

16.3

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' TRAINING INSTITUTE INSTRUCTORS
EFFECTIVENESS IN DEFINING AND IMPLEMENTING THE
GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF PEDAGOGIC SYLLABUS
(WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO TTIs IN REGION THREE)

BY
GETNET DEMISSIE

JUNE 1996

**AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' TRAINING INSTITUTE INSTRUCTORS
EFFECTIENESS IN DEFINING AND IMPLEMENTING THE
GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF PEDAGOGICS SYLLABUS
(WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO TTIS IN REGION THREE)**

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES, ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

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

**BY
GETNET DEMISSIE**

JUNE, 1996

**AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' TRAINING INSTITUTE INSTRUCTORS
EFFECTIENESS IN DEFINING AND IMPLEMENTING THE
GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF PEDAGOGICS SYLLABUS
(WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO TTIS IN REGION THREE)**

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES, ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

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

**BY
GETNET DEMISSIE**

JUNE, 1996

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' TRAINING INSTITUTE INSTRUCTORS
EFFECTIVENESS IN DEFINING AND IMPLEMENTING THE
GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF PEDAGOGIC SYLLABUS
(WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO TTIS IN REGION THREE)

BY
GETNET DEMISSIE

APPROVAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Ambaye Tsehaye
CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT GRADUATE COMMITTEE

[Signature]
14/10/88

Abbe Bekela
ADVISOR

[Signature]

Abdirahman M. Korrum
EXAMINER, EXTERNAL

[Signature]
14/10/88

Ambaye Tsehaye
EXAMINER, INTERNAL

[Signature]
14/10/88



LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Inter raters' and Intrarater's reliability coefficients -----	45
II. Instructors' Preparation of Lesson Plans per week in three months in each TTI-----	50
III. Classification of the formulated Lesson Objectives into non behavioral and behavioral as well as specific and general objectives-----	51
IV. Classification of the specific behavioral objectives of the prepared Lesson plans into cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains -----	53
V. Classification of Behavioral Objectives based on the Emphasis given by Instructors while teaching-----	54
VI. Distribution of the Lesson Objectives over the Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI -----	58
VII. Percentage Distribution of the Lesson Objectives over the Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI. -----	60
VIII. Distribution of the Lesson and Unit Objectives of the Instructors over the Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI -----	62
IX. Instructors' Response on to what extent they are referring to the Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus while preparing Lesson Plans -----	64
X. Distribution of Instructors' Response in formulating Lesson Objectives which can fully describe each Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus -----	65
XI. Evaluation Scores of Instructors on their attempt to make their Trainees aware of the Lesson Objectives -----	66
XII. Evaluation Scores of Instructors on their Performance to match the Instructional Activities of themselves and their Trainees to the Objectives of each Lesson -----	68
XIII. Evaluation Scores of Instructors in following their Lesson Plans -----	69
XIV. Evaluation Scores of Instructors in Shortening the Instructional Time that can be spent for routine activities -----	70

	Page
CHAPTER FIVE	
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	89
5.1 Summary -----	89
5.2 Conclusion -----	93
5.3 Recommendations -----	94
REFERENCES -----	96
APPENDICES -----	100
Appendix - A: Instructors' Questionnaire -----	100
Appendix - B: Trainees' Questionnaire -----	104
Appendix - C: Interview Guide -----	112
Appendix - D: Observation Checklist -----	115
Appendix - E: General Objectives of the Pedagogics Syllabus in which the Study was concentrated-----	119
Appendix - F: Unit Objectives of the Pedagogics Syllabus in which the Study was concentrated -----	120
Appendix - G: Instructors-made Unit Objectives of the Three TTIs in which the Study was concentrated -----	122
Appendix - H: Lesson Objectives of the three TTIs -----	126
Appendix - I: The Classification of the Lesson Objectives of the three TTIs into Non behavioral and behavioral as well as specific and general Objectives-----	137
Appendix - J: The Distribution of the Lesson Objectives of the three TTIs in the Bloom's, Krathwohl's and Simpson's Classification of educational Objectives-----	138
Appendix - K: Personal Profile of the Observed Instructors -----	
Appendix - L: Statistical Calculations for Computing One-Way Analysis of Variance and Tukey Honestly Significant Difference -----	140

	Page
CHAPTER THREE	
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY -----	41
3.1 Population and Sampling Procedures -----	41
3.2 Data Collection Instruments -----	42
3.2.1 Questionnaire -----	42
3.2.2 Interview -----	43
3.2.3 Classroom Observation -----	44
3.2.4 Documentary Analysis -----	46
3.3 Methods of Data Analysis -----	46
CHAPTER FOUR	
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION -----	49
4.1 Results -----	49
4.1.1 Preparation of Lesson Plans -----	49
4.1.2 The Nature of the Prepared Lesson Objectives -----	51
4.1.3 The Distribution of the Behavioral Objectives in the Bloom's and Krathwohl's Classification of Educational Objectives -----	52
4.1.4 Correspondence of the Specific Objectives of each Lesson to the General Objectives of the Pedagogics Syllabus -----	56
4.1.5 Trainees' Awareness of the Intended Objectives of each Lesson --	66
4.1.6 Correspondence of the Instructional Activities of Instructors and their Trainees to the Intended Objectives of their Lessons ----	67
4.2 Discussion of the Results -----	71

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt and deep gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Abebe Bekele, for his generous and unreserved guidance, and insightful and critical comments since the conception of the problem till the end of the work.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to Debre Birhan, Dessie, and Gondar TTI Pedagogics instructors, deputy directors, and directors for their cooperation in providing the necessary information and official documents.

Finally, I am indebted to W/O Tezera Bekele who sacrificed her leisure time to type the final draft of the thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt and deep gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Abebe Bekele, for his generous and unreserved guidance, and insightful and critical comments since the conception of the problem till the end of the work.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to Debre Birhan, Dessie, and Gondar TTI Pedagogics instructors, deputy directors, and directors for their cooperation in providing the necessary information and official documents.

Finally, I am indebted to W/O Tezera Bekele who sacrificed her leisure time to type the final draft of the thesis.

VII

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the TTI instructors effectiveness in implementing the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus. Among the many characteristics of teacher effectiveness which are necessary for implementing the objectives of a syllabus, due emphasis was given here for instructors' preparation of lesson plans, formulation of objectives, making the trainees aware of each lesson objective, and correspondence of the instructional activities of the instructors and trainees to the intended lesson objectives.

To this end, all the pedagogics instructors (11 in number), the directors, the deputy directors, and a total of 550 trainees (50 trainees for each instructor) in the three TTIs of Region Three - Debre Birhan, Dessie, and Gondar- were the sources of information. The data collection instruments used in the study were questionnaire, interview, classroom observation, and documentary analysis. And, the data collected were analysed using percentages, averages, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Tukey Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) method, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation.

The results of the study revealed that all the instructors did not prepare consecutive lesson plans but use the lesson plans prepared by their colleagues in every instruction. It was ascertained that the majority of the instructors prepared five lesson plans once for a week in every month. Most of the objectives of the prepared lesson plans were specific, and consisted of both behaviour and content. However, an insignificant number of objectives of the lessons included behaviour, content, testing condition, and standard of performance simultaneously. In addition, the prepared lesson plans were observed as highly dominated by lower level cognitive objectives- knowledge and comprehension. In the actual classroom instruction, instructors were also observed in making effort for the attainment of lower level cognitive objectives more often than affective and higher level cognitive objectives- though the latter groups of objectives were given a considerable degree of emphasis by the instructors when they teach than they plan. All the lesson objectives have been found to be encompassed in the unit and general objectives of the syllabus, but a considerable number of unit objectives of the syllabus were not described by the lesson objectives. Instructors did not also make their trainees aware of the intended lesson objectives. Although most of the instructional activities of the instructors and the trainees were aimed at the attainment of the lesson objectives, there were some (instructors' and trainees') instructional activities which do not correspond with the written lesson objectives. Hence, instructors effectiveness in implementing the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus was not as much as it should be. Based on these findings, appropriate recommendations were also forwarded.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Any program is expected to have a certain goal. And, the success or failure of a program is assessed by checking whether or not its goals are achieved. This is, usually, done during and/or after the program is implemented. Besides, most of the factors which determine the success or failure of a program are closely connected with those things which occur at the implementation stage. In fact, this statement does not neglect those decisive factors associated with the planning or developmental stages of a program that affect the attainment of the goals of the program itself.

