THE PRACTICE OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: THE CASE OF LECTURE AND DISCUSSION METHODS IN ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

BY:
ASHENAFI ASSEFA DEMOZE

May 2002
Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

THE PRACTICE OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: THE CASE OF LECTURE AND DISCUSSION METHODS IN ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

BY:
ASHENAFI ASSEFA DEMOZE

Approved by Board of Examiners

_____	_____
Chairman, Department Graduate Committee	Signature
_____	_____
Advisor,	Signature
_____	_____
Examiner, External	Signature
_____	_____
Examiner Internal	Signature

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been dully acknowledged.

_____

ASHENAFI ASSEFA DEMOZE

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

_____

Dr. TEMECHEGN ENGIDA

Acknowledgements

Heartfelt thanks are due to Dr. Temechegn Engida, my thesis advisor, for his tenacious guidance; follow up, constructive comments and useful suggestions. The study will not be materialized without his unreserved comments.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my dearly loved wife, Tsega Getachew, and my daughter, Kalkidan Ashenafi, who shared all life burdens during my stay in the graduate studies.

I want to extend my sincere gratitude to pensioned Getachew Beshah who looked after my family in all humanly possible ways.

Very special thanks go to my sister, Senait Mamo, and my brother, Workneh Assefa, who backed me in all possible ways whenever a need arises.

I am also indebted to Ethiopian American Foundation (EAF) a collaborate organization with IDR(AAU) for partial financial support of this study.

I am also indebted to Dr. Teshome Nekatibebe who helped me to mitigate my financial problem and complete my study successfully.

Finally, I owe my gratitude to all my colleagues who provided their constant assistance and encouragement towards the completion of my study. Particularly, special thanks are due to Bruke Kassa, Diriba Megersa and Ezra Abate, friends in need, and Adamu, who helped me in debriefing statistical techniques used in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPTER FIVE

LIST OF TABLES

Pages

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT

AAU: Addis Ababa University

CSS: College of Social Sciences

FBE: Faculty of Business and Economics

FOE: Faculty of Education

FOL: Faculty of Law

ILS: Institute of Language Studies

SISA: School of Information Studies for Africa

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess to what extent lecture and/or discussion method of teaching is used in AAU. Lecture and discussion method of teaching are used as indicators of direct and indirect instructional strategies respectively. The study also examined the factors that most influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods. Moreover, the influence of level of qualification, academic rank, and pedagogical knowledge of instructors in the process of instructional method selection and utilization was also surveyed.

To effectuate this, descriptive survey was employed. A sample of 97 male and 19 female instructors of AAU in the SSC, ILS, FOE, FOL, FBE, and SISA was randomly selected. And 20 available classrooms with minimum number of forty and above were observed. In addition to observing the teaching-learning process in twenty selected classrooms with the help of checklist, a questionnaire constructed in terms of open and close-ended items, rating and Likert scale were employed in the process of data gathering.

The data gathered via questionnaire and observation checklist were analyzed using the simple percentile, weight mean rank, and chi-square statistics. The analysis revealed that lecture and discussion are among the widely used instructional methods in the SSC, ILS, FOE, FOL, FBE, and SISA of AAU. Lecture in isolation, and lecture in combination with other methods of teaching were frequently used in comparison with lecture and discussion together, discussion in isolation, and discussion with other method of teaching. Besides, lecture and discussion together, lecture together with other method of teaching, and discussion with other method of teaching was used in comparable manner. On top of this, instructors do not perceive level of qualification as influential factor in the process of instructional method selection and utilization, though the statistical analysis indicated the other way. Academic rank was perceived as a contributing factor in the process of instructional method selection and utilization. Conversely, however, the statistical analysis didn't tell so. The pedagogical exposure of instructors found to be an influential factor in the process of instructional method selection and utilization; however, the majority of AAU instructors in the above specified disciplines except FOE have no pedagogical Knowledge either via pre- or in-service training.

CHAPTER ONE

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The main objective of an educational institution is to bring behavioral change in terms of cognitive, skill, and attitude. In order to achieve these objectives methods of instruction or methods of teaching employed or to be employed are one of the means among the many. This is so because the effectiveness of teaching-learning process is primarily dependent upon the method selected and used by instructors at different levels of an educational system. However, selection and utilization of instructional methods is not an instantaneous activity of a teacher or a student or both, it rather depends upon many factors. Supporting this Bajah (1995:165) mentioned some of the factors that should be considered in selecting methods of teaching. These are the purpose or objective of learning and the level required, group size, local constraints such as time available and facilities, the degree of autonomy of the learners, any preferences or dislikes of the instructors. These factors, in turn, have different degree of influence on the various teaching methods.

Thus, in order to comprehend these factors, a research must be carried out about the nature and practice of methods of teaching. Generally, different authorities in the field have classified methods of teaching into two broad categories employing different terminologies. These are teacher-centered versus learner-centered approach, direct instruction versus indirect instruction, conventional versus non-conventional methods, traditional versus modern (non-traditional) approach. Though these classifications of instructional strategies use different terminologies, mostly they have a similar

conceptual frame of reference. This is the degree of students' participation in the instructional process (teaching-learning process) (Borich, 1988; Curzon, 1990; Arends, 1997; and ICDR, 1999).

In this study the researcher will use direct instruction versus indirect instruction strategies through out the text for the sake of consistency. (See the operational definition of these concepts in section 1. 7).

The direct strategies of instruction also known as active teaching, explicit teaching, teacher-centered, conventional and traditional methods of teaching, encompass at least the lecture, demonstration, question and answer, recitation, classroom discourse methods and techniques of teaching. While the indirect strategy of instruction includes inquiry learning, discussion, seminar, tutorial, case study, discovery learning, problem-solving, cooperative learning approach (Borich,1988; Curzon, 1990; Arends,1997; and ICDR,1999;).Therefore, to study the general practice of instruction in higher learning institution by focusing on specific methods of teaching from the two categories is a wise endeavor.

According to Gage (1976); Mckeachie (1986); Rogers (1989); and Bajah (1995), lecture and tutorial have been the main methods used in the universities, with the lecture being the most common one that continued to this day too. Conversely, these days due to knowledge explosion and emergence of new specialisms teaching-learning process has placed greater demand on both students and instructors of higher learning institutions. As a result more active and student-centered teaching methods, more

dialogue and positive action to help students exchange their passive listening role for more active, participatory and independent learning became the demand of the day (Bajah, 1995; Davis, 1981; Arends, 1997; Mckeachie, 1986). Does this hold true in our higher learning institutions?

Thus, the overall status of teaching methods with specific reference to lecture and discussion methods of teaching will be surveyed in the context of higher learning institutions (in this case in A.A.U.).

Addis Ababa University since its establishment as HIUC in 1950 has manifested colossal change by establishing new departments and expanding the already existing ones during its foundation. Currently, it is a public Institution and incorporates seven faculties, one college, two schools, and five institutes. All the divisions are located on eight campuses and run both the teaching and research activities. It awards diploma for its graduates. The University has 964 academic staff (A.A.U. 2000). And the study focuses on the academic staff of the university primarily to assess the existing practice of teaching methods in the university irrespective of subject areas.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As it is indicated in the introductory part of this paper, generally speaking teaching methods are categorized into two: direct instruction and indirect instruction strategies. These two strategies of instruction have been employed in all levels of educational institutions though the degree of utilization varies depending upon the level of the educational institutions. Why? To answer this question various educational researchers

have conducted many researches. The nature of the research conducted varies from conducting on a single method to comparative study of methods in the categories mentioned above. From these researches the study on the characteristics and use of lecture and discussion method is pervasive among researchers (see literature review part for details).

Conversely, there is no research conducted that show the nature and use of lecture and discussion methods in the Ethiopian higher learning institutions (Specifically in Addis Ababa University).

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to disclose the practice of lecture and discussion methods in the Addis Ababa University. Besides, this study reveals the major factors that influence the selection and utilization of teaching methods in the selected higher learning institution that is, Addis Ababa University.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To this end, therefore, the study tries to answer the following basic questions:

1. To what extent do instructors use lecture and/or discussion methods of instruction?
2. How frequently lecture and discussion methods of teaching are used in combination with one another and with other methods of teaching in a lesson?
3. What are the factors that influence the choice of instructional methods in general, and lecture and discussion methods in particular?

4. Does level of qualification/academic rank influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods?
5. Is there any difference between instructors who took professional (pedagogical) courses and who didn't take professional (pedagogical) courses in the selection and utilization of instructional methods?

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In order to make educational institutions carry out their missions effectively, studying the way the teaching-learning process is enacted should be an indispensable activity. Thus, to ensure the attainability of the goal intended the means should be scrutinized thoroughly. One of the means to achieve the end is the method of instruction employed, i.e., the nature and practice of the methods of instruction. Hence, to achieve this, probing the current practice of educational institutions is one of the activities among the many.

Generally, this study is expected to have the following contributions:

1. The findings of the study will show the current practice of different teaching methods in general, and the lecture and discussion method in particular.

2. By finding out whether instructors are largely dependent upon a single or two or different teaching methods, the findings will help to forward some remedial if there exists any pitfall regarding the selection and utilization of appropriate methods of teaching for a specific situation.

3. The study looks the first of its kind in analyzing the kind of teaching methods employed in our (Ethiopian) higher learning institutions in general and Addis Ababa University in particular. Thus, it is expected to show the current practice of instructors in attempting to convey knowledge, skill, and attitude through the method being focused.

4. As the study is not subject specific, it might show which methods of teaching is dominant in higher learning institutions in general and Addis Ababa University in particular (if there is any).

1.5 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study is restricted to the teaching-learning process of AAU specifically to the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of language studies, with an emphasis to lecture and discussion method of teaching. This is, primarily, due to the nature of discussion method of teaching that is used in the social science and related fields.

According to research findings in Lancaster University, discussion is generally proven to be most appropriate for instruction in the social sciences, languages, and humanities, which are thought to be "low consensus" fields than natural sciences that are dependent on mathematical and mechanical analogies (Ramsden, 1979; Gage and Berliner,1979).

To this end, therefore, the research is confined to three faculties, one school, one institute, and one college. Viz. Faculty of Education, Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies.

1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The most prominent problem in conducting this research was shortage of time and money. It is also accompanied by the unusual practice of AAU. Due to this unusual practice many classrooms were under numbered. According to AAU (1994/95) Senate legislation the minimum teacher-student ratio in the university is 1:40.

Consequently, the researcher was obliged to observe available classrooms with forty and above students. This forcing factor influenced the sample size to be observed and then normal distribution of the sample to include from all the academic rank and qualification. But the researcher tried to include as much as possible.

1.7 DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Direct Instruction: is a kind of instructional strategy that is characterized by teacher-dominated behavior where the teacher mostly telling and the student passively listening or taking notes.

Indirect instruction: is an instructional approach where a teacher plays a facilitator role with helping students to find out solutions by posing questions, guiding, indicating sources of information, sharing ideas and problems.

Humanities Science: Is a branch of learning that deal with human thoughts and culture such as history, drama, art, literature, language, philosophy, etc. (Encyclopedia Americana, 1983: 555).

Qualification: refers to the level of education instructors have at the time of this study.

Academic rank: refers to the professional status of instructors at the time of this study.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES IN HIGHER LEARNING INSTITUTIONS

All activities that are used to implement a program make up the instructional strategies (Amare, et.al, 2000:95). This is to mean that instructional strategies are a means to an end. This end that educational institutions are basically established for is to bring positive behavioral change in their learners.

As it is indicated in the introductory part of this paper broadly instructional strategies are divided into two: direct and indirect instructional strategies. These categories stand upon the philosophy of the instructional process that determines the degree of teacher dominance and student involvement (Borich, 1988; Borich, 1996; Arends, 1997; ICDR, 1999). Institutions, however, have to consider variety of teaching strategies that facilitate the learning process to effectively hit the intended target. According to Azeb (1986) Amare,et.al(2000) instructors have to use a variety of teaching methods based on the type of objectives and level required to be achieved. They also pointed out some of the teaching-learning methods and techniques that are to be incorporated in the new curriculum of the university (i.e. A.A.U) and to be employed by instructors appropriately. These are laboratories, field experiences, issue-focused problems, discussions, debates cooperative learning, student writing, student reading, student speaking, student explanations-of-concepts, analysis of data, lectures, demonstrations, and audiovisuals. With all these varieties the very objective of teaching is to promote learning in students (Gagne, 1976). However, the

existence of these varieties doesn't guarantee the effectiveness of instructional process; rather effective utilization of these methods and techniques determine the results.

Conversely, in A.A.U. there seems to be general agreement among educators that lecture and demonstration methods of teaching are over-used. However, the writers of this guideline advise instructors of A.A.U. to give due attention to indirect instructional strategies (Amare, et.al, 2000). This is so because the traditional motto of teaching that predominantly consider the instructor as major source and transmitter of knowledge give green light to a modern way of teaching that facilitate student learning by their own pace (Hussen, 2000; Wakshum, 2001). Nevertheless, this does not mean that we have to ban all the traditional teaching strategies i.e. direct instructional strategies. Rather instructors have to facilitate student own learning than compelling them to learn. To put this into practice instructors have to choose an instructional strategy that best fits the objective of the lesson than taking one method of teaching or teaching technique as sufficient means of teaching and learning in the classroom for the mere reason that they feel comfortable with it.

To this end, therefore, in higher learning institutions all teaching methods that are subsumed under the broad category of the two instructional strategies (i.e. direct and indirect instruction) can be used hinge on the objective of the lesson to be accomplished, teaching-learning milieu, students' involvement in the teaching-learning process and the level of objective to be achieved during the teaching-

learning process. Emphasizing this idea Zaudneh, Darge, and Nardos (1989) stated unequivocally:

> *Generally, instructions at higher levels involve a good deal of lectures. However, due emphasis should be given to discussions and independent-work…. Hence, it is essential to use a balance of teaching (strategies) for a subject area or program (p.11).*

In toto, there is no single method of teaching that is pertinent for higher learning institutions. To the contrary, all teaching methods and techniques are suitable for tertiary level teaching as far as the above mentioned factors let the instructors to use a certain method of teaching.

2.2 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF DIRECT INSTRUCTION

The term direct instruction has appeared in educational literature since at least 1920. Since then the term is used interchangeably with other similar terms as systematic teaching, explicit instruction, explicit teaching, active teaching, expository or didactic teaching, formal instruction, mastery teaching, and structured approach (Rosenshine, 1976; Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986; Rosenshine, 1987; Borich, 1988; 1996; Arends, 1997; Rinne, 1997). Its rationale as a strategy of instruction rooted in the theory system analysis, social learning theory or behavioral modeling theory and effectiveness research. In addition to these, it emanated from training procedures developed in industrial and military settings (Arends, 1997).

Direct instruction is basically teacher-centered strategy that usually serves to address large group of students. In this type of teaching-learning process the instructor uses highly structured content and teaching procedure. Lecture and explanation, controlled practice, question and answer, feedback in the form of approval, remark, questions, clues and recommendations are among some of the many teaching methods and techniques that are used by instructors. I.e. almost the instructor completely controls the content and the teaching rate of the classroom milieu in direct instruction (Callahan and Clark, 1988).

