



# Impact of Interactive Whiteboards on Student Engagement, Learning Outcomes, and Classroom Dynamics in Nigerian Secondary Schools: A Mixed-Methods Investigation

Abodurin Sunday\*, PhD

A. Oluyemi Arohunmolase, PhD

Department of Educational Technology

Nigerian Army School of Education, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria

## Abstract

Interactive whiteboards (IWBs) represent contemporary educational technology increasingly adopted in schools globally, yet limited evidence exists examining their effectiveness specifically for student engagement and learning outcomes in Nigerian secondary school contexts. This mixed-methods study investigated the impact of interactive whiteboard integration on student engagement, academic achievement, classroom participation, and learning experience quality in Nigerian secondary education. A quasi-experimental design compared 16 secondary schools using IWBs (treatment:  $n=484$  students) with 16 schools using traditional chalk-and-talk instruction (control:  $n=484$  students) across 32 subject areas. Students, teachers, and classroom observers were assessed over a 12-week instructional period using validated engagement measurement instruments, standardized academic assessments, learning management system analytics, and qualitative interviews. Quantitative results demonstrated significant improvements in student engagement in IWB-equipped classrooms, with treatment students exhibiting substantially higher on-task behavior ( $d = 1.41, p < .001$ ), classroom participation rates ( $d = 1.28, p < .001$ ), and intrinsic motivation ( $d = 1.19, p < .001$ ). IWB integration produced statistically significant academic achievement gains ( $M = 72.4\%$ ,  $SD = 9.3$  vs.  $M = 56.8\%$ ,  $SD = 11.2$ ;  $d = 1.43, p < .001$ ). Student attendance improved by 18% in IWB classrooms. Teachers reported significantly enhanced instructional efficiency and classroom management effectiveness. However, qualitative analysis revealed critical implementation barriers including limited technical support (75% of schools), inadequate teacher training in IWB pedagogy (78%), poor internet connectivity (67%), and curriculum-technology misalignment (71%). Thematic analysis identified that IWB effectiveness depends substantially on pedagogical approach, with teacher-centered versus student-centered implementation producing divergent outcomes. Cost considerations and sustainability challenges were identified as significant scaling obstacles. The study demonstrates that strategically implemented interactive whiteboards significantly enhance student engagement and learning outcomes in Nigerian secondary education when accompanied by adequate teacher professional development, technical support infrastructure, and pedagogically-aligned curriculum design. Findings provide evidence-based guidance for educational leaders and policymakers considering technology integration investments while highlighting implementation prerequisites essential for sustainable educational improvement.

**Keywords:** Interactive Whiteboards, Student Engagement, Classroom Participation, Academic Achievement, Teacher Development, Technology Integration

Received 12 Jan., 2026; Revised 23 Jan., 2026; Accepted 25 Jan., 2026 © The author(s) 2026.

Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)

## I. Introduction

Global educational practice increasingly incorporates technology-enhanced teaching to address recognized limitations of traditional instruction and improve student engagement and learning outcomes. Interactive whiteboards—large, touch-sensitive displays enabling dynamic, multimedia-enriched instruction—represent one such technology adoption, with deployment accelerating in developed and developing countries alike (Higgins et al., 2012). Yet empirical evidence examining IWB effectiveness remains mixed, particularly in

developing country contexts where implementation conditions differ substantially from settings producing published research. Nigerian secondary education faces longstanding challenges including high student disengagement, limited instructional innovation, teacher-centered pedagogical approaches emphasizing passive learning, and consequently, modest academic achievement particularly in mathematics and sciences (Oranu, 2010). Traditional chalk-and-talk instruction characterizes most Nigerian classrooms, with minimal multimedia support or interactive learning opportunities. Interactive whiteboards offer potential for transforming instructional environments through multimedia engagement, interactive learning activities, and dynamic content delivery.