In connection with this, like any planned activity, a curriculum has to be implemented in actual classrooms in the form of its different component courses or subjects. In other words, the implementation of a curriculum is assured when, among other things, the courses or subjects which constitutes the curriculum are implemented in actual classrooms, almost, as they were intended or planned. And, at this stage, the teacher plays the most important role. It seems to emphasize this decisive role of the teacher that Douglas (1964), as mentioned in Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989:6), said: "The greatest single factor in the teaching process is the teacher. No technique, no method, no device, no gadget can guarantee success - only the teacher can do this." Hook (1971) also supported Douglas's view by saying "Everyone who remembers his own educational experience remembers teachers, not methods and techniques. The teacher is the kingpin of the educational situation. He makes or breaks programmes." (*Ibid.*: 12). Hence, teacher effectiveness; that is, the ability of a teacher to apply a curricular guide successfully which in turn facilitates the accomplishment of desired goals, is the major

factor which can affect the curriculum implementation - the attainment of the objectives of the curriculum. Bargar (1974:59) also said that what teachers perceive, what they value, what they decide and how they act are critical, and all of these issues make them key decision makers for what actually happens in the classroom.

The general statements made by Adams (1884), as cited in Fullan and Pomfret (1977:335), which says: "No matter what sort of bill you have, everything depends upon the men who, so to speak, are inside of it, and who are to make it work. In the hands of the right men, any bill would produce the desired result" also explicitly supports the above idea - the decisive role of the teacher in curriculum implementation. When the statements of Adams are interpreted in the context of curriculum studies, it can be said that though the nature - its importance, objectivity, and the like - of a curriculum plays a crucial role on the success of the program, a curriculum which was, at first, considered as relevant and worthy may not achieve its objectives unless effective personnel (particularly teachers) are involved in the implementation process.

Curriculum planners develop a curriculum on the assumption that, as Fullan and Pomfret (1977: 337) described, the curriculum would be implemented at the classroom level more or less as planned. That is, the actual outcomes would eventually correspond to planned or intended ones. However, this assumption badly requires effective teachers - among other things. The findings of a study carried out by Hess and Buckholdt, as mentioned by Fullan and Pomfret (1977: 349-350), also substantiate this view. In the study, students in classes of effective teachers showed greater acquisition of objectives of their lessons; that is, students in classes of effective teachers attained many of the objectives of their lessons better than students in classes of teachers who were not considered as effective. In other words, as Cullingford (1995 : 1) and Medley (1979: 11) said, the effect of an educational program on the individual

learner depends to a considerable extent on who his teacher is. Cullingford (1995: 186) said further that "We know why some schools are more effective than others. It all depends on the teachers and how they perform together." One can, then, conclude that since students' learning is most often influenced, guided, and facilitated by teachers, the latter should be effective enough to obtain the desired result.

As Davies (1981: 24); Borich (1988: 7); Good and Brophy (1987: 3); Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 7-8); Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 11) remarked, teachers effectiveness in curriculum implementation includes many characteristics. Among these characteristics, the major ones are: having a deep knowledge of the objectives and contents of the subjects teachers teach, developing positive attitudes toward the subjects and the students as well as using appropriate teaching method, instructional materials, and evaluation techniques. Though the concept of teachers effectiveness in curriculum implementation signifies the above broad and major characteristics, and many other ones, due emphasis was given in this paper for instructors effectiveness in specifically defining and implementing the general objectives of the pedagogic syllabus in TTIs.

When the implementation of the objectives of a course at the TTI level is considered, the role and responsibility of the instructor will be crucial and high because the instructor is intended to train the would-be teachers. In so doing, the instructor is supposed to equip the trainees with the necessary knowledge and skills on-and attitudes towards - teaching. To this effect, he/she, primarily, needs to have a clear understanding of the curricular objectives. In line with this, Brandt (1988), as cited in Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 55), remarked that teachers' personal preferences or differences in their conceptions about curriculum are major planning influences which in turn affect the implementation of the curriculum. Hence, misunderstanding the objectives and other main concepts of the curriculum, and/or failure to

apply the knowledge teachers possess result failure in the attainment of the objectives of the program.

Instructors effectiveness in defining and implementing the objectives of a course begins from their planning because instructors planning, as Clark (1988) - mentioned in Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (*Ibid.*) - remarked, is the thread that links the curriculum and instruction. In other words, it is at the planning stage that instructors can formulate specific instructional objectives based on the general objectives of a course. In connection to this, Perrott (1986: 13) pointed out that instructors should formulate instructional objectives which state what the instructors expect the trainees to acquire as a result of their lesson, and should describe how the trainees will show what they have learned.

It is also remarked by Gronlund and Linn (1990: 23) that defining the desired instructional objectives is the first step in good teaching and learning because properly stated instructional objectives serve as guides for both teaching and learning, communicate the intent of the instruction to others and provide guidelines for evaluating student learning. In formulating instructional objectives for lessons or units of a course, as Gronlund and Linn (1990: 43), and Mehrens and Lehmann (1991: 43) stated, the instructors should make an effort to include all important outcomes of the course. That is, objectives in the area of understanding, thinking skills, attitudes, and the like should be considered.

In other words, while instructors are specifically defining instructional objectives, they should not only focus on knowledge outcomes (lower level objectives) but also deal with the development of intellectual abilities, and skills and desired attitudes (more of higher level objectives).

However, writing specific, and behavioural instructional objectives is not an end by itself. The written objectives should also be put into practice in the classrooms. As Ryburn

and Forge (1969: 17), Deterline (1973: 2), and Perrott (1986 : 14) said, the first step which instructors should follow in implementing their instructional objectives is to make their trainees aware of the intended objectives of their lessons at the beginning of each period. In other words, trainees should be told what is expected of them after completion of a certain learning activity. Particularly Deterline (1973: 3) mentioned that if trainees are told precisely what the objectives of their lessons are, in the form of descriptions of at least minimum performance requirements, and are given sample criterion questions, the entire learning task suddenly breaks through the murk of over abundant, disorganized information so that definable goals and directions for trainees' activity are clearly visible.

Now, it is clear that one of the many aspects of teachers effectiveness in curriculum implementation is the teachers' ability in putting the general objectives of a course into practice in a classroom as it was intended. This aspect of teachers effectiveness encompasses the teachers' ability in preparing lesson plans which have specific and behavioral objectives; considering both lower and higher level objectives; formulating specific objectives which are relevant to the corresponding general objectives of the course; and making their students aware of the intended objectives of the lessons. Above all, their lessons should be directed towards the attainment of the objectives. That is, the teachers' and students' instructional activities should correspond with the intended objectives. It was this need- the need to have effective teachers in defining and implementing the objectives of a curriculum- that has initiated the investigator to study about instructors effectiveness in specifically defining and implementing the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus in TTIs. Here, the investigator began his work on the basic assumption that the objectives of the pedagogics syllabus are in line with the New Education and Training Policy. Of Course, it is believed that objectives of a course are derived from the broad statements of the Educational Policy of a country in which the course is intended to be offered.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Selection of instructors in Ethiopian TTIs is usually done on the basis of the qualification of the candidates. But, does this criterion alone assure that the candidates will be effective instructors? For instance, Leithwood (1978), as cited in Fullan (1981: 313), made a research on a group of professional teachers in New York and found that the teachers are aware of the objectives of the curriculum and use the proposed materials at quite a high level, but that their use of teaching strategies and especially their use of designated assessment tools and procedures are quite low. This finding indicates that qualification is not a sufficient condition for being an effective teacher.

A couple of studies conducted in Ethiopia may also illustrate the issue. A study made by Hailu (1991: 132-135) on the assessment of teachers' performances in curriculum implementation in selected secondary schools of Illubabor showed that the teachers properly select, structure and reorganize the contents of the subject they teach. On the other hand, Hailu's study indicated that the teachers are not effective in the use of appropriate teaching techniques, instructional materials, and in assisting the students. Another study made by Getachew (1992: 88-92) on the evaluation of teaching skills of pedagogical course instructors in TTI, which was limited on the instructors' skills in planning, structuring instructional process, initiating trainees participation, and reacting to trainees' responses, found more than fifty percent of instructors (in the sample of the study) who are ranked less adequate in view of the indicated skills. In addition, a study made by another Getachew (1994: 124-125) on an evaluation of the implementation of the lower primary schools Social Studies in North Shewa Administrative Zone indicated that a considerable number of teachers of Social Studies have no interest on the subject they are assigned to teach. Getachew's study also showed that the

Social Studies teachers do not use the instructional guide-lines set in the syllabus effectively in the classrooms.