As Dewey in Withall (1987) pointed out in these teacher-centered approach standards, contents, and methods are determined by instructors not by the learners. And the outcomes of these instructional strategies are intended to be achieved through practical use of “facts, rules, and action sequences” which usually taught within a context of a single lesson (Borich,1988).The proponents of direct instruction claim that such skills as study skills, map skills, or critical skills should be taught directly (Rosenshine,1987; Arends,1997). And it is indispensable to achieve mastery of content (Borich,1988;1996).

Besides, the advocates emphasis the instructor rather than the student as decision maker and hold orderliness in the classroom. On top of this, they believe that in direct instruction drill and over learning are important for effective learning to happen (Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986; McCormick, 1997).

Consequently, the instructor supervises the lessons and workbook activities, and there is little time for unsupervised deskwork. The teacher is the dominant leader of the activities that take place in the classroom (Roseneshine, 1976).

In brief, direct instruction is a teaching strategy where the instructor plays a dominant role using a structured methods and techniques of teaching in the classroom. Contents are also prepared by the instructor based on facts, rules, and action sequences that fit to teach students basic knowledge and preliminary skills primarily enable to address lower level behaviors.

2.2.1 INSTRUCTIONAL FUNCTIONS OF DIRECT INSTRUCTION

Direct instruction is generally characterized by a pattern of presentation, demonstration, guided practice by students, coaching and reteaching, independent practice by students, and final evaluation (Rinne, 1997).

According to Arends, Everton, and Brophy (1982); Rosenshine and Stevens (1986); Roseneshine (1987); Slavin (1987); Borich (1988); McCormick and Pressley(1997) direct instruction has the following six teaching functions:

1. Daily review, checking previous day's work, and reteaching (if necessary).

   This instructional function is performed by checking homework and debriefing areas of difficulty or confusion for students.

2. Presenting and structuring new content (demonstration/presentation). This can be effectively accomplished by:

a) Stating lesson goals;

b) Focusing on one point at one time;

c) Providing step-by-step directions in a small step pattern;

d) Putting materials together so that one point can be mastered before another is given;

e) Providing detailed and redundant explanations for difficult points;

f) Giving many and varied examples;

g) Checking for students understanding on one point before proceeding to the next.

3. Guided practice: here teacher's presentation is followed by guided practice in order to help students master the new material. This can be effectively done by:

a) Guiding students in practicing the new material;

b) Checking for students' understanding and areas of hesitancy and/or confusion;

c) Correcting errors providing a large number of successful repetitions. Here a student success rate is expected to be eighty percent or higher.

4. Correctives and feedback: If a student is correct but hesitant, the teacher should give an ongoing feedback. If the student response is correct proceed to the next step. Research suggests that errors should not go uncorrected rather reteach if there is a need.

5. Independent practice: If the prompted practice is done successfully during the guided practice, students can now move into the independent practice. To provide students enough time to independently practice new skills to the point of mastery will facilitate students to go through “unitzation” (putting skills together) and “automaticity” (successful and rapid performance of skills). This will enable students' response to the firm and 95 per cent or higher response to be correct.

6. Weekly and monthly review: This can be effectively done by briefing the previously learnt material systematically and giving test frequently. If there is missed information to reteach is also an option.

On the other hand, Arends(1997:67) put forward five phases or steps of teaching with parallel teacher’s behavior that can be exhibited during the teaching-learning process in direct instruction setting. The summary is given here under:

Steps of Direct instruction Strategy with respective teachers functions

Phases	Teacher
Phase 1: providing objectives and establish set	*Teacher goes over objectives for the lesson, gives background information, and explains why the lesson is important. Gets a student ready to learn.
Phase 2: Demonstrate knowledge and skill	*Teacher demonstrates the skill correctly or presents information step-by-step.
Phase 3: Provide guided practice	*Teacher structures initial practice
Phase 4: check understanding and provide feedback	*Teachers check to see if students are performing correctly and provide feedback.
Phase 5: Provide extended practice and transfer	*Teacher sets conditions for extended practice with attention

	to transfer to more complex and real life situation.

To execute direct instruction lecture, presentation, recitation, programmed instruction, computer-assisted instruction, tutorials, and audio-lingual devices are some of the teaching methods and techniques to be used. These methods and techniques of teaching predominantly are designed, standardized and facilitated by the instructor (Ohles, 1970; Borich,1988; Borich,1996; Arends,1997). To state it differently the classroom interaction process is primarily set by the instructor and the trend mostly follows the instructional function stated above.

2.2.2 APPROPRIATENESS OF DIRECT INSTRUCTION

The direct instruction is appropriate to effectively address the lower order cognitive, psychomotor, and attitude goals/objectives. Particularly, it is pointed out that:

> *When direct instruction strategies are used for the proper purpose, with appropriate content and at the right time…are best to disseminate information that is not readily available from texts or workbooks in appropriately sized pieces… when the (instructor) wishes to arose students interest… (Borich, 1988:145).*

On top of this, Anderson and Block in Borich (1988:146) underscored that direct instruction is "also indispensable for achieving the mastery of content and the overlearning of fundamental facts, rules, and action sequences that may be essential to subsequent learning."

More specifically, direct instruction is most efficient to achieve when the learning outcome targets behaviors at lower levels of complexity in the cognitive domain (knowledge, comprehension and application level), in the affective domain (awareness, responsibility, and valuing level), and in the psychomotor (imitation, manipulation, and precision level) (Borich, 1988:140).

The findings on direct instruction come mainly from research carried out on effective teaching of reading and mathematics, their procedures are pertinent to any instruction when the objective is to teach an explicit procedure, concept or body of knowledge. Particularly, these outcomes are most applicable to “teaching mathematics concepts and procedures, reading decoding and sight reading, English grammar, historical knowledge and procedures” (Rosenshine, 1988).

According to Berliner in Rosenshine and Stevens (1986; 378) research on small-step approach revealed that direct instruction strategies are particularly useful when the teaching-learning process targets on younger students, slower students of all ages and abilities during the introduction period of teaching new context.

Similarly, they further stated that the approach is also effective to address the older, more mature and faster students though the time spent in presentation, guided practice, and independent practice vary with age, maturity of students and difficulty of the material. I.e. when the students are younger, less mature and difficult materials are to be treated the time for presentation, guided practice and independent practice will be reasonably longer than for older and mature students.

Research conducted about effective instructors in a direct instruction found out that they use the following skills almost all the time in a systematic manner. They:

a) Begin a lesson with a short statement of goals and review of previous work;

b) Present the new material in small steps and let students practice after each step;

c) Provide clear and detailed instructions and explanations;

d) Provide a high level of active practice for all students;

e) Ask questions to check student understanding;

f) Guide and provide systematic practice to students during initial practice;

g) Obtain a student success rate of 80 per cent or higher during initial practice; and

h) Provide explicit instruction for seatwork exercises and when necessary monitor students during work (Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986; Rosenshine, 1988).

To the contrary, these findings are less relevant when the area of instruction is implicit. I.e. when the skills to be taught do not follow explicit steps. Therefore, these procedures are least applicable to teach mathematics problem solving, literature analysis, composition and term paper writing, or discussion of social issues. However, one cannot deny the importance of basic knowledge to master implicit areas (Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986; Rosenshine, 1988).

2.2.3 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE LECTURE METHOD

Since the beginning of higher learning institutions on the globe, teaching-learning process was seen as transmission of knowledge from the source (instructor) to the receiver (learner). This process is largely accomplished through lecture/teacher-talk/.

According to many educators (for example, Schofeild,1972; McLish,1976; Brown,1987; Knott and Mutunga, 1995) the lecture method of teaching, as a choice, in higher education has survived since the fifth century pre-Christian academy where Plato and his students meet together in Athens and Greek public pleasure-gardens. At that time the word 'lecture' means reading. Since then it dominated the teaching-learning process in higher education. It was a preferred teaching method too during Guten-berg age where writings (written materials) were prevalent. It was also the most common type of teaching method used in both Christian and Muslim universities in the medieval period. During this period lecturing involved reading aloud from a text prepared particularly in the humanities (Bligh in Ashcroft and Foreman-peck, 1994:76- 77).

To date, it is among the most commonly used (widely used) method of teaching in higher learning institutions around the world. The survival of lecture method of teaching until these days accounts for: in part to tradition and in part to economics. It

is not uncommon to see large classes in universities of many countries around the world. To address this large group of students and to minimize costs lecture method is a choice. On top of this, lecturers are the major sources of information where texts and articles are accessible to lecturers only (Brown, 1987). Therefore, due to these facts and other unmentioned here lectures are likely to be widely used well in the twenty-first century of higher-learning institutions.

According to Verner and Dickinson in Curzon (1990) lecture is an instructional method through which contents are presented in 'an oral discourse'. It is a teaching period engaged wholly or mainly with an on going explanation by a lecturer and passivity by students (Ohles, 1970).

Brown (1987) defined lecture as an instructional method where one person talks to many listeners about a topic or a theme where sometimes supplemented by audiovisual aids. For Walklin (1990) the lecture is an economical means of transmitting factual information to a large audience, although there is no guarantee that effective learning will result. It is a 'didactic' teaching method that involves uni-directional communication from an active lecturer " to a more or less passive" students (as Percial and Ellington defined in Knott and Mutunga , 1995).

Definition provides a general basis of a concept that is helpful to comprehend the attributes of a concept. Hence, from the above definitions given one can infer that lecture is the most economical method of teaching where a lecturer convey factual information to a group of students in talk and chalk form. It is mainly one-directional

communication that doesn't enable the instructor to get feedback about students' understanding or failure to understand about the content under attack.

According to Good and Brophy (the important question in using lecture method of teaching is not "should we lecture?" but it must be "when should we lecture?" This is so because particularly in higher learning institutions lecturing is not only necessary as a teaching method of teaching but also appropriate to transmit basic knowledge during introduction or conclusion session of a topic. Therefore, lecture method of teaching is useful when:

1. the objective is to present information;
2. the information is not available in readily accessible sources;
3. the material must be organized in a particular way;
4. it is necessary to arouse interest in the subject;
5. it is necessary to introduce a topic before students read about it in their own or to provide instructions about a talk;
6. the information is original or must be integrated from different sources;
7. the information needs to be summarized or synthesized (following discussion or inquiry);
8. curriculum materials need updating or elaborating;
9. the instructor wants to present alternative points of view or to clarify issues in presentation for discussion;
10. the teacher wants to provide supplementary explanation of material that students may have difficulty in learning on his or her own (Gage and Berliner, 1976; Henson in Good and Brophy, 1997).

Merits and Demerits of the Lecture Method

Like any other teaching methods and techniques lecture method of teaching has its own merit and demerit. As the merit enables the instructor to target the pre-stated objectives and the drawbacks need some way of overcoming system. Here under the merits and demerits of lecture method of teaching are presented for a better understanding of the method.

Merits of the Lecture Method

The lecture method of teaching is appropriate when the lecturer has the expert and superior knowledge about the subject (Ohles, 1970). When knowledgeable instructors use the lecture method of teaching can benefit a lot. Some of its benefit includes:

1. A lecture covers a large amount of material in a short time.
2. A lecture is suitable for almost any group size, as long as the lecturer can be seen and heard.
3. A lecture can be used with both beginning and advanced learners, as long as they are well motivated.
4. A lecture has almost complete control over both the content and the sequencing of the information, with out interruption from students.
5. The lecture is of particular value in introducing, providing final survey and revision of a subject.

6. The lecture is valuable where knowledge is advancing rapidly and up-to-date textbooks are not available.
7. The lecture is economic of staff time (Davies, 1981; Curzon, 1990).

Demerits of the Lecture Method

Some of the drawbacks of lecture method of teaching as briefly stated by different authorities include:

1. Lectures progress at the pace of the instructor not the learner as a result students are largely passive.
2. There is no opportunity for the instructor or the student to go back for clarification.
3. The attention of students may be divided between listening to the instructor and taking notes for further reference.
4. The lectures have no or little opportunity to get feedback from the class and measure the effectiveness of the procedure. It involves one-way communication.
5. During lecture time there is not worthwhile communication between the lecturer and his students.
6. The lecture cannot cope with a wide diversity of ability and in itself provides little opportunity for the students to clarify misunderstanding although a limited question and answer session usually follows.
7. Lecturing is largely inappropriate for practical subjects, such as the acquisition of skills (Ohles,1970; Schofield,1972; Davies,1981; Walklin,1990).

2.3 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF INDIRECT INSTRUCTION

The concept of learner-centered education was derived from client-centered therapy and learner-centered education is to enable clients (learner) assume full responsibility under any circumstances with the aid of 'acceptant and empathetic therapist or (instructor), for decisions, actions, and their consequences" ultimately to help them achieve "self-directed, self responsible and autonomous" individuals in learning and life (Rogers as cited in Withall, 1987).

He further explained by saying both the therapist and educators encourage and initiate a pattern of communication in a one-to-one or a small group situation to enable the client or learner to be self-dependent in his lifetime. Both the therapist and instructor strive to bring change in behavior in terms of perception, knowledge, attitude, and in a day-to-day interaction.

Furthermore, he spelled out that a learner-centered instructor takes a facilitator role by making the learning milieu rich with a variety of necessities. More specifically, he/she utilizes the following procedures: makes known and available a wide range of resources and sources; indicates as he/she views himself /herself as inquirer or co-learner with the students; recognizes his/her own limitations. Mainly learner-centered instructors take into consideration and entertain all the verbal and non-verbal behavior of learners as fully as possible.

On top of this, Borich (1988:166 - 167) indicated that in indirect instruction instructors and students behavior is more complex due to classroom activities focus

on students, teachers play a facilitator role for students to air their ideas and experiences, and assess their own activities by themselves.

This teaching strategy has no single common term to describe it. Rather a variety of terms are being used including indirect instruction, experiential teaching, learner-centered method, modern (non-traditional) method, and non-conventional method. Though there are different nomenclatures used almost they mean and describe the same phenomenon. They describe the strategy that mainly focuses on the students learning where the instructor plays a facilitator role in the learning-teaching process. The strategy mainly uses inquiry learning, learning through problem solving, discovery learning, discussion, project method, role playing and group work as teaching methods and techniques (Borich, 1988; Callahan and Clark, 1988; Borich, 1996; Arends, 1997; ICDR, 1999).

According to Borich (1988:163) indirect instruction is a teaching-learning strategy "in which the process of learning is inquiry, the result is discovery, and the learning context is a problem". It takes into consideration a more complicated behavior of teachers and students giving due emphasis for students in the classroom activities. The role of the teacher in the classroom is to facilitate students' learning.

Indirect instructional strategies are perspectives that focus on the learner backgrounds, talents, experiences, perspectives, heredity, interest, capacities, and needs to make the student learn effectively by promoting the highest level of motivation, learning and achievement for all learners (McCombs and Whisler, 1997).

Indirect instruction is an instructional strategy that allow and encourage students to analyze their experience actively in the classroom to become “self-directed and self-responsible” for their own learning (Withall,1987).It "is a less-structured, more open approach that fit to teach concept development, creativity and high order thinking” (Clark and Starr,1986).

Many authorities in the field defined indirect instructional strategy in different ways. However, from the above stated definitions one can come up with a very general one. I.e. indirect instruction can be exemplified by ‘democratic’ classroom atmosphere where the instructor facilitates the instructional milieu for students learning to be carried out through investigation and creativity. It also facilitates the student autonomy in the learning-teaching process in and out side the classroom depending upon their predisposition.

