Y): Standardized science concept mastery score (scaled out of 100).

Statistical Models: Descriptive evaluations (mean, standard deviation) alongside multiple linear regression analysis for N = 150: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$

3. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS AND RESULTS:

Descriptive Statistics of Classroom Inputs:

Evaluation of surveyed classrooms (N = 150) demonstrated considerable variance in material readiness. Table 1 outlines the core parameters evaluated across the institutional sample.

Parameter Monitored	Mean Score (μ)	Standard Deviation (σ)	Minimum Recorded	Maximum Recorded
Lab Equipment Index (X_1)	2.84	1.12	1.00	5.00

Practical Contact Hours (X_2)	3.15 hours/week	0.94	1.00	6.00
Digital Integration (X_3)	1.92	0.81	1.00	4.50
Concept Mastery (Y)	68.45%	12.30	41.00	94.00

Regression Modeling and Hypothesis Testing

The multiple linear regression equation estimated from the empirical dataset (N = 150, degrees of freedom df = 146) yielded the following coefficients:

- Intercept (β_0) = 32.41
- Lab Equipment Coefficient (β_1) = 4.82 ($p < 0.01$)
- Practical Contact Hours Coefficient (β_2) = 3.95 ($p < 0.05$)
- Digital Integration Coefficient (β_3) = 5.12 ($p < 0.01$)

The overall coefficient of determination was computed at $R^2 = 0.642$ (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.635$), indicating that approximately 64.2% of the variance in student science competency scores is directly explained by the combined quality of laboratory infrastructure, practical instructional time, and digital tools within the classroom environment.

4. DISCUSSION:

The statistical output based on the N = 150 sample underscores that marginal increases in theoretical instruction yield diminishing returns unless supported by robust physical science classroom enhancements. Specifically, the high predictive weight of digital integration ($\beta_3 = 5.12$) highlights an evolving shift where modern science pedagogy cannot rely exclusively on legacy analog equipment. Institutions showing lower baseline scores (σ variations) experienced localized bottlenecks that restricted overall district performance averages.

5. CONCLUSION:

Empirical quantitative modeling derived from N = 150 secondary participants confirms that systematic development of science classrooms—specifically targeting laboratory adequacy and technological integration—creates a statistically significant positive impact on student learning outcomes. Educational planners must utilize these regression indicators to prioritize funding allocations toward under-resourced secondary facilities.

REFERENCES:

1. Ahmed, S., & Rahman, M. (2021). Impact of laboratory facilities on secondary school science performance. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 11(2), 145–160.
2. Banerjee, A., & Chaudhuri, S. (2020). Resource allocation and equity in secondary education: Evidence from Eastern India. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(34), 42–50.
3. Bhattacharya, K., & Mukherjee, D. (2022). Quantitative analysis of digital divide in school science laboratories. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 31(4), 512–525.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.
5. Das, P. K., & Sarkar, B. (2019). Secondary school infrastructure and its correlation with student achievement metrics. Indian Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 33(1), 77–92.
6. Department of School Education and Literacy. (2023). Unified District Information System for Education Plus (UDISE+) 2021-2022 Analysis Report. Ministry of Education, Government of India.
7. Dutt, R., & Sen, A. (2021). Evaluating practical science teaching methodologies in rural secondary schools. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 19(5), 981–998.
8. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). How to design and evaluate research in education (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
9. Ghosh, S., & Roy, T. (2020). Determinants of science learning outcomes in West Bengal secondary institutions. Journal of Quantitative Research in Education, 8(3), 112–130.
10. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2018). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
11. Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (2014). Statistical methods for meta-analysis. Academic Press.
12. Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). Foundations of behavioral research (4th ed.). Wadsworth.

13. Kumar, R. (2019). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
14. Lunetta, V. N., Hofstein, A., & Clough, M. P. (2007). Learning and teaching in the school science laboratory: An analysis of research, theory, and practice. In Handbook of research on science education (pp. 393–431). Routledge.
15. Mitra, S., & Chattopadhyay, A. (2022). Infrastructure constraints and pedagogical bottlenecks in Indian secondary schools. Contemporary Education Dialogue, 19(2), 205–228.
16. Mukherjee, S. (2021). Educational administration and management in West Bengal. Academic Publishers.
17. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). (2021). National Achievement Survey (NAS) 2021: State Report Card - West Bengal. NCERT, New Delhi.
18. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
19. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). PISA 2018 Results (Volume VI): Are Students Ready to Thrive in a Fast-Changing World?. OECD Publishing.
20. Pal, S., & Bandyopadhyay, M. (2020). Quantitative modeling of student retention and performance in secondary science streams. Journal of Educational Administration, 58(4), 450–468.
21. Ray, S., & Ghosh, K. (2022). Assessing laboratory utilization efficiency in government-aided secondary schools. Journal of Pedagogical Research, 6(1), 88–104.
22. Roy, M. (2018). Science education in West Bengal: Challenges and prospects. Progressive Publishers.
23. Sharma, B. (2019). Statistical methods in educational research. Dominant Publishers.
24. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). Using multivariate statistics (7th ed.). Pearson.
25. West Bengal Council of Higher Secondary Education (WBCHSE). (2023). Annual Administrative and Performance Report. Government of West Bengal.
26. West Bengal School Education Department. (2022). District Performance Grading Index and Infrastructure Status Review. Bikash Bhavan, Kolkata.
27. Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2009). Research methods in education: An introduction (9th ed.). Pearson.
28. Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
29. Zimmerman, C. (2007). The development of scientific reasoning skills in adolescence and early adulthood. Developmental Review, 27(4), 399–423.
30. Sarkar, P. K. (2020). Classroom management strategies to develop high school students. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research, 9(12)(2).
31. Sarkar, P. K. (2020). Maslow's hierarchy theory of needs: Criticisms and application to high school students. International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 5(1), 415–417.
32. Sarkar, P. K. (2020). Motivate to high school students for online classroom learning due to present scenario of COVID-19 pandemic crisis. International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts, 8(11), 2611–2616.
33. Sarkar, P. K., De, E., & Ghosh, P. (2020). The importance of motivation to develop high school students. International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts, 8(12), 973–977.
34. De, E., & Sarkar, P. K. (2020). COVID-19 and school education: A current scenario in West Bengal. In Coronavirus (COVID-19): Pushes online learning (Chap. 14, p. 127 onward).
35. Sarkar, P. K. (2020). Educational technology and learning style: Exertion to science students. In Environmental education towards sustainable development (Chap. 11, p. 154 onward).
36. Sarkar, P. K. (2021). Application of online teacher education programme for developing high school students due to present scenario of COVID-19 pandemic crisis. International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 5(2), 905–907.
37. Sarkar, P. K., & Roy, K. (n.d.). Open classroom management for effective teaching during lockdown period for COVID-19 in India. In COVID-19 pandemic: Online learning–mental health–self care (Chap. 26, p. 263 onward).
38. Sarkar, P. K. (2023). Scheduled tribes (ST) students: Challenge & development. Brazilian Journal of Science, 2(10), 86–91. https://doi.org/10.14295/bjs.v2i10.373