All of the above studies show the presence of a problem in some aspects of teachers effectiveness. But, no study was carried out on teachers effectiveness in defining and implementing the objectives of a curriculum as far as this investigator is concerned. Nevertheless, for the effective implementation of a curriculum and that of a course, as indicated earlier, it is imperative that teachers should write the objectives of their lesson in specific and behavioral terms. It is also necessary to translate these specifically defined objectives into practice in actual classrooms. Hence, the purpose of this study was to examine whether or not TTI instructors possess some of the essential characteristics of teachers effectiveness to put the objectives of the pedagogics syllabus into practice. More specifically, it focused on:

- investigating whether or not instructors prepare lesson plans which have specific and behavioral objectives;
- assessing the extent to which instructors aim at the attainment of lower and higher level objectives in their various lessons which are in harmony with the general objectives of the syllabus;
- investigating whether or not instructors make their trainees aware of the specific objectives of the lessons at the beginning of each period; and
- examining the extent to which instructors' and trainees' instructional activities match with the desired objectives of their lessons.

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

1. Do instructors prepare lesson plans always?
2. Do the prepared lesson plans have specific and behavioral objectives?

3. Do instructors include higher level objectives in their various lessons?
4. Are the specific objectives of the lessons in harmony with the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus?
5. Do instructors make their trainees aware of the intended objectives of the lessons at the beginning of each lesson?
6. Do the major instructional activities of the instructors and their trainees correspond to the intended objectives of their lessons?

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Instructors effectiveness is one of the major criteria for the success of TTI curriculum implementation. Thus, this study is important for the following reasons:

1. By identifying some of the strengths and weaknesses of the instructors in implementing the objectives of the pedagogics syllabus, the study helps the instructors to improve their short-comings and to keep up with their strong points which in turn maximizes the degree of the implementation of the course.
2. The study gives some hints for the officials who are involved in the recruitment of TTI instructors to select the instructors by considering their previous work efficiency or ability in implementing the objectives of an instruction in particular, and by using the different criteria of teachers effectiveness in general.
3. Moreover, by sorting out the common weaknesses of most of the instructors, the findings of the study are expected to help concerned personnel in the program of teacher education at College level to improve the program thereby producing

effective teachers who are equipped not only with knowledge of a subject matter but also with the necessary skills in planning in general, and in defining and implementing objectives of a course in particular.

4. Finally, the findings of the study are expected to serve as reference for further broad and detailed investigations.

1.4 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was concerned with the investigation of the major characteristics of instructors effectiveness in defining and implementing the objectives of the pedagogics syllabus rather than with the overall effect of all the factors in the teaching situation. In other words, the scope of the study was defined to exclude the assessment of instructors' attitudes toward teaching and their trainees. The study was not also concerned with the evaluation of the content aspect of the syllabus, the trainees' academic and social background, the physical facilities of the classrooms, and the investigation of other factors affecting instructors effectiveness.

The study, generally, was delimited to deal with the instructors' ability in specifically defining and translating the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus into practice in actual classrooms. This included the assessment of instructors' abilities in preparing lesson plans which have specific and behavioral objectives; formulating lower and higher level objectives which are in line with the general objectives of the syllabus; making the trainees aware of the intended objectives; and directing the instructional activities toward the attainment of the intended objectives. To make the study manageable, the analysis of the lesson objectives was limited on those lesson plans prepared from October to December (three months) of the 1995/96 academic year.

Moreover, pedagogics was purposely selected because it is a major course in TTI and it is intended to shape the trainees toward effective teachers- provided that the trainees have the basic knowledge of the subjects taught in primary schools. Pedagogics is also a new course for the trainees so that due emphasis should be given for it.

1.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

While the study was on progress, the investigator encountered some major problems. The first was lack of appropriate and up-to-date literatures, particularly research works, related to the study. Secondly, in the lesson plans, the instructional activities of instructors and trainees were not written in detail. This problem obliged the investigator to depend only on the instructors' and trainees' instructional activities of the actual classroom observation. If all the instructional activities were written in detail in the lesson plans, it was possible to see the correspondence of these instructional activities and the intended objectives in the three months duration.

1.6 DEFINITION OF IMPORTANT TERMS

1. General Objectives: intended or desirable outcomes of an instruction which have been stated in general or broad enough terms to include a set of specific learning outcomes.
2. Implementing Objectives: putting or translating the intended objectives into practice in the actual classrooms.
3. Instructors Effectiveness: It is a measure of the extent to which instructors realize their responsibilities, that is, the instructors' abilities in

performing their intended activities or duties (what is expected of them) successfully.

4. Specific Objectives:

intended or desirable outcomes of a lesson or a unit which have been stated in terms of definite/specific/ and observable student performance, and written by using action verbs.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Teacher effectiveness is a broad concept and includes many elements. Due to its broadness, various scholars gave it different interpretations. For instance, Biddle (1964: 20) defined teacher effectiveness as "the ability of a teacher to produce agreed-upon educational effects in a given situation or context". The "agreed-upon educational effects" are educational outcomes which a teacher produces especially in students, school operations, and school community relationships (Gage and Orleans, 1952: 296). In this sense, a teacher is effective, for example, with respect to students insofar as their behaviour is changed because of things the teacher does directly or indirectly (Ibid.).

However, in any given situation, there are always many variables like students' learning behaviour and classroom environment that are out of the control of the teacher but which can affect the attainment of the "agreed-upon educational effects". Hence, it seems unfair to judge the effectiveness of a teacher by the educational outcomes he is intended to produce, for example, in students.

Gage and Orleans (1952: 296-297) have also described teacher effectiveness as having a variety of patterns of behaviour. Nevertheless, these patterns of behaviour, as Davies (1981: 22) explained, are aimed at assessing whether or not a teacher is doing the right things. In other words, teacher effectiveness is a measure of the degree to which a teacher realizes his responsibilities. This definition of teacher effectiveness focuses on whether or not the teacher satisfactorily accomplishes his duties. But, this does not necessarily imply that the teacher can

attain educational outcomes- the "agreed- upon educational effects". Here, the effectiveness of a teacher is judged by what he is doing. For instance, since an effective teacher is expected to be punctual, energetic and enthusiastic, and well prepared in all of his/her lessons (Farrant, 1968:253-254), the teacher can be judged with respect to these perspectives and many others.

As one of his many responsibilities, a teacher, to be truly effective, should be aware of the context of his work, especially the conditions that influence teaching and learning (Bellon, Bellon and Blank, 1992: 7). Hence, to be effective, a teacher should be sensitive to the needs of the learning task and to the needs of the students. The teacher, for instance, should have a deep knowledge of the subject he is teaching. He should also know the interest and prior learning experiences of his students.

An effective teacher plans his instructional activities carefully thereby determining what has to be done in each instructional sessions. Moreover, an effective teacher uses appropriate instructional methods and materials for each stage of a lesson (Davies, 1981: 24). A teacher should also be well grounded in pedagogy so that he can make the most appropriate decisions about instructional organization and delivery. Farrant (1968: 395) summarized all the above points of teacher effectiveness by saying: "Teachers must possess the knowledge and skill of the scientist but apply their knowledge with the sensitiveness and feeling of the artist." Above all, dedication and skill on teaching is required on the part of an effective teacher. That is, a teacher should have a positive attitude towards teaching as well as towards his students to be effective. He should also have the proper training and experience required to teach the subject he is teaching.

Borich (1988: 7-11) has also enumerated five "key behaviours" which contribute for teacher effectiveness. These are clarity, variety, task orientation, engagement in the learning process, and moderate-to-high success rate. Clarity is concerned with how clear and

understandable a teacher's presentation is to the students. Variety deals with a teacher's ability to use different instructional methods and techniques as required. Task orientation refers to the extent to which a teacher is achievement oriented with respect to his/her students; that is, the degree to which he/she is directing the students toward the attainment of the objectives of the instruction. Engagement in the learning process applies to a teacher's ability to draw the attention of students toward the instruction. In other words, this "key behaviour" refers to the amount of effort a teacher exerts to increase the time students are actually engaged in learning a material. This seeks the teacher's prior knowledge of the abilities and interests of the students as well as his ability of motivating the students. The last one, moderate-to-high success rate, deals with a teacher's ability to produce students within partial and full understanding of a task; that is, the teacher's attempt to produce students with a moderate-to- high success rates in an instructional program.

It is clear from the above presentation that the concept of teacher effectiveness encompasses many aspects, that are called "right things" by Davies (1981: 22), which the teacher is expected to do. It is, hence, on the bases of these "right things" and other similar ones- which will be discussed latter in this chapter- that the effectiveness of a teacher should be judged.

Although it is not easy to measure human behaviour, different types of measurement techniques can be used for the assessment of teacher effectiveness. Among the techniques, ratings by various persons, direct observation of behaviour, and objective instruments are the major ones (Biddle, 1964: 21). There are ratings filled by students, teachers, parents, supervisors, researchers, or others which are aimed at the assessment of the effectiveness of a teacher. Rating forms can be presented to the rater in the form of a questionnaire- to be filled by using his prior knowledge about the teacher, or by using a direct classroom observation.