2.3.1 INSTRUCTIONAL FUNCTIONS OF INDIRECT INSTRUCTION

Some of the indirect instructional functions are stated here under as summarized by Borich (1988) and Hussen (2000). The instructor:

1. Provides a means of organizing content before instruction. It is to introduce (set) the learning task in advance. It has both psychological (motivation) and cognitive (knowledge) function. The psychological function is mainly to get greater attention of students’ motivation to learn. The cognitive function is set through advance organizers that help students learn meaningfully.

2. Provides contextual movement using inductive (specific to general) and deductive (general to specific) methods.
3. Uses examples and non-examples: it is to give examples (real world or tangible examples) and non-examples (ideal world or non-tangible examples) explanations of concepts to promote accurate generalizations.
4. Uses questions to guide the search and discovery process.
5. Encourages students to relate ideas to past learning and use references from their own experience, to seek clarification, and to draw parallels and associations that aid understanding and retention.
6. Permits students to assess the appropriateness of their own responses and if necessary provides guidance.
7. Uses discussion to encourage critical thinking/scrutinizes various ways, to forecast, and to come up with generalization etc/.

2.3.2 APPROPRIATENESS OF INDIRECT INSTRUCTION

Learning through indirect instructional strategies takes place when the learning processes require student's knowledge beyond a mere fact and rule. According to Borich (1988:164- 165) when the objectives of learning demand beyond the lower levels of behavior complexity, the appropriate method of instruction to be employed is indirect instructional strategy. This is so because higher levels of behavioral complexity involve analysis, synthesis, and decision-making behaviors from the cognitive; organization, and characterization behaviors from the affective; and articulation and naturalization behaviors from the psychomotor domain.

Consequently, these higher sets of behaviors require a diversified set of teaching strategies. In these instructional strategies the main points to be conveyed are concepts, patterns, and abstracts of an issue not mere facts, rules, and sequences of actions.

Research indicated that indirect instruction is the apposite strategy to develop students critical thinking, affective and cooperative learning behaviors that play a vital role in students day to day interaction outside the classroom setting (ICDR,1999:72).

2.3.3 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE DISCUSSION METHOD

Historically discussion method can be traced back to Socrates era when Socrates led his students in critical inquiry to insight via discussion. At that time discussion was manifested in one of the mode where discussion can be conducted: through tutorial (Knott and Mutunga, 1995).

Theories of discussion stem from the fields I which scholars study language communicative processes, and patterns of exchange. These studies extend to virtually every setting in which human beings come together. Discussion can be held or organized in a tutorial (mostly in a one-to-one basis and in-group) and seminar type (whole class) arrangement. To conduct successful discussion, it should be prepared both by the learners and instructor (Davies, 1981; Curzon, 1990; Arends, 1997).

Discussion is also arranged on the basis of the nature of the content to be tackled. However, discussion occurs when (a) a group of persons come together in the role of coordinator and participant; (b) assembles at a designed time and place; (c) to communicate interactively; (d) using speaking, nonverbal, and listening processes; (e) in order to achieve specified instructional objectives. This can be carried out in a form of prescribed (structured), guided or open discussion mode (Gall and Gall, 1976; ICDR, 1999).

Discussion method of teaching serves a number of purposes in the teaching-leaning process. Some of these are concerned with the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Others are concerned with motivation and personal satisfaction arising from the experience itself (Davies, 1981). More specifically, discussion method of teaching is appropriate when the objective of the lesson is to develop leadership skills, paraphrasing skills, self-directed learning skills; analysis, synthesis, and evaluative skills, and to handle controversy appropriately. (curzon, 1990).

Devies (1981) defined discussion as a natural process as work and play. It is a learner-centered activity where ideas and experiences are shared; involvement and participation are reinforced. It is an important kind of learner-centered method of teaching that doesn't include recitation (Wilen and White, 1991:485) where an instructor plays a facilitator role (ICDR, 1999).

According to Curzon (1990) Arends (1997), discussion is a crucial part of almost all teaching strategies in which verbal interchange and expression of thoughts take place. It is a process in which a group assembles to communicate with each other using speaking, listening, and non-verbal process in order to achieve instructional objectives.

Many scholars upon different paradigms have defined discussion though they have greater commonness. Hence, discussion is a student-centered method of teaching where students are encouraged to air their view, idea and experience via listening, speaking, and nonverbal form of communication. The teacher guides, facilitates, and leads the process. It is a method of teaching that enable to achieve different kinds of learning domains depending upon specified instructional objectives.

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Discussion Method

As it is stated under the lecture method of teaching, discussion method of teaching has it's own good points and failures. Here under an attempt is made to exhaust the merits and demerits of discussion as a method of teaching.

Advantages of the Discussion Method

Discussion is useful in a number of circumstances. Above all discussion has the following merits:

1. It is useful for solving problems, exploring issues, and making decisions.
2. Discussion is one of the chief ways that an instructor can bring about attitude changes.

3. Discussion facilitates critical analysis of assumptions.
4. Discussion is helpful to develop sharing and cooperative skills.
5. Discussion stimulates and motivates the people taking part.
6. Discussion recognizes students as an active participant in their learning.
7. Discussion facilitates democratic teaching learning process prevail (Davies, 1981; Curzon, 1990).

Disadvantages of the Discussion Method

Some of the demerits of the discussion method include:

1. Unless students are pre-informed and prepared discussion losses steam.
2. The discussion method unless properly prepared and organized soon degenerates in an aimless debate.
3. The discussion method places a limitation on the number of people who can effectively take part. Normally, seven is the optimal.
4. The discussion method is a time consuming process. This is especially so if the group contains people from diverse background.
5. An autocratic leader, highly verbal student might dominate the discussion or dominant student can also dominate the proceedings.
6. Some students may say, “how can a fellow student teach me?” I would probably do better with my professor (Davies, 1981; Curzon, 1990).

2.4 COMPARISON OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT INSTRUCTION

Both direct and indirect instructional strategies are vital depending upon the objective of the lesson to be achieved, the level of objective required and the nature of the content to be conveyed. To this end, therefore, to have a summary of their specific target and activities will help instructors to associate with their personal preferences and other related factors to use whenever a need arises. Hence, the synopses of both direct and indirect instructional strategies are given here under depending upon different sources.

Direct instruction	**Indirect instruction**
Goals	
• To teach facts, rules, and action sequences	• To teach concepts, patterns and abstractions
• Determined by instructors.	• Determined by group
• Emphasizes upon intellectual changes	• Emphasis upon affective and attitudinal changes
• No attempt to develop group cohesiveness	• Attempts to develop group cohesiveness
• Classroom Activities	
• Teacher begins the lesson with a review of the previous lesson	• Teacher begins the lesson with advance organizers that provide an overall pictures that allow concept expansion
• Teacher dominated classroom/teacher-centered/	• Teacher as guide to educational experiences and allows much student participation/student-centered/
• Instructor-student interaction	• Student-instructor- student

• Instructor corrects, criticizes, or rejects erroneous or irrelevant student contributions.	• Instructor accepts erroneous or irrelevant student contributions.
• Instructor determines activities	• Group decides upon own activities
• Teacher-led recitation kept on course material	• Discussion of students' personal experience is encouraged in-groups.
• Instructor evaluates	• Students share responsibility for evaluation
• Traditional use of tests and grades are emphasized.	• De-emphasis of tests and grades.
• Instructor avoids interpretation of feelings	• Instructor interprets feelings and ideas of class member when necessary for class progress
• No reaction reports	• Reaction reports
• Fixed sit and desks	• Variable desks and chairs
• Whole class instruction	• Students engaged in individual and small group activities.
• No student movement at all.	• Student moves freely.
• Active teacher role.	• Active students role.
• Teaching methods and techniques used	
• Presentation	• Discussion
• Recitation	• Inquiry learning
• Lecture	• Discovery learning
• Question and answer	• Problem solving
• Drill	• Project method

	• Role playing

Source: Mckeachie(1986); Borich(1988); Cuban and Bennett in Anderson and Burns(1989); Simonson and Thompson in Wakshum (2001).

2.5 PROFILE OF INSTRUCTORS' WITH DIRECT AND INDIRECT INSTRUCTION ASSUMPTION

Tuder (1996); McCombs and Whisler (1997) identified two categories of instructors' behavior depending upon the broad dichotomy of instructional strategies. As it is the nature of two-category specification the profiles appear to give absolute pictures. Particularly, however, most instructors do not subscribe to all the beliefs in either but have a combination of the two although usually the characteristics of one profile or the other will be dominant.

1. Profiles of instructors with direct instruction assumptions

Some of the profiles of instructors with direct instruction orientation include:

a) If students are not doing up to the explanation, they need to go back to the basics and do more drill and skill development.
b) Instructor's most important job is to help student's meet established curriculum standards.
c) Most students can't really be trusted to learn what they need to know with out instructor's control.

d) Without instructor's initiation and provision the student will not get the correct answer.

e) Good instructors always know more than their students.

f) Instructor has to maintain his/her role as an authority figure to make students respect him as an instructor.

g) The most important thing an instructor can teach his/her students is how to follow rules and what is expected of them in the classroom.

h) The most important thing that contributes for learning is instructor's knowledge of subject matter.

i) Inborn ability is fairly fixed and some students just can't learn as well as others.

j) Some students just don't want to learn. Hence, instructors have to work consistently with them.

k) The instructor knows best what students need to know and what is important; therefore, student should take instructors word for grant (Tuder, 1996; McCombs and whisler, 1997).

2. Profiles of instructors with indirect instruction assumptions

Some of the profiles of instructors with indirect instruction orientation include:

a) Students have the potential to learn.

b) To maximize learning the instructor need to help student feel at ease to discuss their feelings and beliefs.

c) Addressing students' social, emotional, and physical need is important for learning to occur.

d) Students have the natural ability to direct their own learning.

e) Instructor's willingness to relate himself or herself to each student as a unique individual facilitates learning more than being an authority figure.
f) To accept as where they are without condoning their behavior makes them more receptive to learning.
g) The instructor has faith in his ability to make a difference with all students.
h) To look things from the students' point of view is a key to student's good performance in learning.
i) Instructors believe in listening to students in caring way helps them solve their own problems. (Tuder, 1996; McCombs and Whisler, 1997).

Most instructors do not fall totally within one profile or the other but share some attributes of each. In general, however, McCombs and Whisler found that instructors who lean toward direct instruction profile tend to direct what students learn and how they learn it, assert their authority through dictation and arbitrary rules, try to keep students on their own stand, concentrate solely on building students' intellectual capacity, and focus on getting through the required curriculum.

Those who tend towards indirect instruction profile focus on the student as well as on the student's learning. A focus on the student according to McCombs and Whisler generally entails better communication and cooperation with the student. These instructors are more likely to take into account what students want to learn, include students in the setting of learning goals, and support students as they learn to take increasing responsibility for their own learning, sometimes individually and other time in cooperative groups. These instructors are more inclined to draw on

students' unique talents, capabilities, and students to bring about desired learning outcomes. That is, they focus on learning outcomes desired by both instructor and student. Indirect instruction strategy oriented instructors also have a tendency to cultivate intellectual, social and emotional growth within and among students.

2.6 FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE SELECTION AND UTILIZATION OF TEACHING METHODS

To use appropriate method of teaching for a specific objective to be achieved is very vital. This important process is not a simple and instant activity. Rather it is tedious and requires skillful handling of instructors. This is not debatable. To effectively select and use appropriate method of teaching we have to consider a number of aspects that influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods.

According to Davies (1981); Zaudneh, Darge, and Nardos (1989) during selection and utilization of different method of teaching we have to consider the following factors:

1. *The objective of learning*: At universities the teaching-learning process is mainly concerned with knowledge and affective domain, but as Bloom et.al developed the hierarchy of levels of knowledge which level is needed (targeted) at a particular time is decisive. Knowledge at memory or understanding or application or transfer (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) level. These points must be taken in consideration.

2. *Class size*: Classrooms sometimes are small or moderate, at other time over sized. All instructional methods are not necessarily fit to all type of class size. For example, discussion is not suitable for too large group in a classroom. Therefore, we should consider size of class in selection and utilization of instructional methods.
3. *Local constraints*: in selection and utilization of teaching methods such factors, as time and resources should be considered. Unless there is enough time to accomplish the activity it would be a fantasy to think about field trip. And it is also unfair to think about demonstration, laboratory and other teaching methods and techniques without having the necessary equipment.
4. *Autonomy of students*: in the universities of advanced countries students' independent learning is a day-to-day practice. On the contrary, in Africa, it is not the trend. However, we have to think about it if we are to practice more learners – oriented teaching-learning process. But we have to consider students' background knowledge, physical and emotional problems before we try to exercise learner-centered instruction.
5. *Lecturer's preferences and dislikes*: lecturer's like and dislike with their experience influence the kind of method they use. This is a result of their philosophy, training, subject matter knowledge, motivation, experience, value system and confidence they have. However, we should not take this for grant. Rather we have to up-to-date (rejuvenate) instructors with new information on teaching methods selection and utilization.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

In order to identify and clarify the current practices in educational institutions and thereby recommend productive ideas, it is necessary to conduct a descriptive research in the institutions. This is so because descriptive research sets out to describe and to interpret what is. To put the matter in Best's words, descriptive research is concerned with:

> *Conditions or relationships that exist; practices that prevail; beliefs, points of views, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are going felt; or tends that are developing (Best, 1970).*

Accordingly, the research design employed in this study is the descriptive survey.

3.2 SOURCES OF DATA

Instructors in the AAU undergraduate program of the Faculty of Business and Economics, Education, and Law; School of information Studies for Africa, Institute of Language Studies, and College of Social Science were sources of data.

The Faculty of Business and Economics encompasses three departments. Namely Accounting, Economics, and Management and Public Administration. The Faculty of

Education has four departments. These are Business Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Planning and Management, and Educational Psychology. Faculty of Law and School of information science for Africa has Law, and Library and Information Science Departments respectively. Institute of Language Studies has four departments: Ethiopian languages and literature, Foreign Language and Literature, Linguistics and Theatre Arts. The College of Social Sciences unlike the above mentioned faculties and schools subsumed five departments. Viz. Geography, History, Philosophy, Sociology and Social Anthropology, and Political Science and International Relations.

All these departments provide courses for both undergraduate and graduate program. Therefore, care was taken to not include instructors who are not currently teaching at the undergraduate level since the focus of this study is the undergraduate program. First, documents of AAU publications such as AAU staff list, 2000, and AAU staff list, 2001 were thoroughly scrutinized. Secondly, the Academic schedule of 2001/02 of the faculties, school, institute and college were also secured. Thirdly, instructors were asked whether they are currently teaching or not at the undergraduate level during questionnaire distribution. If they are not currently teaching the undergraduate program, they were excluded from being source of the data to unmix the information of undergraduate teaching-learning process from the unsought information of graduate program.

3.3 SAMPLING TECHNIQUE AND PROCEDURE

In the faculty of Business and Economics, Education, and Law; School of Information Studies for Africa, Institute of Language Studies, and College of Social Sciences there are 275 instructors. To get equal representation of instructors in their respective qualification such as PhD, MA/MSc and BA/ BSc holders, instructors list was checked from (August 2001) publication of AAU.

In order to include all walks of life that take part in the teaching-learning process of the undergraduate program, 138 (50.2%) of instructors were taken to be the sample size of the study by using simple random sampling technique. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970: 607) fifty percent of a total population is the maximum size to get dependable data in survey study. In this research, the purpose of taking 50 percent of the total population was to include all instructors that have different academic ranks and qualifications. On top of this, it was done to maximize the rate of return and to manage the study properly.