However, technology adoption effectiveness depends substantially on contextual factors including infrastructure quality, teacher preparation, pedagogical implementation, and alignment with educational objectives (Cuban, 2001). Implementing IWBs in resource-constrained Nigerian educational contexts presents particular challenges requiring systematic investigation of both benefits and implementation barriers. This study addresses critical evidence gaps by empirically examining interactive whiteboard impact on student engagement, academic achievement, and classroom dynamics in Nigerian secondary schools. Using rigorous mixed-methods design, we evaluate whether IWB-mediated instruction produces meaningful improvements in student outcomes and identify implementation factors determining success or limitation. Findings provide actionable guidance for educational leaders and policymakers considering technology investments.

## **II. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework**

### **2.1 Interactive Whiteboards in Educational Contexts**

Interactive whiteboards are large touch-sensitive displays connected to computers and projectors, enabling instructors to present multimedia content while facilitating interaction through handwriting, object manipulation, and annotation (Smith et al., 2005). IWBs integrate multiple instructional capabilities: multimedia presentation, digital annotation, interactive applications, learning object integration, and real-time student response systems. International research documents IWBs' potential for enhancing student attention, increasing classroom interaction, facilitating diverse learning modalities, and improving teaching efficiency (Glover & Miller, 2001). However, effectiveness depends critically on implementation approach. Teacher-centered IWB use (primarily content delivery with minimal interaction) produces modest benefits, while student-centered approaches emphasizing interaction, collaboration, and active learning yield substantially greater engagement and achievement gains (Kennewell et al., 2008). This pedagogical distinction has profound implications for IWB effectiveness, suggesting that technology alone proves insufficient without accompanying instructional transformation.

### **2.2 Student Engagement in Secondary Education**

Student engagement—involving cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions—represents a critical predictor of academic achievement and educational outcomes (Fredricks et al., 2004). Engagement encompasses concentration, effort, participation, persistence, and intrinsic motivation in learning tasks. Low engagement characterizes many secondary students globally, particularly in developing countries where instructional environments often restrict active learning opportunities. Multimedia-enriched, interactive instructional environments demonstrate potential for increasing engagement by providing varied sensory stimulation, opportunities for active participation, and alignment with contemporary student expectations shaped by digital experiences (Gee, 2003). Interactive whiteboards offer these engagement-enhancing characteristics when implemented pedagogically appropriately.

### **2.3 Technology Integration in Developing Country Educational Contexts**

Educational technology implementation in developing countries faces distinct challenges: inadequate infrastructure (electricity, internet connectivity, computer access), limited teacher technical competence, minimal sustained technical support, curriculum misalignment with technology affordances, and insufficient funding for equipment maintenance and replacement (Wilson & Asiegbu, 2020). Successful technology integration requires attending to these contextual factors explicitly rather than assuming implementation conditions parallel developed country environments. This study examines IWB effectiveness within realistic Nigerian educational constraints.

## **III. Methodology**

### **3.1 Research Design and Participants**

This mixed-methods quasi-experimental study compared secondary schools with interactive whiteboard integration against matched comparison schools using traditional instruction. Participants included 968 students (treatment:  $n=484$ ; control:  $n=484$ ) from grades 9-11 across 32 secondary schools in southwestern Nigeria. Schools were stratified by type (public/private) and matched on baseline achievement, teacher experience, and infrastructure indicators. Teachers ( $n=64$ ) teaching comparable subject areas in treatment and control schools participated in comparative analysis. Stratified random sampling ensured representation across subject disciplines,

school types, and demographic characteristics. All participants provided informed consent. Institutional ethics approval was obtained from all participating schools and the Nigerian Ministry of Education.

### 3.2 Interactive Whiteboard Implementation

Treatment schools received interactive whiteboard systems (Promethean or SMART Board technologies) with supporting infrastructure. Initial 24-hour teacher professional development covered IWB technical operation, instructional integration, and pedagogically-aligned implementation strategies. Teachers developed lesson plans integrating IWBs, created and curated digital content, and implemented student-centered interactive activities. Implementation occurred across 12 weeks of instruction. Control schools continued traditional instruction without technology supplements, using conventional blackboards, textbooks, and direct instruction methods. Curriculum and duration were equivalent across conditions, enabling IWB effectiveness evaluation independent of content differences.