While employing an observation technique, an investigator can use a variety of categorical checklists and electronic recordings of behaviour like sound-tape recordings of classroom interaction. Objective instruments also include the use of achievement tests, ability inventories, questionnaires, and interviews (Ibid.: 21 - 25).

2.2 GENERAL AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

In education, objectives are "statements which indicate the kinds of behaviour a society wishes its youth to acquire through schooling ..." (Abebe, 1974: 26). In other words, educational objectives are what it is expected students will learn as a result of instruction; that is, what students are hoped to accomplish after a certain instructional program. With this notion, objectives can range from the very general to the very specific results of learning.

2.2.1 General Objectives: They are broad statements that describe what a student will be able to do after a given learning process has been successfully completed. General objectives are intended outcomes of instruction which are usually written in broad enough terms so that they can encompass other more specific learning outcomes (Salia-Bao, 1989: 26; and Gronlund and Linn, 1990: 24). These broad statements of learning results are stated by using the general terms such as: know, understand, comprehend, appreciate, and so on (Payne, 1968: 12; and Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 143).

General objectives are mainly applied to a specific course and formulated on a semester or annual basis (Borich, 1988 : 51). They can be also applied to a unit of a course (Clark and Starr, 1986: 54-55). Since general objectives are set to indicate the intended broad concepts, skills, attitudes, appreciations, and the like that will be attained by a student in an instructional

process, they are excellent sources for the daily lessons' objectives (Perrott, 1986: 13; and Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 143). It is when the general objectives of a course are broken down into more specific outcomes that lesson objectives can be found. This indicates the importance of general objectives, which are at a unit and/or course level, to formulate specific outcomes of a lesson. In support of this argument, Callahan and Clark (1988: 38) have concluded that general objectives are bases for specifying objectives at a lesson level.

General objectives of a course are also useful for connecting the curriculum and the daily lessons of the course. This statement is derived from the assertion that course objectives are part of a larger set of curricular objectives. For instance, since the objectives of the ninth grade mathematics are necessarily expected to be part of the broader objectives of mathematics of the high school curriculum, the specific learning outcomes of each lesson of the ninth grade mathematics- which are derived from the general objectives of this subject in the specified grade level- will be directly interlinked with their corresponding curricular objectives. This relationship, in turn, helps the teacher know what to expect from his students when they enter a class at the beginning of each successive grade levels.

2.2.2. Specific Objectives: They are precise statements that describe what a student will be able to do at the end of a certain instructional process. They are intended outcomes of instruction which have been stated in terms of specific and observable student performance (Gagne, Briggs, and Wager, 1988: 121).

The main difference between general and specific objectives lies on the verbs which are used to express the statements. As mentioned above, general objectives are often stated by using general terms such as: know, understand, appreciate, and the like. These verbs are vague and subject to many interpretations. Moreover, the verbs do not show observable or measurable

students performance. For instance, if we say: "The student will know a mathematics principle", this general objective does not indicate how the student is to demonstrate the suggested "knowledge" - the learning of the mathematical principle. That is, one cannot observe directly how well the student has achieved the objective. But the action verbs which are used to express specific objectives such as tell, write, solve, discriminate, use, and so on indicate the intended terminal behaviour of the students. For instance, in the specific objective: "The student will use the mathematical relation called transitivity", it is easy to observe a student while he is using the transitivity relation in a given mathematical problem. Hence, the aforementioned action verbs that constitute specific objectives help to observe and measure directly how well the student has achieved the objectives.

2.2.2.1 Writing Specific Behavioral Objectives: Tyler (1949: 46-47), one of the prominent educators who made significant studies on educational objectives, wrote that "The most useful form for stating objectives is to express them in terms which identify both the kind of behaviour to be developed in the student and the content or area of life in which this behaviour is to operate." This is to mean that objectives should clarify what do the students are expected to perform (the behaviour) after they accomplished a certain instructional task (the content or area of life).

Tyler (1949: 45), Taba (1962: 200), and Abebe (1973: 66-67) strongly argue that if objectives are expressed only in terms of content coverage, then it is difficult to determine whether this content is intended to be recalled, thought about, or demonstrated by the student. That is, it does not clearly show the kind of student's behaviour to be developed by means of this content. This type of objective also gives the teacher little base for measuring students' performance.

On the other hand, Tyler (1949: 46), Taba (1962: 201), and Abebe (1992: 192) described that if objectives are written only in terms of the behaviour which the student is expected to demonstrate, then this objective, " ... too, must be considered incomplete because it has not suggested the kind of content in which this behaviour is to operate" (Abebe, *Ibid.*). Hence, as to the above educators, while writing objectives, one should include the behaviour and the content in which the student is intended to show the performance.

When we see the actual practice of Ethiopia in the above context, a study made by Abebe (1986: 50) shows that:

... all the objectives of Amharic (100%) at both levels of schooling (Primary and Secondary), and (66.7%) of the mathematics objectives at the primary school level are expressed in terms of content only without suggesting what kinds of behaviour must be cultivated as a result of learning the contents of Amharic and mathematics. Therefore there is a need for clearly determining why students are learning the contents.

As it is shown in the above study, since all of the objectives of Amharic at primary and secondary school levels and most of the objectives of mathematics at the primary school level are written in terms of content coverage alone, the respective subject teachers will face a major problem of measuring the students' performance. This statement is evident because of the fact that the given objectives do not clarify what the students are going to do with the indicated contents.

Moreover, Abebe's study indicates that:

... most of the objectives in three secondary school subjects: English (85.7%), History (60%), and Physics (81.3%) and in two

Elementary school subjects: English (60%) and Elementary Science (66.6%) are formulated in terms of behaviour only; thereby making them inadequate because they have not suggested the kind of contents in which the sets of behaviour are to operate (Ibid.).

Here, again, since most of the objectives of the aforementioned subjects (in the study) are stated in terms of behaviour alone, the respective subject teachers will face a problem in determining the contents in which the students are expected to demonstrate the indicated behaviour. The study also shows that: " --- the objectives in three secondary school subjects: Geography (100%), Biology (61.7%), and Chemistry (59%), and only in one elementary school subject: Social Studies (100%) are stated in the correct form" (Abebe, 1986: 51); that is, containing both content and behaviour.

A more elaborated way of writing specific behavioral objectives is also proposed by many educators (e.g., Arends, 1991: 56; Borich, 1988: 84 - 89; Callahan and Clark, 1988: 41; Clark and Starr, 1986: 143 - 144; Kibler and Others, 1981: 52; Mager, 1984: 23; Nacino - Brown, Oke and Brown, 1989: 144 - 145; Payne, 1968: 23 - 24; and Shepherd and Ragan, 1982: 136). These scholars explained that writing specific objectives in behavioral terms should also include:

- (i) describing the important conditions under which the performance is to occur, that is the conditions under which the behaviour will be performed. These conditions may encompass certain information about the instructional materials that the students should or should not use; restrictions of time and place; and the like. For instance, in the specific objective: "Given the letters of the English Alphabet, the student will be able to differentiate the vowels from consonants", the phrase 'Given the letters of the English Alphabet' is the available

information (or condition) under which the student is expected to perform the indicated behaviour; and

- (ii) specifying the standard of performance expected; that is, determining the criterion of acceptable performance by describing how well the student should perform in order to be considered acceptable. The criterion, which is the characteristic of the performance, can be expressed in the form of an acceptable minimum number as: at least three reasons; per cent or proportion as: with 95 per cent accuracy or in three of four cases; and so on. For example, in the specific objective: "Given the letters of the English Alphabet, the student will be able to differentiate the vowels from consonants with 100 per cent accuracy", the phrase 'with 100 per cent accuracy' shows the acceptable standard of performance expected of the student. The objective in the last example is a specific behavioral objective which fulfils both criteria of writing specific behavioral objectives; that is, behaviour and content, condition, and standard of performance.

2.2.2.2. The Importance of Writing Objectives in Specific Behavioral Terms:

In a research made by Clayman (1980: 36) on the importance and attainment of objectives of "a link course" in the secondary school students of Australia, the study demonstrated the need for clearly stating objectives. As to this study, if objectives are broadly stated, their importance will be obscured and their attainment will be in question. Here, the study concluded that writing objectives in specific behavioral terms is a precondition for their attainment.

One of the major reasons for greater specificity of behavioral objectives is to have an accurate information about the particular type of learning outcomes that are desired (Gagne',

Briggs, and Wager, 1988: 123). That is, specific behavioral objectives communicate the teacher's instructional intention better than general objectives by describing the students' intended performance clearly enough thereby preventing misinterpretation. This, in turn, helps the teacher in measuring student attainments of the specified objectives. In other words, specifically defined behavioral objectives determine the teacher's particular means of assessment- the assessment technique used to check whether the expected outcomes are achieved or not.