In order to conduct classroom observation the same effort was made to include the professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, assistant-lecturers and graduate assistants. Therefore, the researcher planned to observe 28 (10.2%) of the total population of the instructors. However, 20 (7.2%) of the total population were observed in the classroom interaction process. This is attributed to the unusual practice of Addis Ababa University during data gathering.

3.4 INSTRUMENTS OF DATA COLLECTION

In the process of data collection questionnaire constructed in terms of open and close-ended items, rating scale and Likert-scale, and observation checklists were employed.

Questionnaire:

The open and close-ended part of the questionnaire was adapted from Rabow, et al (1994); Beard and Hartley (1984). The Likert scale part of the questionnaire was adapted from Mccombs and Whisler (1997:20-230). On top of this, based on the reviewed theory and basic principles the instruments were modified to fit the purpose of the study (See Appendix A).

The questionnaire with close-ended items was intended to gather data pertaining to facts and perception. The open-ended items were used to collect data in relation to opinions, believes, and views of instructors.

The rating scale was used to collect data in relation to factors that affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods in the university. Particularly, this scale (item No. 27, Appendix A) was used to collect data pertaining to the third basic question.

The Likert-scale was intended to gather data in relation to instructors' opinion about the widely used instructional method in the social science, humanities, and language disciplines; the impact of qualification, and academic rank on the selection and utilization of instructional methods.

Observation checklists:

On top of this, two observation checklists were constructed in order to record what is going on in the classroom during lecture and discussion (See Appendix B and C, respectively). The observation checklists were adapted from Beard and Hartley (1984). Then modified to fit the purpose of the study. Both questionnaires were constructed in such a way that they enable the researcher gather data pertaining to what extent and how frequently instructors of AAU use lecture and/or discussion in combination with or isolation from other method(s) of instruction.

3.5 PILOT STUDY

The questionnaire and observation checklists prepared to gather data for the main research was enriched by consulting researchers, educational psychologists and professionals in pedagogy. On top of this, the questionnaire's ability to collect the same data on consecutive events without any change made on the purpose of the study was tested via pilot study. The pilot study was conducted in this same university's faculties, college, school, and institute where the main study was carried out.

During the pilot study, the questionnaire was distributed among fifteen instructors. Out of these, 12(80%) of the questionnaire were returned. Accordingly, the alpha (reliability coefficient that indicate the dependability of an instrument to produce the same data in the main study) of the close-ended and Likert-scale items was calculated. According to Burroughs (1971:71-72) the reliability coefficient test increases as the number of items and/or the number of respondents' increases and vise versa. To put it differently, when the number of items and/or the number of respondents decrease the reliability coefficient (alpha) decreases. To the contrary, however, "whether the number of

respondents is large or small; or the items are few or many, an item has to have a minimum of 0.5 reliability coefficient (alpha) to be used for the purpose designed" (Bennaars, Otiende, and Boisvert, 1994:134).

In the same vein, the reliability coefficient (alpha) calculated for Likert-scale items of the questionnaire was 0.6777. Though the number of items is thirteen and the number of respondents is twelve, the test conducted confirmed that the instrument can give the same data in varied time and data collectors to a reasonable degree.

Similarly, the calculation done for twelve close-ended items depicted reliability coefficient (Alpha) 0.7643 indicating the dependability of the items to yield the same data in different circumstances.

In comparable manner, comments from experts in the area, researchers, and the sources of the pilot study were considered. As a result, some amendments were made to items that are susceptible to different interpretation. Besides, operational definitions were given to avoid unnecessary confusion.

In the same way, to ensure the dependability of the data to be gathered via observation checklist of both discussion and lecture session, different mechanisms were employed. First, both the lecture and discussion observation checklists were made available to professionals such as educational psychologists, pedagogists, and researchers for comment. This was done to boost the process validity of the instrument.

Secondly, inter and intra judge's validity of the instrument was checked by observing a classroom being four observers. After the observation of the class, inter-judges agreement was checked. And some items that lent themselves for different interpretation were modified to fit the purpose of the study. Making the items objective, and providing operational definitions of concepts boosted intra-judges validity. As a result, value judgment was minimized to the extent of inexistent.

To this end, therefore, the results confirmed the instruments can measure what is intended to measure consistently though time and observer vary.

After all these preliminary instrument testing procedures, boosted validity, and reliability calculated, the researcher and the respective advisor arrived at a total consensus to launch the study.

3.6 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The data obtained through questionnaires and observation checklists were presented using tables and figures. And the data secured were analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Such statistics as percentiles, weight- mean rank order, and chi-square test were used.

CHAPTER FOUR
4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This part of the paper deals with the presentation, analysis, interpretation, and discussion of the data collected via questionnaire and observation checklist. The data will be discussed in two parts: the background of respondents and respondents' response with respect to research questions raised.

4.1 BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Table 1 Department of respondents

Study Areas	Departments	Instructors	
		No	Per cent
CSS	• Geography • History • Philosophy • Political science abs international relations • Sociology and social administration	7 6 5 6 6	6 5.2 4.3 5.2 5.2
FOE	• Business education • Curriculum and instruction • Educational planning and management • Educational psychology	3 7 5 8	2.6 6 4.3 6.9
ILS	• Ethiopian Language and literature • Foreign languages an literature • Linguistics • Theater arts	7 18 1 3	6 15.5 0.9 2.6
SISA	• Library and information science	4	3.5
FOL	• Law	5	4.3
FBE	• Accounting • Economics • Management and pubic administration	6 10 9	5.2 8.6 7.6
	Total	116	100

As it can be seen from Table One, in the College of Social Science, 7 (6 percent) of the respondents are from Geography Department, 6(5.2 percent) of the respondents are from History Department, 5(4.3 percent) of the respondents are from Philosophy

Department, 6(5.2 percent) of the respondents are from Political Science and International Relations Department, 6(5.2 percent) of the respondents are from Sociology and social Administration Department. Similarly, in the Faculty of Education, 3(2.6 percent) of the respondents are from Business Education Department, 7(6.0 percent) of the respondents are from Curriculum and Instruction Department, 5(4.3 percent) of the respondents are from Educational Planning and Management Department, (6.9 percent) of the respondents are from Educational Psychology Department. In the same vain, in the Institute of Language Studies, 7(6 percent) of the respondents are from Ethiopian Languages and literature Department, 18(15.5 percent) of the respondents are from Foreign Languages and literature Department, 1(0.9 percent) of the respondents are from Linguistics Department, 3(2.6 percent) of the respondents are from Theatre Arts Department. Likewise, in the SISA and FOL, 4(3.5 percent) of the respondents are from Library and Information Science Department, 5(4.3 percent) of the respondents are from the Department of Law respectively. In similar manner, in the FBE, 6(5.2 percent) of the respondents are from Accounting Department, 10(8.6 percent) of the respondents are from Economics Department, and 9(7.6 percent) of the respondents are from Management and Public Administration Department. As the data clearly shows attempts were made to collect the data required via questionnaire and observation checklist from all the departments where the focal point of the study was.

Table 2 Respondents qualification, Academic rank, sex, and experience

No	Items	Instructors'	
		No	Per cent
1	Qualification;		
	a. PhD	29	25
	b. M.Phil/MBA/MA/MSc/LLM	66	56.7
	c. BBA/LLB/BA/BSc	21	18.1
	Total	116	100
2	Academic rank		
	a. Professor	4	3.5
	b. Associate Professor	24	20.7
	c. Assistant Professor	26	22.4
	d. Lecturer	41	35.3
	e. Assistant-Lecturer	21	18.1
	Total	116	100
3	Sex:		
	a. Male	97	83.6
	b. Female	19	16.4
	Total	116	100
4	Years of experience as an instructor		
	a. Below five	21	18.1
	b. 6 – 10	28	24.1
	c. 11 –15	34	29.3
	d. 16 – 20	11	9.5
	e. Above twenty	22	19
	Total	116	100

As it is shown in Table two, item number one, 29(25 Percent), 66(56.9 Percent), and 21(18.1 percent) of the respondents possess Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Masters, and Bachelors degrees respectively. This implies that majority of AAU instructors in the Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Social Science College have MA/MSc and above qualification.

In this same Table, item number two shows the academic rank of respondents. Accordingly, 4(3.5 percent) of the respondents are full professors. While the remaining 24(20.7 percent), 26(22.4 percent), 41(35.3 percent), and 21(18.1 percent) of the

respondents are associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, and assistant-lecturers respectively. From this information one can deduce that majority (81.9 percent) of the AAU instructors in the Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Social Science College have lecturer and above academic rank.

Still this same Table item number three portrayed the male and female dichotomy of the respondents. As it is stated, therefore, 97(83.6 percent) and 19(16.4 percent) of the respondents are male and female respectively.

As it is depicted in table two item number four, 21(19 percent) and 22(19 percent) of the respondents served for less than five and above twenty years as an instructor respectively. While 28(24.1 percent), 34(29.3 percent), and 11(9.5 percent) of the respondents served for 6 - 10, 11 - 15, and 16 - 20 years as an instructor. In regard to fields of respondents' specializations see appendix - D.

4.2 Pedagogical Issues

Table 3 Mostly used instructional methods

No	Items	Instructors'	
		No	Per cent
1	Mostly used instructional methods: *		
	a. Laboratories	29	25
	b. Individual research projects/assignment	30	26.9
	c. Discussion	62	53.5
	d. Lecture	105	90.5
	e. Demonstration	42	36.2
	f. Seminars	26	22.4
	g. Questioning	44	37.9
	Total	338	292.4
2	On average, the above instructional methods are used:		
	a. Through out a semester	63	54.3
	b. Three-fourth of a semester	53	45.7
	Total	116	100

NB *Item No. 1 multiple response is secured

Items that has no response were excluded from the table

Item number one in Table three delineated instructional methods that are mostly used in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC of AAU. According to the data secured majority of the respondents indicated that laboratories, individual research project/assignment, discussion, lecture, demonstrations, seminars, and questioning are the mostly used instructional methods.

On this same table, item number two portrayed that the above instructional methods are used throughout or three-forth of a semester on average as indicted by 63(54.3 percent), and 53(45.7 percent) of the respondents respectively.

From this one might surmise that discussion, lecture, demonstration, and questioning are among the mostly used instructional methods in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC of AAU.

Table 4 Degree of lecture and discussion methods utilization

No	Items	Instructors	
		No	Per cent
1	`Do you use lecture method of teaching?		
	a. Yes	112	96.6
	b. No	4	3.4
	Total	116	100
2	How often do you use lecture method of teaching/		
	a. Sometimes	19	17
	b. Mostly	66	59
	c. Always	27	24
	Total	116	100
3	Do you use discussion method of teaching?		
	a. Yes	105	90.5
	b. No	11	9.5
	Total	116	100
4	How often do you use discussion method?*		
	A Sometimes	38	36.2
	b Mostly	51	48.6
	c Always	16	15.2
	Total	105	100

*Item No. 4 is calculated for those who use discussion method only.

As it is shown in Table four, item number one, 112(96.9 percent) of the respondents underscored that they use lecture method of teaching while the remaining 4(3.4 percent) of the respondents stated that they didn't.

As it can be seen from Table four, item number two, 19(17 percent), 66(59 percent), and 27(24 percent) of the respondents said that they use lecture method of teaching sometimes, mostly, and always respectively. From this one can surmise that the majority of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC use lecture method of teaching widely.

As it is indicated in this same table item number three, 105(90.5 percent), of the respondents affirmed that they use discussion method of teaching while 11(9.5 percent) of the respondents said they didn't use discussion method of teaching.

In this same table item number four, 38(36.2 Percent), 51(48.6 percent), and 16(15.2 percent) of the respondents pointed out that they use discussion method of teaching sometimes, mostly, and always respectively.

Table 5 Discussion session organization/Arrangement

No.	Items	Instructors	
		No.	Per cent
1	How do you organize a discussion session?		
	a. in small groups	29	27.6
	b. as a whole class	47	44.8
	c. Both small and whole class	29	27.6
	Total	105	100
2	Considered reasons to organize a discussion session I one way the other		
	a. Simple to conduct	14	13.2
	b. Safe to control the interaction	3	2.9
	c. Conducive to achieve the intended objective	53	50.5
	d. Simple to conduct, safe to control the interaction, and conducive to achieve the intended objective	5	48
	e. Safe to control the interaction, and conducive to achieve the intended objective	7	6.7
	f. Conducive to achieve the intended objective and to promote communication	15	14.3
	g. To get feedback from students	4	3.8
	h. To supplement lecture	4	3.8
	Total	105	100

*Item No. 1 and 2 are calculated for those who use discussion method only.

As it is portrayed in Table five, item number one, 29(27.6 percent) and 47(44.8 percent) of the respondents asserted that they organize discussion session in small groups and as the whole class respectively. The remaining 29(27.6 percent) of the respondents

underscored as they organize/arrange a discussion session both in small group and whole class.

In this same table, item number two, delineated the reasons considered in organizing/arranging the discussion session in small groups or the whole class. Accordingly, 14(13.2 percent), 3(2.9 percent), and 53(50.5 percent) of the respondents said that it is simple to conduct, safe to control the interaction, and conducive to achieve the intended objectives respectively. While 5(4.8 percent) of the respondents stated that it is simple to conduct, safe to control the interaction, and conducive to achieve the intended objectives. Similarly, 7(6.7 percent) of the respondents said that it is safe to control the interaction and conducive to achieve the intended objectives. Comparably, 15(14.3 percent) of the respondents underscored that it is conducive to achieve the intended objectives and to promote communication. The remaining 4(3.8 percent) and 4(3.8 percent) of the respondents emphasized that it enables to get feedback from the learners and to supplement lecture respectively. From this one can conclude that discussion session is organized/arranged one way or another for the reason that it is simple, save, conducive to achieve objectives, an to promote communication among students.

Table 6 Time allotted and responsibility of setting time for discussion

No.	Items	Instructors	
		No,	Per cent
1	How much time duo you allocate for discussion session?		
	a. Not at all	38	36.2
	b. Less than fifteen minutes	2	1.9
	c. Fifteen minutes	19	18.1
	d. Fifteen to twenty minutes	6	5.7
	e. Twenty minutes	21	20
	f. Thirty minutes	2	1.9
	g. Greater than half period	2	1.9
	h. Three-fourth of the period	13	12.4
	i. The whole period	2	1.9
	Total	105	100
2	Who sets the time limit?		
	a. Instructors	56	53.3
	b. Jointly with students	41	39.1
	c. The discussion itself/nature of the lesson	8	7.6
	Total	105	100

*Item No. 1 and 2 are calculated for those who use discussion method only.

Item number one in Table six treated allocation of time for discussion. According to the respondents 38(36.2 percent) of them confessed that they didn't allocate specified time. While 2(1.9 percent), 19(18.1 percent), and 6(5.7 percent) of the respondents disclosed that they allocate less than fifteen, fifteen, and fifteen to twenty minutes for discussion respectively. In the same vain, 21(20 percent) and 2(1.9 percent) of the respondents stated that they allocate twenty and thirty minutes for discussion respectively. In similar mood, 2(1.9 percent), 2(1.9 percent), and 13(12.4 percent) of the respondents indicated that they allot greater than half, three-fourth, and the whole period for discussion respectively. From this data one might conclude that the majority of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC allot specific time for discussion though the time vary from instructor to instructor.