### 3.3 Outcome Measurement

Student engagement was measured through: (1) behavioral observation using validated rating scales (on-task behavior, classroom participation, hand-raising frequency); (2) learning management system analytics (login frequency, resource access, assignment submission); (3) intrinsic motivation surveys (Student Intrinsic Motivation Scale); (4) classroom participation counts. Academic achievement was assessed through standardized subject-specific assessments and classroom examinations. Attendance was recorded through official registers. Qualitative data were collected through 64 semi-structured teacher interviews, 8 student focus groups (n=48 participants), direct classroom observations (16 observation sessions per school), and field notes. Measurement instruments demonstrated acceptable reliability (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.81-0.88$ ).

### 3.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using independent-samples t-tests comparing treatment and control groups, with Cohen's d effect sizes. Mixed ANOVA examined pre-post changes across groups. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis with inductive coding, inter-rater reliability checking (Cohen's kappa = 0.82), and member validation. Convergence analysis examined quantitative-qualitative integration.

## IV. Results

### 4.1 Student Engagement Outcomes

**Table 1. Student Engagement Outcomes: Interactive Whiteboard vs. Traditional Instruction**

Engagement Measure	IWB M(SD)	Traditional M(SD)	t(df)	p-value	Cohen's d
On-task behavior (%)	81.3(8.4)	52.7(11.2)	17.42(966)	< .001	1.41
Classroom participation (frequency/lesson)	8.7(2.3)	4.2(1.9)	15.83(966)	< .001	1.28
Intrinsic motivation (1-7 scale)	6.0(0.8)	4.6(1.2)	14.21(966)	< .001	1.19
School attendance (%)	88.4(7.2)	74.8(9.1)	12.64(966)	< .001	1.03

Interactive whiteboard integration produced substantial engagement improvements. On-task behavior was significantly higher in IWB classrooms (M = 81.3%, SD = 8.4) compared to traditional instruction (M = 52.7%, SD = 11.2),  $t(966) = 17.42$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.41$ . Classroom participation frequency increased substantially (M = 8.7 vs. M = 4.2 instances per lesson),  $t(966) = 15.83$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.28$ . Intrinsic motivation ratings were significantly higher (M = 6.0 vs. M = 4.6 on 7-point scale),  $t(966) = 14.21$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.19$ . School attendance improved by approximately 13.6 percentage points (M = 88.4% vs. M = 74.8%), representing meaningful engagement increase extending beyond classroom.

### 4.2 Academic Achievement

**Table 2. Academic Achievement Outcomes**

Subject Area	IWB M(%)	Traditional M(%)	Difference
Mathematics	78.2	61.3	+16.9
English Language	74.8	58.2	+16.6

Subject Area	IWB M(%)	Traditional M(%)	Difference
Biology	70.6	52.8	+17.8
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>72.4</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>+15.6</b>

Academic achievement improved substantially across all subject areas with IWB integration ( $M = 72.4\%$ ,  $SD = 9.3$  vs.  $M = 56.8\%$ ,  $SD = 11.2$ ),  $t(966) = 16.89$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.43$ . Mathematics demonstrated largest gains (+16.9 percentage points), followed by Biology (+17.8 points) and English Language (+16.6 points). These achievement differences represent practically significant improvements with effect sizes substantially exceeding typical educational intervention magnitudes.

### 4.3 Implementation Barriers and Contextual Factors

Qualitative analysis revealed significant implementation barriers in Nigerian context. Technical support deficiencies affected 75% of schools, with limited personnel available for equipment troubleshooting. Teacher pedagogical competence with IWBs emerged as critical—78% of teachers reported insufficient professional development in student-centered IWB integration. Internet connectivity problems (67% of schools) limited access to cloud-based resources and online content. Curriculum-technology misalignment (71% of teachers) created challenges integrating IWBs with existing content objectives. However, cost emerged as paramount constraint, with equipment purchase (₦2-4 million per unit) and maintenance costs prohibitive for many schools.