The research findings which were made by Block (1971); Block and Anderson (1975); and Duchastel and Merrill (1973) as cited by Kibler and others (1981: 7) have also supported the view that "Students are more likely to achieve clearly stated objectives than ambiguous ones." Mager (1984: 6) and Popham (1981: 18 - 19) are also in favour of this finding. Moreover, a recent research finding made by Serafin (1990: 16) has shown that more explicit objectives represent greater amount of information that can be better processed in the learning situation. Again, this finding indicated that the changes introduced to a course syllabus from general to specific objectives did affect the final grade performance of students positively. That is, students who were taught on the basis of certain specific objectives of a course improved their grade results when compared with students who were taught on the basis of the general objectives of the same course.

Clearly defined behavioral objectives have also an important role in guiding teacher's activities in the classroom (Tyler, 1949: 44; Popham, 1981: 25; Kibler and Others, 1981: 4; Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 145; and Callahan and Clark, 1988: 32). They are the basis for the selection and designing of instructional materials and teaching strategies (Tyler, 1949: 1; and Mager, 1984: 5). Specific behavioral objectives, then, give clear direction for teaching, and prevent unnecessary wastage of time in the classroom. Supporting the above

statements, Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 54) have said that "When the objectives are not clear or have not been made explicit, it is very difficult for teachers to make decisions about the most appropriate classroom activities." Therefore, general or vague objectives at the classroom level do not help the teacher to lead his instructional activities properly because they do not tell the precise intended behaviour to be performed.

It was also because of the presence of too general objectives in the English textbooks of Jordan that the textbooks were blamed and considered as the cause for the failure of English instruction (Zughoul, 1986: 19). After a conference on compulsory education in Amann, a proposal is offered for the new text series which states that the textbooks should be constructed according to the form of specific behavioural objectives. This actual experience of Jordan indicates the failure of general objectives to meet specific instructional activities. That is why it is believed by many educators (example: Borich, 1988: 85; Bellon, Bellon, and Blank, 1992: 54; Kibler and others, 1981: 4; Mager, 1984: 5-6; Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 145; and Popham, 1981 : 25) that specific behavioural objectives are more helpful than general objectives in directing detailed classroom instructional activities.

Abebe's study on the specificity and generality of the objectives of the Ethiopian primary and secondary school subjects also indicates that:

The objectives of five secondary school subjects, out of the eight, and of three elementary school subjects, out of the five, are formulated at a level of high generality and broadness. These subjects include Amharic (80%), English (71.4%), History (80%), Mathematics (100%) and Physics (87.5%) at the secondary school level; and English (60%), Mathematics (100%), and Elementary Science (83.3%) at the primary school level (Abebe, 1986: 54 - 55).

The above findings show that since most of the objectives of the aforementioned eight subjects are too general to give clear direction for teaching, improvement should be made on

these objectives so that a better attainment of the objectives will be possible. Moreover, this study shows that:

The objectives of three secondary school subjects: Geography(87.1%), Chemistry (68.2%), and Biology (52.4%), and two elementary school subjects : Amharic (62.5%) and SocialStudies (85%) are expressed with clarity but not a high degree of specificity or broadness. Elementary English is the only subject whose objectives (40%) are stated at a rather high degree of precision and measurability (Ibid.: 55).

It is the objectives of the aforesaid (in the last paragraph) subjects- those objectives which are stated with clarity but not with high generality- that are helpful for classroom instruction. However, there are also some educators like Stenhouse (1991: 72); Atkin (1969) as cited by Stenhouse (Ibid.); and Eisner (1967) as cited by Kibler and others (1981: 7) who are disappointed with writing behavioural objectives in specific terms. Their major objection is that the important results of learning will be ignored while trying to express the learning in specific behavioral objectives because "trivial learning behaviors" are the easiest to attain. But the educators such as Popham (1981: 10) who are in favour of defining behavioral objectives in specific terms gave a counter response for the above objection by saying: "... explicit objectives make it (learning) far easier for educators to attend to important instructional outcomes than ignoring them." Popham (Ibid.) has also remarked that an important learning outcome which seems difficult to attain at the classroom level will be much easier when it is interpreted and described in many very specific behavioral objectives. Hence, as to Popham (Ibid.) and his supporters, it is the weakness of some teachers that they focus on trivial learning outcomes but this is not the inherent limitation of specific behavioral objectives. Generally, as to the investigator, the aforementioned merits of specifically defined objectives surpass their limitations.

2.3 CLASSIFICATION OF BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES

Different educators developed their own ways of classification of behavioral objectives in various categories from the least to the most complex levels of learning outcomes. Among these educators, the prominent ones are Benjamin S. Bloom and David R. Krathwohl. In their book, "Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The classification of Educational Goals, Handbook II: Affective Domain", Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964: 6-7) categorized objectives into three major domains; namely, "cognitive, affective, and psychomotor."

The cognitive objectives range from simple recognition and recall of information to highly creative way of synthesizing new ideas and judging the worth of a material. Thus, this domain encompasses six categories which are arranged in order from simple to complex. The categories are: knowledge- the recognition and recall of a material; comprehension- the understanding of the meaning of the material; application- the ability to use the material; analysis- the ability to break down the material into its component parts and examine their relationships; synthesis- the ability to put the parts together to form new ideas; and evaluation- the ability to judge the worth of an idea. Each category in this domain is again classified into other subcategories (Ibid.).

The affective objectives range from the lowest level of simply being aware of an affective stimulus to the highest level of acceptance of the affective stimulus and incorporating it into one's personality as part of one's pattern of behaviour. This domain also encompasses five categories which are arranged in order from the simple to complex effort required to assimilate the affective behaviour. The categories are: receiving or attention- awareness of an affective stimulus and the beginning of favourable feelings toward it; responding- having an interest in the stimulus and viewing it favourably; valuing- tentative belief in the value of the

affective stimulus becomes commitment to it; organization- organization of values into a system of dominant and supporting values; and characterization by a value or value complex-determination of one's beliefs and character or philosophy of life. Here, again, each category is subdivided into other subcategories (Ibid.).

The psychomotor objectives focus on muscular or motor skill, some manipulation of materials, or action^s which require a neuromuscular coordination; and they range simply from unskilful to most skilful. In this domain, several persons have constructed different categories. Among them is the following hierarchy developed by J.S.Simpson in 1972: perception- becoming aware of objects, qualities or relations by way of the sense organs; set- a preparatory adjustment of readiness for a particular kind of action or experience; guided response- the overt behavioral act of an individual under the guidance of the instructor; mechanism-achieving a certain confidence and degree of proficiency in the performance of an act; complex overt response- carrying out a complex motor act smoothly and efficiently; that is, with minimum expenditure of time and energy; adaptation- altering motor activities to meet the demands of new problematic situations requiring a physical response; and origination- creating new motor act or ways of manipulating materials out of previously developed abilities and skills. Like the above two domains, each category of the psychomotor domain is also classified into other subcategories (Simpson, 1981: 103-109).

In their classification of objectives, Bloom, Krathwohl, and Masia (1964: 6-7); and Simpson (1981: 104) put knowledge, receiving, and perception as the lowest levels of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains respectively. This implies that knowledge requires a lower mental effort or a lower energy of intellectual skill when compared with the rest categories of the cognitive domain; receiving seeks a lower energy feelings and attitudes than the other categories of the affective domain; and perception requires a lower skill of

sensory and muscular coordination than the rest categories of the psychomotor domain (Shepherd and Ragan, 1982: 139-140).

The highest levels of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, in this classification, are evaluation, characterization by a value or value complex, and origination respectively. Thus, evaluation requires a higher mental effort or a higher energy of intellectual skill than the rest categories of the cognitive domain; characterization by a value or value complex needs a higher energy feelings and attitudes than the other categories of the affective domain; and origination seeks a higher skill of neuromuscular coordination than the other categories of ^{the} psychomotor domain (Ibid.). In general, the classification of the categories within each domain is made in hierarchical order- from simple to complex. But this does not mean that the lower levels such as knowledge and comprehension are not as important as the more complex levels such as synthesis and evaluation in the cognitive domain (Arends; 1991:48). This is also true in the other two domains.

Another classification of objectives is also made by Gagne', Briggs, and Wager (1988: 43-48). Here, five "principal categories of learning outcomes" are proposed. They are: intellectual skills- which enable a person to deal with the environment symbolically; cognitive strategies- they are skills of self management governing the process of attending, learning and thinking; verbal information- or knowledge which ranges from knowledge of individual facts to comprehension of complex concepts; motor skills- a kind of capability to be learned, like printing a letter; and attitudes- positive or negative reactions toward a person, thing or situation.