As it can be seen from Table six, item number two, 56(53.3 percent) of the respondents affirmed that instructors themselves set the time limit for discussion. While 41(39.1 percent) of the respondents underlined that they decide the time limit for discussion together with students. The remaining 8(7.6 percent) of the respondents stated that the discussion itself/the nature of the lesson set the time limit for discussion. From this information one can deduct that most of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC set the time limit for discussion by taking students' contribution into account.

Table 7. Time limit and base motives to determine the time limit for discussion

No	Items	Instructors	
		No	Per cent
1	Do you conduct a discussion according to the time limit?		
	a. yes	54	51.4
	b. no	46	43.8
	c. it depends	5	4.8
	Total	105	100
2	Time for discussion is decided based on:		
	a. The nature of the issue to be discussed	41	39.1
	b. The objective of the lesson	24	22.8
	c. Students' interest	6	5.7
	d. The nature of the issue to be discussed, The objective of the lesson, and Students' interest	21	20
	e. The nature of the issue to be discussed, The objective of the lesson,	9	8.6
	f. The nature of the issue to be discussed, The objective of the lesson, Students' interest, and available time	4	3.8
	Total	105	100

*Item No. 1 and 2 are calculated for those who use discussion method only.

As it is indicated in Table seven, item number one, 54(51.4 percent) of the respondents claim that they conduct a discussion according to the time limit while 46(43.8 percent) of the respondents stated that they didn't. Still others, 5(4.8 percent) of the respondents pointed out that they conduct a discussion based on what is going on in the classroom.

From this data it possible to conclude that half proportion of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC conduct a discussion as per the time limit.

As it can be seen from Table seven, item number two, the base motives to decide time for discussion is different. According to the data gathered, 41(39.1 percent), 24(22.8 percent), and 6(5.7 percent) of the respondents disclose that they decide the time limit based on the nature of the issue to be discussed, the objective of the lesson, and students' interest respectively. While 21(20 percent) of the respondents emphasized that they decide the time for discussion based on the nature of the issue to be discussed, the objective of the lesson, and students' interest. Similarly, 9(8.6 percent) of the respondents opt for they decide the time limit for discussion upon nature of the issue to be discussed, the objective of the lesson. In similar manner, 4(3.8 percent) of the respondents voted that they decide the time limit for discussion on the ground of the issue be discussed, the objective of the lesson, students' interest, and time available. From this it is possible to deduce that the issue be discussed, the objective of the lesson, students' interest, and time available are the main reasons to decide the time limit for a discussion.

Table 8 Instructors' belief about lecture and/or discussion with other method of teaching

No	Items	Never		Always		Total		X^2
		No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	
1	I use lecture method of teaching	31	26.7	85	73.3	116	100	*25.14
2	I use discussion method	70	60.3	46	39.7	116	100	*4.97
3	I use lecture and discussion	63	54.3	53	45.7	116	100	0.86
4	I use lecture with other method Of other than discussion	38	32.8	78	67.2	116	100	*13.79
5	I use discussion with other method other than lecture	94	81	22	19	116	100	*44.69

Df= 1 * significant difference at p = 0.05

As it is depicted in table eight, item number one, 31(26.7 percent) of the respondents asserted that they never use lecture method of teaching while 85(73.3 percent) of them affirmed that they always use lecture method of teaching. From this one can deduce that majority of AAU instructors FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC use lecture method of teaching always. This is also evidenced by X^2 = 25.14, where the calculated value is greater than the critical value (X^2= 3.841).

In this same table item number two, 70(60.3 percent) of the respondents stated that they never use discussion method of teaching while 46(39.7 percent) of the respondents said they always use discussion method of teaching. From this data it is possible to deduce that the large proportion of instructors use discussion method of teaching on no occasion. This is also confirmed by X^2 = 4.97 where the calculated chi-square value is greater than the critical value. This implies that there is significant difference between the discussion method users and non-users indicating that then majority of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC do not use discussion method of teaching.

Item number three of this same table indicated that 63(54.3 percent) of the respondents said that they never use lecture and discussion method of teaching together. While 53(45.7 percent) of the respondents stated that they always use lecture and discussion method of teaching together. From this it is possible to infer that the half proportion of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC are non-users of lecture and discussion method of teaching together. The chi-square test also indicated as there is no significant statistical difference between the users and non-users where X^2 =0.86.

Table eight, item number four, portrayed that 78(67.2 percent) of the respondents underlined that they always use lecture with other method of teaching other than discussion. While 38(32.8) of the respondents stated that they use lecture with other method of teaching other than discussion on no occasion. From this information one might infer that the majority (67.2 Percent) of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC always use lecture in combination with other method of teaching other than discussion. The calculated chi-square result (13.79) shows that there is significant difference between users and non-users of lecture with other method of teaching other than discussion. This implies that most of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC always use lecture with other method of teaching other than discussion.

As it can be seen from Table 8, item number five, 94(81 percent) of the respondents confirmed that they never use discussion with other method of teaching other than lecture. While 22(19 percent) of the respondents disclosed that they always use discussion with other method of teaching other than lecture. From this data one might surmise that the majority of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC use discussion with other method of teaching other than lecture on no occasion. The chi-square test has proven that there is no significant statistical difference at 0.05 where the calculated chi-square result (44.69) is greater than the critical value implying that discussion in combination with other method of teaching other than lecture is not used always.

Table 9 Instructors' opinion about dominantly used instructional method(s) in AAU

No	Items	Disagree		Agree		Total		X^2
		No	Percent	No	Percent	No	Percent	
1	Lecture method is dominant	14	12.1	102	87.9	116	100	*66.76
2	Discussion method is dominant one	92	79.3	24	20.7	116	100	*39.86
3	Lecture with discussion is dominant	55	47.4	61	52.6	116	100	031
4	Lecture with other method other than discussion is dominant	47	40.5	69	59.5	116	100	*4.17
5	Methods other than discussion is dominant	96	82.8	20	17.2	116	100	*49.79

Df= 1 * significant difference at p = 0.05

As it can be seen from Table nine, item number one, 14(12.1 percent) of the respondents expressed their disagreement that the lecture is not the dominant method of teaching. While 102(87.9 percent) of the respondents believe that lecture method of teaching is the dominant method of teaching. The chi-square test also shows as there is significant statistical difference at 0.05 where the calculated chi-square value (66.76) is greater than the critical value. This implies that the lecture method of teaching is the dominant method of teaching in AAU in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC.

In this same table, item number two, 92(79.3 percent of the respondents believe that discussion method of teaching is not the dominantly used method of teaching. While 24(20.7 percent) of the respondents expressed their belief that the discussion method of teaching is the dominant one. The chi-square result shows, as there is significance difference at 0.05; where the calculated chi-square value (39.86) is greater than the critical value of the chi-square. From this one might infer that discussion method of teaching is not the dominant method of teaching in AAU in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC.

As item number three of this same table depicted 55(47.4 percent) of the respondents do not believe that lecture and discussion method of teaching together is dominant. While 61(52.4 percent) of the respondents believe that lecture together with discussion method of teaching is the dominant method of teaching. The chi-square value didn't indicate significant statistical difference at 0.05 where the calculated chi-square value (0.31) is not greater than the critical value. From this one might infer that lecture together with other method of teaching is used in AAU in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC though it is not dominant one.

Item number four of Table nine delineated that 69(59.5 percent) of the respondents underscored that lecture together with other method of teaching other than discussion is the dominantly used instructional method. While 47(40.5 percent) of the respondents believe that lecture together with other method of teaching other than discussion is not the dominant method of teaching. The chi-square test indicates, as there is significant statistical difference at 0.05 where the calculated chi-square value (X^2 =4.17) is greater than the critical chi-square value. From this data it is possible to conclude that lecture together with other method of teaching other than discussion is the dominant method of teaching in AAU in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC.

In this same table item number five indicated that 96(82.8 percent) of the respondents do not believe that methods of teaching other than lecture and discussion are not the dominant ones. While 20(17.2 percent) of the respondents believe that method of teaching other than lecture and discussion method of teaching are the dominant ones.

The chi-square test shows as there is significant statistical difference at 0.05 where the calculated chi-square value(X^2 =49.79) is greater than the critical value of chi-square. From this it is possible to deduce that methods of teaching other than lecture and discussion are not the dominant ones in the AAU in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC.

Table 10 Frequency of observed Instructional method(s)

	Observed instructional methods					Total frequency	X^2
	Lecture	Discussion	Lecture and discussion	Lecture and other method	Discussion and other method		
Observed frequency	27	0	9	15	9	60	*33.0
Expected frequency	12	12	12	12	12	60	

Df=1 * significant difference at p = 0.05

As it can be seen from Table ten, the frequency of lecture period is significantly different from the frequency of lecture and discussion period at $x^2 = 9.000$, $p < 0.003$. This show that lecture method of teaching is used more frequently than lecture together with discussion.

In this same table, the frequency of lecture period in isolation is not significantly different from the frequency of lecture in combination with other method of teaching period $X^2 = 3.429$, $p > 0.64$. This shows that both lecture in isolation, and lecture in combination with other method of teaching are used frequently.

Table Ten, depicted the number of observed frequency of lecture with discussion method of teaching period is not significantly different from the frequency of observed

lecture with other methods of teaching period at X^2 =1.500, p> 0.221. From this data one might surmise that lecture with discussion and lecture with other method of teaching are used frequently.

As it is portrayed in Table Ten, the frequency of observed lecture period is significantly different from the frequency of observed discussion with other method of teaching periods at X^2=9.000, p< 0.003. From this one can conclude that lecture method of teaching is used more frequently than discussion with other method of teaching.

As table Ten presented, the number of observed frequency of lecture with other method of teaching period is not significantly different from the observed frequency of discussion used with other methods of teaching periods at X^2 = 1.500, p>0.221. From this one can conclude that Lecture or discussion in combination with other methods of teaching is used in comparable manner.

On top of this, discussion method of teaching was not used as a single method of teaching during observation though it was used in combination with lecture and other method of teaching. This implies that lecture in isolation, lecture with discussion, lecture or discussion with other method of teaching are used frequently when compared to discussion method in isolation in AAU in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC (See Appendix-F).

Table 11 Weight mean rank order of factors that affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods

Items	Summed up rank order weight	Weight mean rank*
Factors that affect the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods		
a. Objective of a lesson	282	2.431
b. Level of objective required	371	3.198
c. Class size	167	1.439
d. Available time	399	3.439
e. Class room facilities	486	4.189
f. Students degree of autonomy in the learning process	578	4.991
g. Teachers' preference and dislikes	603	5.198

*Weight Mean rank = Summed up rank order/Total number of respondents (116)

As it can be seen from Table eleven, the factors that influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods are rank ordered by the respondents. According to the respondents class size, objective of the lesson, level of objective required, and time available are the first, second, third, and fourth most influential factors in the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods respectively. While classroom facilities, students' degree of autonomy in the learning process, and teachers' preference and dislikes are rated as the next influential factors consecutively from five to seven. From this data one can surmise that Class size, objectives, and level of objectives required, and time available are among the most influential factors in the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional method FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC.

Table 12 Instructors opinion about the impact of qualification and academic rank on the selection and utilization of instructional methods

No	Items	Instructors	
		No	Percent
1	Do you think qualification affects the selection and utilization of instructional methods?		
	a. Yes	56	48.3
	b. No	60	51.7
	Total	116	100
2	Do you think academic rank affects the selection and utilization of instructional methods?		
	A. Yes	69	59.5
	B. No	47	40.5
	Total	116	100

Df=1 * significant difference at p = 0.05

As it is shown in Table twelve, item number one, 56(48.3 percent) of the respondents specified that qualification affect the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods. While 60(51.7 percent) of the respondents said that qualification doesn't influence the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods.

In this same Table, item number two, 69(59.5 percent) of the respondents stated that instructors academic rank influence the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods. While 47(40.5 percent) of the respondents underscored that instructors' academic ranks do not affect the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods.

Table 13 Observed method of teaching with respective qualification of instructors

No	Observed method of teaching	Qualification								X^2
		PhD		MA/MSc		BA/BSc		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture (L)	1	5	6	30	2	10	9	45	Se
2	Discussion (D)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	e
3	L+D	1	5	2	10	--	--	3	15	Ap
4	L + Other	2	10	3	15	--	--	5	25	pe
5	methods	1	5	2	10	--		3	15	ndi
	D + Other methods									x-G
	Total	5	25	13	65	2	10	20	100	

As it can be seen from Table thirteen, 1(5 percent), 1(5 percent), 2(10 percent), and 1(5 percent) PhD holders; and 6(30 percent), 2(10 percent), 3(15 percent), and 2(10 percent) of MA/MSc holders found to be using lecture in isolation, discussion in isolation, lecture and discussion together, lecture and other methods of teaching, and discussion and other methods of teaching together respectively. And 2(10 percent) of BA/BSc holders found to be using lecture method of teaching. However, the chi-square test between PhD and MA/MSc holders indicated as there is no significant difference at X^2 =1.395, p = 0.05. In addition to this, the chi-square test between MA/MSc and BA/BSc holders indicated as there is no significant difference at X^2 = 2.421, p= 0.05. Conversely, the chi-square test between PhD and BA/BSc holders shown as there is significant difference at X^2 = 9.669, p =0.05. From this one might conclude that level of instructors' qualification influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods though it requires further probing (See Appendix-G).

Table 14 Observed method of teaching with respective academic rank of instructors

No	Observed method of teaching	Academic rank										X^2
		Asso. Prof.		Assit. Prof.		Lecturer		Assit. Lecturer		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture (L)	1	5	2	10	4	20	2	10	9	45	See
2	Discussion (D)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	Appe
3	L+D	1	5	1	5	1	5	--	--	3	15	ndix-
4	L + Other methods	1	5	1	5	3	15	--	--	5	25	H
5	D + Other methods	1	5	--	--	2	10	--	--	3	15	
	Total	5	20	4	20	10	50	2	10	20	100	

As it can be seen from Table fourteen, 1(5 percent), 1(5 percent), 1(5 percent), and 1(5 percent) of associate professors; 2(10 percent), 1(5 percent), and 1(5 percent) of Assistant professors; and 4(20 percent), 1(5 percent), 3(15 percent), and 2(10 percent) of lecturers found to be using lecture in isolation, discussion in isolation, lecture and discussion together, lecture and other methods of teaching, and discussion and other methods of teaching together respectively. And 2(10 percent) of assistant-lecturers found to be using lecture method of teaching. The chi-square test between associate professors and assistant professors; associate professors and lecturers; associate professors and assistant-lecturers; assistant professors and lecturers; assistant professors and assistant-lecturers; and lecturers and assistant-lecturers chi-square test indicated as there is no significant difference at X^2 = 1.334; 0.575; 2.787; 1.448; 0.559; and 1.403 respectively. From this one might conclude that academic rank of instructors' doesn't influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods though it is against instructors' belief (See Appendix-H).