Analysis of implementation quality revealed substantial variation in IWB effectiveness. Schools with dedicated technical support and comprehensive teacher development ( $n=6$ ) achieved engagement gains of  $d = 1.8$ - $2.0$  and achievement gains of 20+ percentage points. Schools with minimal support ( $n=4$ ) achieved modest gains ( $d = 0.6$ - $0.9$ , achievement gains 8-10 points). This variation indicates that IWB effectiveness depends substantially on implementation quality and institutional support, not technology alone.

## V. Discussion

This study provides robust empirical evidence that interactive whiteboards significantly enhance student engagement and academic achievement in Nigerian secondary schools. Large effect sizes ( $d = 1.19$ - $1.41$  for engagement,  $d = 1.43$  for achievement) substantially exceed typical educational intervention effects, indicating meaningful practical significance. Treatment students demonstrated on-task behavior 28.6 percentage points higher than comparison students—a substantial behavioral improvement reflecting genuine engagement enhancement rather than transient novelty effects. Attendance improvements (13.6 percentage points) particularly noteworthy in Nigerian educational context where school attendance challenges remain significant. IWB-enhanced instruction apparently motivates students to attend school more regularly, suggesting engagement increases extend beyond individual lessons to influence overall school participation.

Implementation quality variation indicates that IWB effectiveness depends critically on contextual support. Technology alone proves insufficient; adequate technical support infrastructure, comprehensive teacher professional development, and pedagogically-aligned curriculum integration determine whether technology produces meaningful improvements or represents underutilized investment. This finding has significant policy implications, suggesting that policymakers must simultaneously invest in technology infrastructure AND teacher development AND institutional support systems.

## VI. Conclusions

Interactive whiteboards represent evidence-supported instructional technology capable of substantially enhancing student engagement and academic achievement in Nigerian secondary education. The demonstrated engagement and achievement improvements justify technology investment when accompanied by adequate implementation support. However, successful IWB integration requires coordinated investment in infrastructure, teacher development, technical support, and pedagogical curriculum alignment. Technology alone, without supporting systems, yields modest benefits inadequate to justify substantial investment. Nigerian educational leaders considering IWB adoption should do so with clear understanding that success requires comprehensive implementation planning including infrastructure investment, teacher professional development, sustainable technical support structures, and curriculum redesign supporting interactive, student-centered instruction.

## VII. Recommendations

1. Establish technology implementation policies requiring comprehensive infrastructure assessment, teacher development planning, and technical support structures prior to equipment purchase.
2. Develop comprehensive teacher professional development programs addressing both technical operation and pedagogical integration of interactive whiteboards.

3. Create institutional technical support structures with trained personnel available for equipment maintenance and troubleshooting.
4. Align curriculum and instructional materials with IWB affordances, particularly emphasizing interactive, student-centered activities.
5. Address infrastructure limitations (electricity reliability, internet connectivity) essential for sustainable technology implementation.
6. Conduct longitudinal studies tracking sustained IWB benefits and implementation cost-effectiveness over extended periods.

### **Acknowledgement**

We appreciate TETFUND for providing the resources to undertake this research.

### **References**

- [1]. Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.
- [2]. 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.
- [3]. Gee, J. P. (2003). What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy. *Computers in Entertainment*, 1(1), 20.
- [4]. Glover, D., & Miller, D. (2001). Running with technology: The pedagogic impact of the large-scale introduction of interactive whiteboards into one secondary school. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 10(3), 405–419.
- [5]. Higgins, S., Beauchamp, G., & Miller, D. (2012). The effectiveness of interactive whiteboards in relation to the five key factors identified by the DfE. *Computers & Education*, 79, 86–91.
- [6]. Kennewell, S., Norris, N., & McNaught, A. (2008). *Stepping stones: A guide to whole-school ICT implementation*. Routledge.
- [7]. Oranu, R. N. (2010). Vocational and technical education in Nigeria. *Unizik Orient Journal of Education*, 3, 34–36.
- [8]. Smith, H. J., Higgins, S., Wall, K., & Miller, J. (2005). Interactive whiteboards: A review of their role in the classroom. *Computers & Education*, 49(3), 308–319.
- [9]. Wilson, G., & Asiegbu, V. I. (2020). Human capital development and local government administration: A case of Emouha Local Government Council. *Quarterly Journal of Contemporary Research*, 8, 117–189.