There is, in fact, a clear interrelation between the classifications of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964: 6-7); and Gagne', Briggs, and Wager (1988: 43-48). For instance, the cognitive domain has a direct relation with intellectual skills and verbal information; the affective with attitudes; and the psychomotor with motor skills. Moreover, the behaviours

listed in one domain are not mutually exclusive of the behaviours listed in other domains of the former classification (Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964: 45-62; and Borich, 1988: 92). Similarly, the behaviours that are expected to be performed in one of the "principal categories of learning outcomes" are not mutually exclusive of the behaviours which are anticipated to be observed in the other "principal categories of learning outcomes" of the latter classification.

In support of the above idea- particularly on the interrelation between the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains- a study made by Hurst (1980: 107) indicated that "Cognitive skills and attitudes were integrally related and built on each other, leading to mastery of the terminal goal." For example, putting parts together to form an idea or a material; that is, synthesis requires some sort of interest or positive belief on the material; that is, responding or valuing. Similarly, it is difficult for an individual to reach at the level of origination- the invention or modification of techniques to manipulate a material, the highest level of the psychomotor domain- without having the necessary knowledge required to operate the material (cognitive) as well as a favourable feeling or interest and a positive belief on the value of the material (affective).

In addition, as Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964: 9-10) and Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 146-147) remarked, each succeeding categories of the three domains includes the behaviours of previous categories as prerequisites. That is, the higher levels develop out of the lower levels, and elements of the lower levels behaviour continue to persist at the higher levels. For instance, understanding the meaning of a material (comprehension) requires the recognition and recall of the material (knowledge); and a belief in the value of an affective stimulus (valuing) requires an awareness of the affective stimulus and the beginning of favourable feelings toward it (receiving) as well as taking an interest in the stimulus and viewing it favourably (responding) as prerequisites. Likewise, an overt behavioral act of an individual on

a given material seeking the use of motor skills under the guidance of an instructor (guided response) requires the individual's readiness to perform the activity (set) and awareness of the nature of the material by using his sense organs (perception) as prerequisites. It is precisely because of this fact that Clark and Starr (1986:60) have remarked: "Before one can judge something one must know it; before one can create a value system one must have values; before one can play Beethoven ... one must learn to play the scales." That is, evaluation, organization, and complex overt response require knowledge, valuing, and guided response as prerequisites respectively.

The taxonomies help the classroom teacher in that they show the different levels to which instruction should aim (Callahan and Clark, 1988: 51). They also permit exact inferences about the kinds of behaviours expected of students thereby making evaluation precise and clear (Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964: 5). Moreover, the taxonomies serve as a guide in determining the "appropriate level of behaviour associated with a desired learning outcome and the extent to which objectives for a unit of instruction reflect various levels of behaviour" (Kibler and Others, 1981: 55). This, in turn, helps the teacher not to overemphasize on limited types of behaviours- usually lower level behaviours- while formulating behavioral objectives.

In spite of the above advantages of the taxonomies, teachers usually face a problem to determine the specific level of behaviour in which an objective belongs (Payne, 1968: 18). That is, because of the difficulty of making discrete classifications of the complex human behaviour, there is a possibility for a behavioral objective to be classified into more than one category. A good illustration is given by Kibler and others (1981: 83) which clearly describes the issue at hand. These scholars pointed out that if we take an example of a behavioral objective: "... be able to present an original five-minute speech in front of the class without exhibiting stage fright", it includes the three different types of learning outcomes. That is, psychomotor skills

are involved in meaningful sound production, while certain attitudes about speaking before others are also implied (which is an affective domain). In addition, comprehending and repeating information contained in the speech suggests the inclusion of relevant cognitive behaviours (*Ibid.*). However, teachers should not give up trying to use the taxonomy because its advantages surpass the difficulty of using it.

2.4 IMPLEMENTING OBJECTIVES

Implementation is the putting into practice of a program. When it is especially seen in a curriculum perspective, implementation is a complex phenomenon which can be affected by many factors. Among these factors, the complexity of the curriculum itself, the climate of the school, the students' characteristics as well as financial and material resources of the school are the major ones- as mentioned by Husen and Postlethwaite (1985: 1210 - 1212). Above all, curriculum implementation requires teacher's awareness and proper use of the "major dimensions of implementation"; that is, the objectives, contents, instructional materials, teaching strategies, and assessment tools and procedures (Leithwood, 1978-as cited by Fullan, 1981:312).

Though all of the above "dimensions of implementation"- in a curriculum context- are interrelated with each other, implementing objectives is one of these major dimensions. And, this is mainly the duty of the classroom teacher. Then, in the process of implementing objectives, the teacher begins his activities from proper planning.

2.4.1. Lesson Planning: planning is a teacher's activity of what and how his students should learn. Deciding what to teach implies selecting objectives and contents; and

deciding how to teach involves the selection of appropriate methods and instructional materials.

A teacher is mainly supposed to plan for a unit and a lesson . Planning in general, and lesson planning in particular, helps attain the intended objectives of an instruction. Concerning this, Callahan and Clark (1988: 20) put that "like a good map, a good plan facilitates one's reaching one's goal with more confidence and with fewer wrong turns." These educators remarked the difficulty of arriving at success in attaining instructional objectives without a well developed plan. Supporting the above educators' conception, Davies (1981: 79) and Azeb (1984: 71) have also remarked that a teacher who plans his lessons ahead of an instruction feels confidence while he is teaching.

If a teacher enters a class with only a vague idea of what and how he is going to conduct a lesson, he will probably leave it having caused a certain amount of confusion among the students (Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 10). Clark and Starr (1986: 174) have also said that "... teachers are best served by carefully thought out, written lesson plans." Since the effectiveness of a unit, a course or a curriculum is based on the success of lessons, the daily lesson plan is a key element in successful teaching. Planning a lesson helps teachers master the material to be taught and the methods to be used while teaching. Moreover, if a teacher plans ahead of an instruction, teaching and learning will be meaningful, interesting, and purposeful. Logically presented lessons are usually the results of careful planning.

In addition to creating a good atmosphere of learning, planning a lesson minimizes the students' disturbances in a classroom. That is, students' disciplinary problem in the classroom will be limited if adequate planning is made which clearly specifies the students' learning activities. Actual classroom observations made by Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 74) have also proved the liveliness of a properly planned instruction. These educators observed a mathematics teacher who has had a lesson plan with carefully structured instructional activities,

and noticed that all the students arrived on time; the students were almost doing their class activities with very few disruptions; their classroom interaction was very high that showed high level of interest in the instruction; and the teacher's activities were properly sequenced and performed which in turn have attracted the attention of nearly all of the students. On the same day, in the same school, Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (Ibid.) also observed a science teacher who did not have plans for her lessons. Their observation as well as the teacher's response for their interview about her students' interest in attending her lessons indicated that "many of the students would be late to class, not have their textbooks with them, and would not participate very much in the class discussion" (Ibid.: 73).

The above classroom observations indicate the usefulness of a well prepared lesson plan in attracting students' attention toward the lesson thereby facilitating the smooth ongoing of the instructional process. Studies carried out by Arends (1991: 56) have also proved the positive consequences of planning a lesson in enhancing students motivation, helping focus student learning, and decreasing classroom management problems. Moreover, through careful planning, teachers can minimize wastage of time (Davies, 1981: 79; and Azeb, 1984: 71). In other words, if teachers plan their day-to-day lessons carefully; that is, if they decide the type and determine the sequence of learning activities to be performed in a classroom ahead of the instruction, students will have adequate time to be engaged in the appropriate learning activities without too much time left over, and hence, instructional time will not be wasted in routine matters.

As Arends (1991: 37); Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 31); and Davies (1981: 79) pointed out lesson planning helps teachers guide their classroom activities and enable them manage a wide range of activities so that instructional objectives can be attained successfully. In addition, if teachers plan their lessons in advance, the plan will provide direction and

guidance for substitute teachers. Hence, teachers are supposed to have lesson plans available if unexpected happenings occur that need someone else to cover their lessons (Bellon, Bellon, and Blank, 1992: 33).

The type of lesson plan format a teacher uses does not have a significant effect on the instruction. But, as Arends (1991: 56); Davies (1981: 81-82); Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 135); and Perrott (1986: 17) said, a good lesson plan should include these basic elements: specific behavioral objectives- what is to be accomplished in the lesson; an appropriate sequence of topics or key points of the lesson; a sequence of learning activities designed to attain the objectives- how is to be done; the allocated time for each major activities; the instructional materials; and a means of evaluating student learning.

The primary task associated with lesson planning, hence, starts with the formulation of specific behavioral objectives (Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 135; and Sullivan, 1973: 49). According to Kibler and others (1981: 7) research findings support the use of specific behavioral objectives to enhance learning. An inability to specify behavioral objectives of an instruction while planning a lesson leads to the absence of a consistent structure for teaching and this in turn results in undesirable learning (Arends, 1991: 56; and Borich, 1988: 83).