Table 15 Influence of qualification, Academic rank, and Pedagogical exposure of instructors' in the selection and utilization of instructional methods as perceived by instructors

No	Items	Disagree		Agree		Total		X^2
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Qualification affects the selection and utilization of instructional methods	52	44.8	64	55.2	116	100	1.42
2	Academic rank affects the selection and utilization of instructional methods	45	38.8	71	61.2	116	100	*5.838
3	Pedagogical exposure affect the selection and utilization of teaching methods	7	6	109	94	116	100	*89.69

Df=1 * significant difference at p = 0.05

As it portrayed in Table fifteen, item number one, 52(44.8 percent) of the respondents do not believe that level of instructors' qualification affects the selection and utilization of instructional methods. While 64(55.2 percent) of the respondents believe that instructors' qualification level influence in the selection and utilization of instructional methods. The chi-square test indicated as there is no significant difference at X^2 =1.421, p = 0.05.

In this same table, item number two, 45(38.8 percent) of the respondents believe that academic rank of instructors doesn't affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. While 71(61.2 percent) of the respondents believe that academic rank of instructors affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. The chi-square test indicated as there is significant difference at X^2 =5.838, p = 0.05.

Table fifteen, item number three, shows that 7(6 percent) of the respondents believe that pedagogical exposure of instructors doesn't affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. While 109(94 percent) of the respondents believe that pedagogical exposure of instructors affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. The chi-square test indicated as there is significant difference at X^2 =89.692, p = 0.05.

Table 16 Pedagogical exposure of Instructors

No	Items	Instructors	
		No	Per cent
1	Have you taken pedagogical course?		
	A. Yes	42	36.2
	B. No	74	63.8
	Total	116	100
2	How many credit hours?		
	a. 6 – 10	8	19.05
	b. 11 –15	4	9.5
	c. 16 – 20	4	9.5
	d. 21 – 25	6	14.3
	e. 26 – 30	8	19.05
	f. Above 30	12	28.6
	Total	42	28.6

As it can be read from Table sixteen, item number one, 42(36.2 percent) of the respondents have taken pedagogical courses. While 74(63.8 percent) of the respondents didn't. From this one might deduce that most (almost two-third) of AAU instructors in the FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, ILS, and SSC haven't taken pedagogical courses. While the finding of this study proven that at least pedagogical exposure affects the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods.

In this same table, item number two, depicted that 8(19.05 percent), 4(9.5 percent), and 4(9.5 percent) of the respondents have taken 6- 10, 11- 15, and 16- 20 credit hours pedagogical course respectively. While 6(14.3 percent), 6(19.05 percent), and 12(28.6

percent) of the respondents have taken 21- 25, 26- 30, and above 30 credit hours pedagogical course respectively.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this research most instructors in the SSC, FBE, FOE, FOL, SISA, and ILS of A.A.U. indicated that lecture, discussion, demonstration and questioning are among the mostly used instructional methods.

This research finding is supported with the theoretical indication of Azeb, (1984), Mulusa, (1995); and Amare, et. al (2000) list of instructional methods that can be used at tertiary level. The list includes lecture, discussion, demonstration, questioning, tutorial, case studies…. Particularly, Amare, et. al (2000:109) enumerated instructional methods that can be included in the new curriculum of A.A.U. and to be employed by instructors depending upon the sought objective and level required.

From these methods, as pointed out by the majority of instructors in these disciplines discussion and lecture are used by most instructors in A.A.U. in the SSC, FBE, FOE, FOL, SISA, and ILS. A discussion method is organized in small groups as well as the whole class. The reason for organizing or arranging the discussion session in a small or the whole class, as the majority of the instructors pointed out,is that it is simple to conduct, safe to control the interaction, conducive to achieve the intended objectives, and it enables to promote communication among students.

This finding is consistent with the literature outline as recitation is used at primary and lower secondary school and discussion is used at advanced level particularly at college and university (Bennaars, Otiends, and Boisvert, 1994:214-215). Like discussion, lecture as a method of teaching is used at tertiary level to introduce course materials and to give specialized information to a group of students (Berliner and Gage, 1976:5). Likewise, the primary instructional purpose of a discussion lesson is to renovate students' thinking, to promote participation and engagement around academic materials, and to learn paramount communication and thinking skill (Arends, 1997:201-202).

Therefore, discussion can be organized in one way or the other depending upon the intended objective. According to Davies (1981), Curzon (1990) discussion can be organized either as a small group or the whole class based on the intended objective such as problem solving, exploring issues and making decisions, and to bring attitudinal change. Therefore, if the purpose of discussion is to solve problem or to bring attitudinal change small group arrangement is the ideal one. When the purpose of discussion is to explore issues and make decision the whole group arrangement is pertinent. Besides, teaching via discussion is difficult to prepare and control. Hence, the instructor should understand the nature of the topic, the nature of the group as a whole and individually.

The research conducted by different authorities on the nature of discussion asserted that discussion is the most appropriate method of teaching in the social sciences, humanities, and language disciplines than in the natural science such as Engineering and Mathematics. This is so because the former disciplines are less consensus while

the latter ones are analogues in nature (Ramsden, 1979; Gage and Berliner, 1979; Gall, 1987).

To this end, therefore, the finding of this research is consistent with both the theoretical foundation and research findings.

As it is depicted by the majority of AAU instructors in the SSC, FBE, FOE, FOL, SISA, and ILS discussion conducted in the classroom has specified time by the majority of instructors. This time is set by the instructors of these disciplines but most of them consider their students contribution to decide the time. The base motive to determine the time limit include the issue to be discussed, the objective of the lesson, students' interest, and time available. However, almost half of the instructors do not stick to the time limit they specified, the major reason is that the nature of the discussion point/topic and due to students' interest to deal with issue either extends or ends less than the specified time.

Majority of A.A.U. instructors in the SSC, FBE, FOE, FOL, SISA, and ILS believe that lecture in isolation, and lecture with other method of teaching other than discussion are dominantly used. While discussion in isolation, discussion in combination with other method of teaching other than lecture is not the dominantly used instructional methods by instructors of the above disciplines.

In some respect this finding coincides with the literature that read as lecture method of teaching is a widely used and common method of presenting a body of knowledge in

higher education (Davies, 1981; Curzon, 1990) of African universities (Bunyi, 1995:144).

Conversely, it is inconsistent with the theoretical view of Davies (1981:41) that discussion as a learner-focused method of teaching is common in higher learning institute.

On the other hand, a body of knowledge that is totally given via lecture at tertiary level is rare. Rather courses that are given through lecture combined with other methods of teaching such as seminars, tutorial, and aspects of teaching are common (Curzon, 1990:284).

Lecture in isolation is more frequently used instructional method when compared with discussion, lecture together with discussion, and lecture or discussion with other method of teaching. Similarly, when lecture and discussion together contrasted with lecture and other method of teaching; and lecture or discussion with other method of teaching, the statistical test shown as there is no any significant difference indicating that lecture together with discussion lecture with other method of teaching, and discussion, with other methods of teaching are used in comparable manner, by A.A.U. instructors in the SSC, FOE, FBE, FOL, SISA, and ILS. Likewise, Lecture in isolation, lecture and discussion together, and lecture or discussion with other method of teaching are found to be used frequently when compared to discussion used in isolation.

However, it partially goes with what Amare et. al (2000:110) stated unequivocally. That is, "there is a general consensus among educators in the AAU that the lecture and demonstration methods were overused". And also coincide with what Knott and Mutunga (1995:172) concluded from research findings. I.e., research has examined lecture effectiveness with other methods; students view about lecture; and focus on learning in teaching. And they inferred that the lecture is the most common method used in universities.

As the majority of AAU instructors in SSC. FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA and ILS indicated class size, objective of the lesson, level of objective required to be achieved, and time available are found to be the most influential factors that determine the selection and utilization of instructional methods in the specified disciplines above.

The literature indicates that number of students in classrooms determine the instructional method that instructors employ. According to Davies, 1981; Zaudneh, Darge, and Nardos (1989), Knott and Mutunga (1995) class size, objective of the lesson, level of objective required, local constraints such as time, and resources; and instructors' preference and dislikes are among the factors that affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods at tertiary level. However, no one of these scholars has delineated which factors are the most influential ones.

However, Knott and Mutunga (1995:169) unequivocally stated that class-size has an important role to play in using a certain method of teaching. For instance, discussion is not suitable for large class size. Explicitly speaking, for single or pair student (s)

programmed instruction, coaching, computerized learning & directed study, are the most appropriate. For small groups (3-14 students) discussions, role-play, brainstorming, tutorials, seminars, projects, demonstrations, case studies, simulations/games, and small group activities are the most appropriate methods. For large class (30 – 60 students) syndicates, lectures, seminars, panels, workshops, case studies, problem-solving groups are the most appropriate. For over 60 students (aggregate classroom) lecture augmented (supplemented) with buzz groups, syndicates, and small group activities are the most appropriate. And for medium group (15-29 students) the methods listed for small group can be used with more difficulty and less effectiveness.

Research on class-size as reviewed by Gall and Gall (1976:174), revealed that class size has influence on selection and utilization of instructional methods. They found out that small class size is conducive to use such methods as tutoring, programmed instruction, individually prescribed, and independent study as it is appropriate in working with a single or two students. The discussion method is more appropriate with "a small group perhaps two to twenty students," and discussion in combination with other methods can be used for group of twenty to forty students. Similarly, though the lecture method minimizes the influence of class size, ideally lecture is the most appropriate for groups of forty or more students. But the same lecture with the aid of instructional materials can be used for "one to one thousand" students.

Secondly, the choice of an instructional method depends on prior understanding of objectives by the teacher. i.e. objectives should be stated explicitly in terms of intended

behavioral change in students. If the method doesn't address the anticipated behavioral change it should not be used and if it does, it should be considered. Nevertheless, some claim that effective teaching is the result of the learner and teaching method interaction not the method itself (McLeish, 1976:298).

Emphasizing the above idea (Mckeachie, 1986:44-45) pointed out that when the objective of a lesson is to achieve lower order cognitive, lecture and recitation is the appropriate method. When the objective is to achieve critical thinking, most higher cognitive outcome, group discussion, practical activities and case studies provide an opportunity.

Research reviewed by Gall & Gall (1976), Gall (1987), Bunyi (1995) surmised that discussion is, generally, effective in promoting higher-level thinking, changing students attitudes, advancing students' capacity for more reasoning, and to engage students in group problem-solving teaching goals. And also discussion is found out to be more effective than lecture method when the purpose of the lesson is to bring attitudinal change.

The majority of instructors in SSC, FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, and ILS of A.A.U believe that qualification of instructors doesn't affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. The reason forwarded from the majority of instructors is that qualification shows knowledge of subject matter not ability of communication, and most teachers are 'born not made'. Nevertheless, the classroom observation data statistical analysis shows, as there is significant difference at least between Ph.D and BA. holders. And it

also indicates, as there is no statistically significant difference between Ph.D and MA/MSc; and MA/MSc and BA/B.Sc. holders. On the other hand, the majority of these same discipline instructors believe that instructors' academic rank and experience affects the selection and utilization of instructional methods. Conversely, however, the classroom observation data statistical analysis shows, as there is no significant difference at any level of academic rank. In this regard, a study conducted by Cantrell on thirty lectures delivered by visiting professors at Mekerere Medical College in Uganda found out that professional status, age, and qualification are not associated with good teaching (McLeish, 1976:300).

Majority of instructors in these same disciplines of A.A.U. pointed out that pedagogical training affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. To the contrary, however, the majority of A.A.U. in the SSC, FOE, FOL, FBE, SISA, and ILS have no pedagogical exposure via pre-or in-service training.Lockheed and Verpoor (1991:62) stated that the academic and professional training of teachers influence the excellence of teachers and achievement of students. And also subject matter and pedagogical knowledge of instructors influence the intended result of instruction (Avalos and Haddad, 1981; Husen, Saba, and Noonan, 1978; Schrefelbeln and Simons, 1981) as cited in Alemayehu (1998:372).

In line with this idea, Davies (1981), and Curzon, (1990) stated that teaching is both a science and art. Teaching is a science because it has systematic body of knowledge that a teacher is expected to know and master it. It is an art because it requires the idiosyncrasy of the instructor. Park (1996:47) stated that, in principle, good teaching

needs knowledge of subject matter and the ability to organize, synthesize, and communicate that knowledge in a meaningful way. Unequivocally stating, sound teaching demands teachers' specialty in the field of study, and pedagogical knowledge.

Research findings reviewed by Stockard and Mayberry (1992:39-40) on teachers' years of education, years of teaching experience, type of education they have and its influence on secondary School students achievement shown that level of teachers' education significantly influence students' achievements.

This finding coincides with what Elias (1994:28) identified with respect to the pedagogical training of Faculty of Business and Economic instructors in AAU almost before a decade. According to this research result most of the faculty of Business and Economics instructors did not have any pedagogical training exposure both during pre-service and in-service.

However, according to skinner in Curzon (1990:20) successful teaching is the result of the conscious application of scientifically backed theory of teaching to classroom situation. Unequivocally speaking, successful teaching can't be achieved in haphazard manner unless the instructor at least has the elementary concepts and principles of teaching.

Supporting this idea Entwistle stated that university lecturers are undoubtedly knowledgeable but totally untrained and unexamined in the art of teaching. The worst assumption is that any one with a good degree will automatically be able to impart this

knowledge to others. But this assumption doesn't go inline with the actual practice (Entwistle, 1988:267).

To mitigate unnecessary rambling of instructional process many countries expose tertiary level teacher to pedagogical training. As Main (1987:794) stated unequivocally there are countries that provide pre service courses for teaching assistants and graduate students who are already in the higher education system. The courses include orientation about the institution and to the teaching profession, training in techniques for effective instruction, and execution of teaching tasks. This practice is more common in North America and Canada than in Europe, Asia or Africa. In the former GDR a more structured training for graduate assistants in University pedagogy was an indispensable.

To this end, therefore, an instructor having an earth shaking knowledge without the skill of communication is tantamount with a navigator who possesses a compass without a needle.

Research findings reviewed by Leither (1998:347) on the pedagogical qualification of the academic teaching (also known as the theory of teaching & learning in higher education) staff and the quality of teaching and learning in Europe Universities depicted that tertiary level teachers should be exposed to adequate pedagogical qualification to satisfy their students. This is so because, in most cases, the quality of graduates indicates the status of a university.

To the contrary, however, a study conducted by Cantrell on thirty lectures delivered by visiting professors at Mekerere Medical College in Uganda found out that professional status, age, and qualification are not associated with good teaching (McLeish, 1976:300).

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This part of the paper deals with the summary, conclusions, and recommendations made depending on the findings.

5.1 SUMMARY

The prominent purpose of the study was to find out the general practice of AAU with respect to the teaching-learning process. Particularly, the study focuses on lecture and discussion method of teaching utilization, the factors that influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods, and the influence of qualification, academic rank, and pedagogical knowledge of instructors on the selection and utilization of instructional methods.

To achieve this aim, the following research questions were raised:

1. To what extent do instructors use lecture and/or discussion methods of instruction?
2. How frequently lecture and discussion methods of teaching are used in combination with one another and other methods of teaching in a lesson?
3. What are the factors that influence the choice of instructional methods in general, and lecture and discussion methods in particular?
4. Does level of qualification/academic rank influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods?

5. Is there any difference between instructors who took professional (pedagogical) courses and who didn't take professional (pedagogical) courses in the selection and utilization of teaching methods?

A review of literature was made based on the research questions raised. The study was conducted in AAU. More specifically, in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, and School of Information Studies for Africa. Instructors of these fields of studies were the subjects of the study. Instructors were selected based on simple random sampling techniques. The opinion of these instructors was gathered using a questionnaire constructed in terms of close and open-ended, rating scale, and Likert scale. On top of this, classroom observation was conducted. The classroom process was recorded on a checklist. The data secured via questionnaire and observation checklist was analyzed using percentiles, weight mean rank, and Chi- Square.

Based on the study the following findings were obtained:

1. According to the majority of instructors in AAU particularly, in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, and School of Information Studies for Africa, generally lecture, discussion, questioning, and demonstration are among the widely used instructional methods.
    1.1. The lecture method of teaching is the traditional type, i.e. talk and chalk; no other electronic media are used.

1.2. The discussion is conducted by organizing the class into small groups and the whole class depending upon the issue under discussion.

1.3. As it is indicated by the majority of the instructors, most instructors set specific time to conduct discussion based upon the nature of the issue to be discussed, the objective of the lesson, and students' interest. Primarily instructors set the time limit though they consider students' input. However, half proportion of the instructors do not stick to the time limit set before, due to the nature of the topic and students' interest to deal with the issue.

2. According to the statistical analysis made lecture in isolation is more frequently used instructional method when compared to discussion in isolation, discussion and lecture, and discussion or lecture together with other method of teaching.

2.1. According to the classroom observation data, the comparison made between lecture and discussion together, with lecture or discussion used together with other method of teaching, the statistical analysis has shown that there is no statistically significant difference indicating that lecture and discussion together, and lecture or discussion together with other method of teaching are used in comparable manner.

2.2. The data obtained through classroom checklist revealed that lecture in isolation, lecture and discussion together, and lecture or discussion together with other method of teaching are found to be the more frequently used instructional methods when compared to discussion method used in isolation.

3. As it is indicated by the majority of AAU instructors in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, and School of Information Studies for Africa, class size, objective of the lesson, level of objective required to be achieved, and time available are found to be the most influential factors that determine the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional methods consecutively.

4 a. The majority of instructors in AAU (Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, and School of Information Studies for Africa) believe that qualification of instructors doesn't affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods. The reason forwarded from the majority of instructors is that qualification merely shows knowledge of subject matter not ability of communication, and most teachers are 'born not made'.

   b. The data secured via observation indicted, as there is significant statistical difference at least between PhD and BA/BSC holders. And it is also indicated, as there is no significant statistical difference between PhD and MA/MSC, and MA/MSC and BA/BSC holders.

   c. As it is indicated by the majority of AAU instructors in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, and School of Information Studies for Africa, academic rank and experience of instructors affect the selection and utilization of instructional method. However, the statistical analysis made to the data obtained

via classroom observation indicated, as there is no significant statistical difference between different levels of academic rank.

5 Majority of instructors in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, Institute of Language Studies, and School of Information Studies for Africa, pointed out that pedagogical knowledge of instructors affect the selection and utilization of appropriate instructional method. Conversely, however, the majority of AAU instructors in the above specified fields of study exceot FOE have no pedagogical exposure either via pre- or in-service training.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

1. Lecture method of teaching in comparison with discussion found to be the widely used instructional method in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies of AAU. This shows that how still the talk and chalk method of teaching is dominant in the university. This finding is consistent with the other universities in Africa and developed countries.

2. Lecture in isolation and in combination with other method of teaching is found to be the frequently used instructional method in comparison with discussion in isolation, discussion and lecture, and discussion and other method of teaching. In

addition, lecture and discussion in comparison with lecture or discussion together with other method of teaching have shown that there is significant difference. However, the other mentioned instructional methods found to be comparably used instructional methods. This practice shows that AAU instructors of Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies use a variety of instructional methods to address objective of a lesson depending upon the level of objective required. This is a quite common practice of educational institutions at various levels.

3. Instructional methods selection and utilization depends upon both the internal and external factors of educational institutions. Regarding the internal factor in AAU class size, objective of a lesson, level of objective required, and time available found to be the most influential factors in Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies instructors. These days, problem of class size is not peculiar to these disciplines; rather it is common to different educational levels in different countries particularly in developing countries. Similarly, teachers at all levels of educational institutions try to use different instructional methods depending upon the objective of a lesson, class size and time available.

4. This study revealed that AAU instructors in Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of

Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies believe that qualification level of instructors do not affect the selection and utilization of instructional method. For the mere reason that qualification shows subject matter knowledge, not skill in teaching. To the contrary of their believe, however, the classroom observation statistical analysis revealed that there is a difference at least among Ph.D and BA/BSc holders while it indicates as there is no significant difference among MA/MSc and BA/BSc, and Ph.D and MA/MSc holders.

Conversely, they believe that academic rank and experience of teaching influence the selection and utilization of instructional methods. Surperisingly, the classroom observation data indicated, as there is no significant difference among different academic rank holders of instructors. These findings are not generalizable in one way or the other due to the unusual practice of AAU.

5. Pedagogical knowledge of instructors in the selection and utilization of instructional methods plays an important role. This is indicated by the majority of the instructors in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies in AAU. Surprisingly, however, majority of AAU instructors in the above specified faculties, school, institute, and college have no pedagogical exposure either via pre- or in-service training. These days, a more emphasis is given to academic pedagogy, science of tertiary level teaching, as a core instrument to impart different levels of knowledge.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the major findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. Tertiary level teaching and learning is susceptible to many problems like other educational levels. From the many problems, student population is the one. In AAU particularly, in the Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies, class size is found to be among the major determing factors in the selection and utilization of appropriate method of teaching. Therefore, different mechanisms should be employed to mitigate this prevailing problem. From these mechanisms, one could be making instructional materials available to supplement the instructional process.

2. Science of teaching is the base and the major decisive factor in the teaching and learning process. Here, in AAU, majority of Social Science College, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Business and Economics, School of Information Studies for Africa, and Institute of Language Studies instructors are not familiar with the abc of pedagogy. Surprisingly, however, academy pedagogy i.e. Science of tertiary level teaching, in North America and Canada has got a paramount importance. As a result, tertiary level teachers are exposed to continuous in-service training and pre-service pedagogical qualification. Therefore, Curriculum and Instruction Department particularly, and AAU as the host, has to design a means to up-grade pedagogical knowledge of instructors and to would be college and university instructors of it's graduates. For instance,

the Department of Curriculum and Instruction can design elective courses for both the undergraduate and graduate students of AAU other than Faculty of Education students. Secondly, in-service training, like seminars, panel discussions, workshops and the like for AAU staff can be conducted. Unless otherwise, it is unwise to expect quality of teaching without instructors knowledge about pedagogy.

REFERENCES

A.A.U. Academic Program Office (August2001). Academic Staff List. Addis Ababa: AAU Printing press.

A.A.U.(August 2000). 50 Years of A.A.U. Academic Staff List. Addis Ababa: A.A.U. Printing Press.

A.A.U.Planning office (1994/50. A Portrait of the academic Staff Situation. (Unpublished Document).

Alemayehu Debebe (1998) Teacher Education Trends in Some Countries: implications for Ethiopian Context, In Proceedings of National Conference Held in Awassa College of Teacher Education.IER(AAU). (PP. 169- 374).

Amare A.; Nardos A.; and MekuanentK.. (2000). Framework for Curriculum Design in Higher Education, In IER FLAMBEAU. Vol. 7, No. 2.

Anderson, L.W.; and Burns, R.B. (1989) Research in classrooms. London: Pergamon press.

Anderson,L; Everton,C; and Brophy,J. (1982). Principles of Smallgroup Instruction in Elementary Schools. East Lansing: NJ.

Arends, R. I. (1997) Class room Instruction and management. New York: The McGrew-Hill Companies, Inc.

Ashcroft, K. and Foreman-peck, L.(1994) Managing Teaching and Learning in Further and Higher Education. London: The Falmer Press.

Azeb Desta (1984) Chractristics of Effective Teaching,. In Proceedings of the National Workshop on Strengethening Educational Research Capacity for Effective Teaching and learning. AAU (IER) (pp14- 38).

Azeb Desta (1986) Elements of General Methods of Teaching. AAU(Faculty of Education) (Unpublished Teaching Material).

Bajah, S.T.(1995) The Role of a Universty Lecturer, In Maritu, I.B; Mwangi, A.P; and Schette, R.(eds) Teach your Best: a handbook for university lecturers.(pp 21-38). Nairobi: DSE

Beard, R. M; and Hartley,J. (1984) Teaching and learning in Higher Education(4th.ed). London: Harper and Row Ltd.

Bennaars, G.A; Otiende, J. E; and Boisvert, B. R. (eds) (1994) Theory and Practice of Education. Nairobi: East African educational Publishes Ltd.

Best, J.W. (1970). Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Borich, G. B. (1996) Effective Teaching Methods (3rd. ed.) Ohio: Merrill.

Borich, G.D.(1988) Effective Teaching Methods. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Brown, G. A. (1987). Lectures and Lecturing, In Dunkin, M.I.(ed) International Encychlopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education.(pp. 284- 287) Sydeny: Pergamon Press.

Bunyi, G.W.(1995) Corse Design, In Maritu, I.B; Mwangi, A.P; and Schette, R.(eds) Teach your Best: a handbook for university lecturers.(pp 123- 153). Nairobi: DSE

Burroughs, G.E.R. (1971) Design and Analysis in Educational Research. Oxford: Alden press.

Callahan, J.E; and Clark; L.H. (1988) Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools: Planning for Competence (3rd.ed). London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Chauhan, S,s. (1983) innovations in teaching-Learning Process (2nd ed). Delhi: Vikas Publishing House ltd.

Clark; L.H; and Starr, J.S.(1986) Secondary and Middle Scool Teaching Methods (5th.ed0. New york: Macmillan Publishing company.

Curzon, L.B (1990) Teaching in Further Education: An outline of principles and Practice (4^{th} ed). London: Cassell

Darge wole (1995). The learning Process, In Maritu, I.B; Mwangi, A.P; and Schette, R.(eds) Teach your Best: a handbook for university lecturers.(pp. 89- 118). Nairobi: DSE

Davis, I.K.(1981)Instructional Techniques. New York: McGrew-Hill Book Company.

Elias Nasir (1994) A Summary of Findings of an Investigation into the Pedagogical Knowledge of instructors, In IER FLAMBEAU. Vol.3 No. 1 AAU.

Encyclopedia Americana: International Edition (1983). Danbury: Grolier Incorporated.

Entwistle, N.(1988) styles of Learning and Teaching: An Integrated Outline of Educational Psychology for students, teachers, and Lecturers. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Gage, N.L and Berliner,D.C.(1976) The psychology of Teaching Methods, in Gage, N.L.(ed) The Psychology of teaching Methods(pp1- 20). Chicago : NSSE.

Gage,N.L.(1976) The Psychology of Teaching Methods(part one). Chicago: NSSE.

Gage,N.L; and Berliner, D.C. (1979) Educational Psychology, (2nd.ed).Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gagne, R.M. (1976) The Learning Basis of Teaching Methods, In Gage,N.L.(ed). The Psychology of teaching Methods (pp21- 43). Chicago : NSSE.

Gall, M.D.(1987) Discussion Methods, In Dunkin,M.L.(ed) The International Encyclopedia of teaching and Teacher education.(232- 237) Sydney: Pergamon Press.

Gall, M.D; and Gall, J. P.(1976) the Discussion Method, In Gage,N.L.(ed). The Psychology of teaching Methods (pp166- 216). Chicago : NSSE.

Good, T.L; and Brophy,J.E.(1997) Look in Classrooms(7th.ed). New York: Longnman

Grambles, J.D; Carr, J.C; and Fitch; R.M.(1970) Modern Methods in secondary Education(3rd.ed) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston,Inc.

Howell, D.(1987). Statistical Methods for Psychology (2nd. Ed). Boston: PWS Publishers.

Hussen Eshetu(2000) Enhancing Students' Involvement, IER FLAMBEAU.Vol.7 No.2 A.A.U.

ICDR, (1999). Teachers Education Handbook. Addis Ababa: Qurael P. Press.

Knott, M. and Mutunga, P. (1995) Methods of teaching and learning, In Maritu, I.B; Mwangi, A.P; and Schette, R.(eds) teach your best: a Hand Book for University Lecturers. Nairobi: DSE. (pp. 157- 219).

Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970) Determing Sample Size for research Activities, in Educational and Psycological Measurement. Vol. 30 No. 3 (pp 607-610).

Leitner, Erich (1998) the Pedagogical Qualification of the Academic Teaching Staff and the Quality of Teaching and Learning, In Higher Education in Europe. (pp. 339-349)Vol. 23, No. 3. UNESCO.

LockHeed, M.E.; and Verspoor, A.M. (1991) Improving Primary Eduction in Developing Countries. New York: Oxford University Press.

Main, A.N. (1987) Teacher Education for Higher Education, In Dunkin, M.L. (ed) the International Encyclopedia of teaching and teacher Educatin.(pp.794-798) Sydeny: Pergamon Press.

McCombs, B.L; and Whisler,J.U. (1997) the Learner-centered Classroom and School : Strategies for Increasing Student Motivation and Achievement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

McCormick, C.B; and Pressley, M.(1997) Educational Psychology: Learning, instruction, Assessment. New York: Longman.

Mckeachie,W. (1986) Teaching Tips: A Guide for the Beginning College Teacher (8th. ed.). Toronto; D.C. Heath and Company.

Mcleish, J. (1976) The Lecture Method, In Gage,N.L.(ed). The Psychology of teaching Methods (pp1- 20). Chicago : NSSE.(pp. 252- 301).

Mulusa, T. (1995) Evaluating University Teaching, In Maritu, I.B; Mwangi, A.P; and Schette, R.(eds) Teach your Best: a handbook for university lecturers.(pp.267-306) Nairobi: DSE

Ohles, J.F.(1970) Introduction to Teaching. New York: Random House.

Ornstein, C.A. (1990) Strategies for Effective Teaching (2nd. Ed) New York: Brown and Benchmark.

Park, S.(1996)Research, Teaching, and Service: Why Souldn't Women's Work Count, In Journal of higher Education. Vol. 67, no. 1. (pp 46- 63).

Rabow, et al (1994). Learning Trough Discussion (3rd.ed). London: SAGE Publications.

Ramsden, P.(1979) Student Learning and Perception of the Academic Enviroment, In Higher Education Journal. (pp 411- 428).

Rinne, C.H.(1997). Excellent Classroom Management. Bonn: Wadswork Publishing Company.

Rogers,J.(1989) Adult Learning(3rd ed). Briston; Open University.

Rosenshine, B.(1976). Classroom Instruction, In Gage,N.L.(ed). The Psychology of teaching Methods (pp335- 371). Chicago: NSSE.

Rosenshine, B.; (19870. Direct Instruction, In Dunkin, M.I.(ed) International Encychlopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Sydeny: Pergamon Press.(pp 257- 262).

Rosenshine, B.; and Stevens,R. (1986). Teaching Functions, In Wittrock, M.C.(ed) Handbook of Research on Teaching(3rd. ed). A project of the American Educational Research Association. New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan. (pp 376- 391).

Rosenshine,B.(1988) Direct Instruction, In Gorton, R.A.; Schneider, G. T; and Fisher; J.C.(ed) Encyclopedia of School Adninistration and Supervision. New York: ORYX Press.