Objectives in a lesson plan should be specifically defined in such a way that they will be indicators of what facts, concepts, skills, and/or attitudes the teacher hopes the students will learn in the lesson. Each behavioral objective should also encompass one and only one learning outcome (Mehrens and Lehmann, 1991: 42-44, and Gronlund and Linn, 1990: 43-44). For instance, an objective like: "The student will tell and write the causes of the 1974 Ethiopian Revolution." is not recommended because it encompasses more than one learning outcome and is likely to lead to inconsistent measurement (Payne, 1968: 23). This objective, hence should be rewritten into two specific behavioral objectives.

While formulating specific behavioral objectives of a lesson, the teacher should refer to the unit and annual plans. This helps him to make his lesson objectives in line with the objectives of the unit and the course. Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 46), who made intensive and various studies on teaching, found in their research that "Daily, weekly, and unit plans should be carefully integrated with year-long plans." This finding explicitly shows the care that teachers should take in planning a lesson in accordance with the weekly (if any), unit and annual plans. These educators remarked the impossibility of attaining unit and course objectives unless each specific behavioral objective of the day-to-day lessons is ingredient of the objectives of unit and annual plans. Moreover, the above educators pointed out the difficulty of using the maximum possible instructional time and other resources if lesson planning does not take into account what should be learned over the course of a semester or an academic year.

Many educators (example: Salia-Bao, 1989: 26; Gronlund and Linn, 1990: 43; Mehrens and Lehmann, 1991: 42-44; and Smith, Krouse, and Atkinson, 1964: 400) agree on the above concept. That is, specific behavioral objectives of lessons should be directly and appropriately related to the general objectives of the corresponding units and course. In other words, each specific behavioral objective should be relevant for and contribute to the attainment of the respective general objectives of the unit and course. This will be possible, as Callahan and Clark (1988: 37-38) mentioned, if formulation of objectives starts at the course level and continues downwards to the unit and lastly to the lesson levels. If this way of formulation of objectives is well done, then the specific behavioral objectives of the lessons will contribute directly to the general objectives of the unit, and the unit objectives will contribute directly to the more general objectives of the course.

While formulating specific behavioral objectives of a lesson, the teacher should refer to the unit and annual plans. This helps him to make his lesson objectives in line with the objectives of the unit and the course. Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 46), who made intensive and various studies on teaching, found in their research that "Daily, weekly, and unit plans should be carefully integrated with year-long plans." This finding explicitly shows the care that teachers should take in planning a lesson in accordance with the weekly (if any), unit and annual plans. These educators remarked the impossibility of attaining unit and course objectives unless each specific behavioral objective of the day-to-day lessons is ingredient of the objectives of unit and annual plans. Moreover, the above educators pointed out the difficulty of using the maximum possible instructional time and other resources if lesson planning does not take into account what should be learned over the course of a semester or an academic year.

Many educators (example: Salia-Bao, 1989: 26; Gronlund and Linn, 1990: 43; Mehrens and Lehmann, 1991: 42-44; and Smith, Krouse, and Atkinson, 1964: 400) agree on the above concept. That is, specific behavioral objectives of lessons should be directly and appropriately related to the general objectives of the corresponding units and course. In other words, each specific behavioral objective should be relevant for and contribute to the attainment of the respective general objectives of the unit and course. This will be possible, as Callahan and Clark (1988: 37-38) mentioned, if formulation of objectives starts at the course level and continues downwards to the unit and lastly to the lesson levels. If this way of formulation of objectives is well done, then the specific behavioral objectives of the lessons will contribute directly to the general objectives of the unit, and the unit objectives will contribute directly to the more general objectives of the course.

Rosenshine (1983), as cited in Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 62-63) has also explained that if specific objectives of lesson plans are derived from, or at least consistent with the course objectives, students will be engaged in the appropriate instructional activities of the course. Moreover, when the general objectives of a course serve as the frame of reference for unit and lesson plans, teachers will have opportunities to evaluate the relevance of the course as well as how well the course meets the needs of the students.

On the other hand, even when course guides contain helpful information, experiences and direct classroom observations of Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (*Ibid.*: 44) showed that some teachers do not use these guides. Because teachers may not have been participated in the development of the guides, they do not feel committed to using them. They may not also have the background information required to use the guides. Moreover, most teachers think that " ... the textbook is really the curriculum (or the syllabus) so their plans are based on getting through the material in the book" (*Ibid.*: 53). Consequently, teachers usually use students' text or teacher's guide to prepare lesson plans thereby formulating lesson objectives based on the instructional activities proposed in the students' text or teacher's guide. The teachers, hence, first decide the instructional activities to be performed in the classroom, and then let their lesson objectives to be determined by these activities. Yinger (1980), as cited by Arends (1991: 111), also observed from his research that instructional activities which are outlined in textbooks are the bases for teachers' planning. This type of planning process, however, makes difficult to achieve the intended objectives of the course. The major reason for this assertion is that since instructional activities are the means to attain the ends (the objectives), it is the ends that should determine the means, but not the converse.

Lesson planning should also aim for an appropriate balance of lower and higher level objectives (Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 147). This is to mean, in formulating

specific behavioral objectives of a lesson, the teacher should not only consider lower level objectives such as knowledge and comprehension but also higher level objectives such as synthesis and evaluation of the cognitive domain. The teacher should also include specific behavioral objectives at the different levels of the affective and the psychomotor domains whenever pertinent. In other words, it is necessary to formulate an affective and/or a psychomotor behavioral objective in a lesson when the attainment of the corresponding general objective of a unit or a course needs it. The main point here is to write and achieve specific behavioral objectives that describe the general objective they represent.

Callahan and Clark (1988: 54-55); Clark and Starr (1986: 58), and Payne (1968: 20-21) have in fact mentioned the difficulty of writing as well as attaining affective behavioral objectives. Nevertheless, these educators have also remarked that teachers should not give up trying. To minimize this problem, Callahan and Clark (1988: 56-57) proposed different action verbs that can be used to write specific behavioral objectives in all the levels of the domains. These action verbs, then, help the teacher write the specific behavioral objectives of his lessons by including lower and higher level objectives of the three domains as required.

Arends (1991: 46); Borich (1988: 90-91); Furst (1981: 450-451); and Rosenshine (1983) as cited in Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 57) have also preferred the Bloom's and Krathwol's classifications of educational objectives to be used as a guide in formulating specific behavioral objectives at the different levels of the domains so that education will be worthwhile. Hence, to make teaching most effective and to encourage optimal students learning, specific behavioral objectives of the different lessons of a course should include objectives in the higher levels of the three domains as well as in the lower ones.

2.4.2. Students' Awareness of Specific Behavioral Objectives: After a teacher plans his lesson carefully thereby determining what and how his students should accomplish, the next step is informing the students of the specific behavioral objectives; that is, communicating the lesson objectives to students. If students understand what they are supposed to do, they will pay more attention and learn more easily (Bellon, Bellon, and Blank, 1992: 64; Broich, 1988: 123-124; Gagne', Briggs, and Wager, 1988: 183; Perrott, 1986: 14; and Kibler and Others, 1981: 4). Clear, well communicated specific behavioral objectives of a lesson, hence, are believed to have a positive influence on students learning.

When teachers make their students aware of the intended objectives of each lesson at the beginning of each period, students emphasize on those learning activities which lead to the desired objectives. Mager (1984: 6); Deterline (1973: 3); and Ryburn and Forge (1969: 11) have also said that informing the students of lesson objectives helps them select and focus their attention on those parts of the instruction leading to the desired behaviour. Moreover, the above educators have remarked that communicating the objectives to students enhances learning and improves the students' motivation to learn.

Mager (1984: 6) wrote that "... many students spend considerable time and effort in learning the peculiarities of their instructors when those instructors fail or refuse to let students in on the secrets of what they are expected to learn." Hence, informing the students of the specific behavioral objectives minimizes the students' frustration and time consuming effort of trying to guess what the teacher expects of them because the objectives specify clearly to students what is to be learned; that is, what the students are expected to do and how they are to demonstrate learning. This also makes tests and examinations less threatening to students because a student entering a classroom to take an examination will feel as secure as an individual who has somehow got a copy of the examination in advance (Deterline, 1973: 4).

Deterline also wrote clearly the danger of not informing the students of the lesson objectives. He said that if a student is not told of the specific behavioral objectives of each lesson of a course, then

... he is left with the chilling prospect of either trying to learn everything or concentrating on a manageable portion-hopefully the correct portion-and ignoring the rest. If he tries to learn everything, there is a better than even chance that he will know a little bit about everything, but not enough about anything. If he tries to 'pick his spots', he runs the risk of choosing the irrelevant portions for his study in depth (Deterline, 1973: 2).