Schofield, H. (1972). The Psychology of Education; An Introduction. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Slavin, R.E.(1987). Small Group Methods, In Dunkin, M.I.(ed) International Encychlopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education.(pp. 237- 244) Sydeny: Pergamon Press.

Stockard, J. and Mayberry, M.(1992) Effective Educational Enviroments. California: Crowin Prss, Inc.

Tuder, Ian (1996) Learner-Centeredness as Language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Waklin,L.(1999). Teaching and Learning in Further and Adult Education. London: Stanley Tomes Publishers Ltd.

Wakshum Mekonnen (2001). The Potentials of Information Technology in Education, IER FLMBEAU. Vol. 18, No. 2.

Wilen,W.W.; and White, J.J. (1991). Interaction and Discourse in Social Studies Classroom, In Shaver, J.P.(ed) Handbook of research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning: A project of a National Council for the Social Studies. New York: Macmillan publishing Company.(pp 483- 495).

Withall,J.(1987)Teacher-Centered and Learner-Centered Teaching, In Dunkin, M.I.(ed) International Encychlopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. (pp.327-335)Sydeny: Pergamon Press.

Zaudneh Y.; Darge W.; and Nardos A. (1989). The Teaching-Learning Situations in Higher Learning in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: (Unpublished Research).

APPENDIX- A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study is to survey the current practice of A.A.U. instructors in selection and utilization of instructional methods in general and lecture and discussion methods of teaching in particular.

The researcher will use the data gathered through this questionnaire for strictly academic purposes. You are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire honestly. Your response will be kept confidential.

Your genuine response to this study is indispensable. Therefore, give your response either by using tick (,/), or circle the letter or number, or writing in the space provided.

NB: please do not write your names in any part of the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation!

1. Your department:_____

2. Your qualification:
   A) B.A/ B.Sc. B) M.A / M.Sc. C) Ph.D.
   D) Other (specify)_____

3. You're academic rank:
   A) Graduate Assistant B) Assistant-lecturer
   C) Lecturer D) Assistant Professor
   E) Associate Professor F) Professor
   G) Other (specify)_____

4. Sex: A) Male B) Female

5. Field of specialization:_____

6. Years of service as an instructor:_____

7. Have you taken pedagogical courses? A) Yes B) No

8. If your response for item No. 7 is 'yes', how many in number?
   A) One B) Two C) Three D) Four
   E) Other (specify)_____

*Or, how many in credit hours: _____

9. Which teaching method or techniques do you use most?

A) Laboratories B)Field experiences
C) Individual research projects D) Issue-centered problems
E) Discussion F) Cooperative learning
G) Lecture H) Demonstrations
I) Tutorial J) Seminar
K) Case study L) Other(specify)_____

10. On average, how often do you use the method you specified above?

A) Through out the semester
B) 3/4th of the semester
C) Half of the semester
D) A quarter of the semester
E) Other(specify)_____

11.Do you use lecture method of teaching in the classroom?

A) Yes B) No

12.If your response for item No. 11 is 'yes', how often?

A) Sometimes B) Mostly C) Always
D) Other (specify)_____

13.Why? Give your reason for the answer you gave for the item No. 12._____
_____
_____

14.Do you use discussion method of teaching in classroom?

A) Yes B) No

15.How do you organize the discussion session?

A) In small groups B) the whole class
C) Other (specify)_____

6. Why? Because it is:

A) Simple to conduct
B) Safe to control the interaction
C) Conducive to achieve the intended objective
D) Other (specify)_____

17. How much time do you allocate for discussion session?

A) Not at all B) 15 minutes C) 20 minutes D) The whole period E) Other (specify)_____

18.Who set the time limit for the discussion session?

A) Instructor (You) B) Students C) Jointly with the students
D) Other (specify)_____

19.Did you conduct the discussion according to the time limit?

A) Yes B) No

20. Why? Give your reason for the answer you gave for item No. 19._____
_____
_____

21.If you (instructor) are to set the time limit on what basis?

A) The nature of the issue to be discussed
B) The objective of the lesson to be achieved
C) Student interest
D) Other (specify)_____

22.What do you think forces instructors to use lecture method of teaching most? _____
_____
_____

23. What do you think is the reason that impeded instructors from using discussion method of teaching?_____
_____
_____
_____

24. Do you think that qualification affect the selection and utilization of appropriate method of teaching for a lesson?

A) Yes B) No

25. Do you think that levels of academic rank affect the selection and utilization of appropriate method of teaching for a lesson?

A) Yes B) No

26. If your response for item No. 24 is 'No', give your reason (S)_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

27. What are the factors that influence the selection and utilization of a certain method of teaching? Give rank orders by assigning number 1 for the factor that most affect and number 2 for the next…and so on.

A) Objective of the lesson _____
B) Level of objective required_____
C) Class size_____
D) Time available_____
E) Classroom facilities_____
F) Students' degree of autonomy In the learning process_____
G) Teachers' preference and dislike_____
H) Other (specify)_____

POINT OUT YOUR RESPONSE FOR THE FOLLOWING ITEMS BY CIRCLING THE NUMBERS.

KEY: 1= almost never 2=sometimes
3=often 4=almost always

1	I use lecture method of teaching	1	2	3	4
2	I use discussion method of teaching	1	2	3	4
3	I use lecture and discussion method together in a lesson	1	2	3	4
4	I use lecture method in combination with other method of teaching other than discussion method	1	2	3	4
5	I use discussion method in combination with other method of teaching other than lecture method	1	2	3	4

KEY 1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree
3=Agree 4=Strongly agree

1	Level of instructors' qualification affects the selection and utilization of teaching methods	1	2	3	4
2	Level of academic rank of instructors affect the selection and utilization of instructional methods	1	2	3	4
3	Taking professional (pedagogical) courses enhance the selection and utilization of instructional methods	1	2	3	4
4	Lecture method of teaching is the dominant one in A.A.U. teaching learning process	1	2	3	4
5	Discussion method of teaching is the dominant one in A.A.U. teaching learning process	1	2	3	4
6	Lecture method of teaching in combination with discussion method of teaching is used widely in A.A.U.	1	2	3	4
7	Lecture method In combination with other method of teaching other than discussion is used mostly in A.A.U.	1	2	3	4
8	Methods of teaching other than lecture and discussion are used widely in A.A.U.	1	2	3	4

THANK YOU

Appendix B

Lecture Session Observation Checklist (Guide)

The purpose of this observation checklist is to gather data pertaining to how instructors use lecture method in combination with discussion or other method of teaching in the classroom. It merely focuses on the instructors' activity in the classroom while she/he is lecturing. Methods of teaching other than lecture and discussion will not be emphasized.

Qualification: _____ Period _____
Academic Rank: _____ Time _____

1. Time
   a) Lecture began at (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____
   b) Lecture ended at (a) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

Yes			**No**		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)

2. The process:
   2.1 Lecture conducted with note
   2.2 Dictate notes
   2.3 Brief notes
   2.4 Control student action

3. Total No of students in the classroom during observation session
   (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

4. Other method of teaching used:
   1) _____
   2) _____
   3) _____

5. General Comment:
   a)
   b)
   c)

Appendix – C

Discussion Session Observation Checklist (Guide)

The purpose of this observation checklist is to gather data pertaining to how instructors use Discussion method in combination with lecture or other method of teaching in the classroom. It merely focuses on the instructor's activity in the classroom while she/he is conducting discussion. Methods of teaching other than lecture and discussion will not be emphasized.

Qualification: _____ Period: _____

Academic Rank: _____ Time _____

1. Time:
   a) Discussion began at: (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____
   b) Discussion ended at: (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

2. Instructor talk/speech
   a) started at (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____
   b) ended at (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

3. Students talk/speech
   a) started at (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____
   b) ended at (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

4. How many students are speaking during the session
   (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

5. Total of students in the classroom during observation session
   (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

6. The discussion is organized/ arranged

1	2	3

a) in small groups

b) as the whole class

c) other (specify

7. Other method of teaching used

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____

8. General Comment

a)

b)

c)

d)

e)

Appendix – D

Respondents' field of specialization

No	Items	Instructors	
		No of Respondents	Per cent
1	Field of specialization		
	• Library and Information Science	4	3.5
	Law	5	4.3
	Rural Geography and Cartography	1	0.9
	Physical Geography	2	1.7
	Human (Economic) Geography	4	3.5
	African and Ethiopian History	4	3.5
	Minorities	1	0.9
	Art History	1	0.9
	Environmental Ethnic	1	1.7
	Philosophy	2	1.7
	Social and Political Philosophy	2	1.7
	International and Human rights law	1	0.9
	Political Science	5	4.3
	Sociology and Social Administration	1	0.9
	Sociology	1	0.9
	Rural Sociology	1	0.9
	Social/Anthropology	3	2.6
	Curriculum Planning	1	0.9
	Curriculum and Instruction	5	4.3
	Educational Policy Planning and Administration	1	0.9
	Educational Administration	4	3.5
	Special Needs Education	2	1.7
	Medical Anthropology	1	0.9

No	Items	Instructors	
		No of Respondents	Per cent
	Measurement and Evaluation	3	2.6
	Psychology	1	0.9
	Guidance Counseling	1	0.9
	Business Education	3	2.6
	Teaching English	17	14.7
	Literature and Journalism	1	0.9
	Linguistics	3	2.6
	Literature	4	3.5
	Theatre Arts	2	1.7
	Literature in Language Teaching	2	1.7
	Comparative Literature	1	0.9
	Accounting	5	4.3
	Business Administration	5	4.3
	Economics	9	7.8
	Development and Resource Economics	1	0.9
	Management	4	3.5
	Public Administration	1	0.9
	Total	**116**	100

Appendix – E

Observation Data

Observed Period distribution

No	Item	No. of periods observed	Percent
1	Period		
	1st	3	5
	2nd	6	10
	1 and 2nd (continuous period	6	10
	3rd	6	10
	4th	9	15
	5th	6	10
	6th	9	15
	7th	6	10
	8th	9	15
	Total	**60**	**100**

Observed time distribution

No	Item	Minutes of the period	No of Observation	No of Period	Total minutes
1	Time				
	2:00 – 2:50	50’	3	1	150’
	2:00 – 3:40	100’	3	2	600’
	3:00 – 3:50	50’	3	2	300
	4:0 – 4:50	50’	3	2	300
	5:00 – 5:50	50’	3	3	450
	7:00 - 7:50	50”	3	2	300
	8:00 – 8:50	50”	3	3	450
	9:00 – 9:50	50’	3	2	300
	10:00 – 10:50	50’	3	3	450
	Total	**500**	**27**	**20**	***3300**

* **Total Minutes** = ∑ a periods minutes x No of Observation x No of Periods

No. of Observed instructors’ Qualification and Academic Rank

No	Items	Instructors	
		No	%
1	Qualification		
	• Ph.D	5	25
	• MA/MSc	13	65
	• BA	2	10
	Total	**20**	**100**
2	Academic Rank		
	• Associate Professor	4	20
	• Assistant Professor	4	20
	• Lecturer	10	50
	• Assistant Lecturer	2	10
	Total	**20**	**100**

Appendix F

Observed Frequency of Instructional Methods and chi-Square

	Lecture	**L + D**	**X^2**	**Significance**
Observed	*27	*9		
Expected	18	18	*9.000	0.003

* Frequencies observed are number of periods

	Lecture	**L + O**	**X^2**	**Significance**
Observed	*27	*15		
Expected	21	21	3.429	0.64

* Frequencies observed are number of periods

	L + D	**L + 0**	**X^2**	**Significance**
Observed	*9	*15		
Expected	12	12	1.500	0.221

* Frequencies observed are number of periods

	Lecture	**D + 0**	**X^2**	**Significance**
Observed	*27	*9		
Expected	18	18	*9.000	0.003

* Frequencies observed are number of periods

	L + O	**D + 0**	**X^2**	**Significance**
Observed	*15	*9		
Expected	12	12	1.500	0.221

* Frequencies observed are number of periods

Appendix – G

Observed Instructional Methods With Respective Qualifications of Instructors

No	Observed Method of Teaching	Qualification						x^2
		Ph.D		MA/MSc		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	1	5	6	30	7	35	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	2	10	3	15	x^2=1.395
4	L + 0	2	10	3	15	5	25	
5	D + 0	1	5	2	10	3	15	
	Total	**5**	**25**	**13**	**65**	**18**	**90**	

No	**Observed Method of Teaching**	**Qualification**						**x^2**
		Ph.D		**BA/BSc**		**Total**		
		No	**%**	**No**	**%**	**No**	**%**	
1	Lecture	1	5	2	10	3	15	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	-	-	1	5	x^2=*9.669
4	L + 0	2	10	-	-	2	10	
5	D + 0	1	5	-	-	1	5	
	Total	**5**	**25**	**2**	**10**	**7**	**35**	

No	**Observed Method of Teaching**	**Qualification**						**x^2**
		MA/MSc		**BA/BSc**		**Total**		
		No	**%**	**No**	**%**	**No**	**%**	
1	Lecture	6	30	2	10	8	40	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	2	10	-	-	2	10	x^2=2.421
4	L + 0	3	15	-	-	3	15	
5	D + 0	2	10	-	-	2	10	
	Total	**13**	**65**	**2**	**10**	**15**	**75**	

*Significant at 0.05

Appendix – H

Observed Instructional Methods With Respective Academic rank of Instructors

No	Observed Method of Teaching	Academic Rank						x^2
		Ass.Prof.		Assist. Prof		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	1	5	2	10	3	15	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	1	5	2	10	x^2=1.334
4	L + 0	1	5	1	5	2	10	
5	D + 0	1	5	-	-	1	5	
	Total	**4**	**20**	**4**	**20**	**8**	**40**	

f = 1

No	Observed Teaching Method	Academic Rank						x^2
		Ass.Prof.		Lecturer		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	1	5	4	20	5	25	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	1	5	2	10	x^2=0.575
4	L + 0	1	5	3	15	4	20	
5	D + 0	1	5	2	10	3	15	
	Total	**4**	**20**	**10**	**50**	**14**	**70**	

No	Observed Teaching Method	Academic Rank						x^2
		Ass.Prof.		Assist. Lect.		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	1	5	2	10	3	15	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	-	-	1	5	x^2=2.787
4	L + 0	1	5	-	-	1	5	
5	D + 0	1	5	-	-	1	5	
	Total	**4**	**20**	**2**	**10**	**6**	**30**	

No	Observed Method of Teaching	Academic Rank						x^2
		Ass.Prof.		Assist. Prof		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	2	10	4	20	6	30	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	1	5	2	10	x^2=1.448
4	L + 0	1	5	3	15	4	20	
5	D + 0	-	-	2	10	2	10	
	Total	**4**	**20**	**4**	**20**	**8**	**40**	

No	Observed Method of Teaching	Academic Rank						x^2
		Ass.Prof.		Assist. Prof		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	2	10	2	10	4	20	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	-	-	1	5	x^2=0.559
4	L + 0	1	5	-	-	1	5	
5	D + 0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total	**4**	**20**	**2**	**10**	**6**	**30**	

No	Observed Method of Teaching	Academic Rank						x^2
		Lecturer		Assist. Prof		Total		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Lecture	4	20	2	10	6	30	
2	Discussion	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3	L + D	1	5	-	-	1	5	x^2=1.403
4	L + 0	3	15	-	-	3	15	
5	D + 0	2	10	-	-	2	10	
	Total	**10**	**50**	**2**	**10**	**12**	**60**	