According to the above Deterline's explanation, if students are told precisely what the lesson objectives are, then their study will be more relevant and their time will be more fruitfully spent on appropriate learning activities. The majority of research findings (example: Dawley and Dawley (1974); Hauck and Thomas (1972); Houston and Warner (1977); Wolk (1973); and Morse and Tellman (1972)- as mentioned by Kibler and Others, 1981: 7) have also confirmed the view that students who know specific behavioral objectives of their day-to-day lessons achieve more than students unaware of the objectives.

Moreover, Mager and McCann (1961), as mentioned by Jenkins and Deno (1973: 9), made a study focusing on student use of behavioral objectives, and reported that "Students who were given detailed statements of the instructional objectives significantly reduced the time required for training, as much as 65 per cent, relative to students who were instructed normally." That is, students who were told precisely what is expected of them have attained the learning objectives in a relatively shorter span of time than those students whose learning objectives were left unspecified.

Another study made by Duchastel and Brown (1974), as cited in Arends (1991: 37-38), on the effects of instructional objectives on students learning found that the students who were given 12 of the 24 objectives to focus their learning outscored other students on test items

associated with these 12 objectives. This, again, indicates how informing the students of the specific behavioral objectives activates the learning process and focuses it in the direction that is most efficient and conducive to obtaining the required behavioral objectives. In general, if objectives are left unspecified, students will be easily confused both about what is expected of them and the extent to which they should be able to perform the behaviours taught.

Borich (1988: 123-124); and Gagne', Briggs, and Wager (1988: 184) have said that specific behavioral objectives of each lesson can be communicated to students orally or in words at the beginning of each period. This can be easily accomplished by, for instance, providing some examples of the behaviours that the students will be expected to perform after the lesson. Here, the language used to communicate behavioral objectives to students should be chosen with their vocabulary level so that they can readily understand.

2.4.3. Correspondence of Instructional Activities with Specific Behavioral Objectives: Instructional activities encompass a wide pattern of behaviours that characterize what teachers do as they teach and what students do as they engage in learning (Arends, 1991: 53). They are the things teachers and students do, or are expected to do, in their lessons. For instance, a teacher's different methods of teaching; students' listening to a lecture; teacher's and students' questions and answers; students' individual seatwork, silent reading, group work, taking a test; teacher's and students' use of different instructional equipment; and so on are some of the instructional activities that can be performed in lessons.

Instructional activities, in fact, require careful planning by the teacher. And, the planned instructional activities should be in harmony with the specific behavioral objectives of the lesson. In other words, while planning a lesson, the teacher should select those instructional activities which are suitable for attaining the specific behavioral objectives of the lesson. And,

every lesson objective should have certain instructional activities aimed at it Arends (1991:53-54); Clark and Starr (1986: 147); Davies (1981: 29); and Woodruff (1962:291-292). Hence, any instructional activity that is not aimed at one or more of the specific behavioral objectives is useless and should be discarded. Concerning this, Nacino-Brown, Oke and Brown (1989: 136) said that "undirected activity (to the attainment of objectives) will lead to chaos and little or no learning."

On the other hand, there is no rule that necessarily corresponds a single instructional activity with the attainment of any specific behavioral objective. In fact it is recommended to use different instructional activities for a single lesson objective or for several objectives. And, using different instructional activities; that is, maintaining variety in instructional activities, by itself, is a sort of motivation for students. Nevertheless, some instructional activities are likely to be much more useful than others for a given lesson objective. For instance, Clark and Starr (1986: 147) proposed the instructional activities such as: explanation, demonstration, and question and answer as useful means for attaining mastery of basic skills.

After planning the necessary instructional activities in line with the specific behavioral objectives of the lesson, the teacher should follow the plan in the classroom unless there is a very important reason for changing it. Following the plan is the only way to do what the teacher has intended to do. Otherwise, the teacher will easily lose sight of his lesson objectives (Clark and Starr, 1986: 195). Ofcourse, this does not mean that the teacher must always stick to his lesson plan (Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown, 1989: 137-138). Occasions may arise that urge the teacher to abandon what he planned to teach. For example, when students can gain more from other methods, the teacher should be flexible enough to use them. But he should still aimed at the accomplishment of his lesson objectives.

Neely (1989), as mentioned in Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 39) has concluded from his study that "... when teachers monitor the implementation of their plans, there is a positive effect on student learning." A teacher, therefore, should appropriately carry out his plan in the classroom so that the already designed instructional activities can be used to achieve the specific behavioral objectives of the lesson.

Research findings of Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 74) have also proved the assertion that teachers who plan appropriate instructional activities prior to the instruction and who execute the plan properly in the classroom attain the intended lesson objectives successfully. Moreover, in their classroom observations in a sixth grade social studies class, Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (*Ibid.*) have found a teacher who was unsuccessful in using a group work because he has not planned this instructional activity in accordance with his lesson objective prior to the instruction. But, after some days, this teacher carefully planned a group work again. This time he based the instructional activities on what he wanted the students to learn. He also organized his students into small groups- according to his plan. And, his second attempt was very successful in attaining the desired lesson objectives.

Arends (1991: 54-55) pointed out that if a teacher carefully plans instructional activities and executes these activities on the basis of his plan, the teacher can use the instructional time appropriately while performing routine activities such as taking attendance, distributing equipment, collecting assignments, and the like. As Arends (*Ibid.*) said, teachers who do not plan instructional activities or who fail in carrying out their plans usually waste instructional time in the routine activities. This does not mean that the teacher should not perform the routine activities, rather it means the teacher should plan and allocate sufficient time for each activity as well as devise a means to execute routines easily,- for example, by training student helpers to provide assistance in carrying out routines- so that unnecessary wastage of instructional time will be reduced.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

As described earlier, the purpose of this study was to examine the TTI instructors effectiveness in performing the major instructional activities that lead to the attainment of the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus. Hence, the descriptive survey method was used. This method is usually useful for research studies of this kind that require numerous types of data to reach at a conclusion.

3.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The population of this study was pedagogics instructors, trainees, deputy directors, and directors in Teachers Training Institutes. And, the study was carried out in all the three TTIs of Region Three- Debre Birhan, Dessie, and Gondar. Since the teaching material of the pedagogics syllabus is prepared in such a way that it is going to be in accordance with the socio-cultural conditions of the region, the study of its implementation seeks, from the part of the investigator, a certain sort of familiarity with the region. It was mainly due to this reason that the three TTIs of Region Three have been chosen as the study area. In addition, the investigator speaks and writes better in Amharic than in any other native languages and hence it was easy to administer questionnaires and interview; to make a direct classroom observation; and to train observers in Amharic and English. The selected TTIs, conduct their training program in Amharic and English.

All the available pedagogics instructors (11) were the major sources of information. To increase the reliability of the information, 150 trainees in Gondar TTI and 200 trainees in each of Debre Birhan and Dessie TTIs- according to the available number of pedagogics instructors in the TTIs - and hence, a total of 550 out of 1163 trainees (50 trainees for each instructor), the deputy directors (3), and the directors (3) of the three TTIs were used as supplementary sources of information. The trainees who were intended to give information about their instructors effectiveness were chosen by using a simple random sampling. This type of sampling technique is useful because it provides equal chance for every member of the population to be included in the sample.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

To obtain adequate and reliable information for the study, four types of data collection instruments were employed: questionnaire, interview, classroom observation, and documentary analysis.

3.2.1 Questionnaire: One set of questionnaire consisting of 17 items, prepared in English, was used to collect information from pedagogics instructors about their attempt in carrying out the necessary instructional activities required to implement the objectives of the pedagogics syllabus. Another set of questionnaire consisting of 16 items, prepared in Amharic, was also used to obtain a supplementary information from trainees about their instructors effectiveness in implementing the objectives of the syllabus under question. The draft questionnaires were first administered to four pedagogics instructors and fifty randomly selected trainees- who have been taught by an instructor- in Arba Minch TTI. This TTI was randomly selected out of the three TTIs (Gambella, Awassa, and Arba Minch) which provide

the pedagogics course in English - excluding the three TTIs in which the major study was carried out.

To determine the content validity of the questionnaires, two open-ended items, at the end of each questionnaire, were given to the respondents during the try out of the instrument. These items request the respondents to write other characteristics of teachers effectiveness which are helpful for the implementation of the objectives of a course and hence should be included in the questionnaires, and to give their comments on the items that should be improved or discarded. Moreover, three instructors and five graduate students in the field of Curriculum and Instruction of the Addis Ababa University were consulted to give their comments on the data collection instruments.

After the questionnaires have been filled by the respondents, the internal consistency of each questionnaire was calculated by Split-half reliability method, and coefficients of +0.92 and +0.96 for the questionnaires administered to students and instructors respectively were obtained. It is assumed that "reliability coefficients over .70, in a split-half reliability method, are within an acceptable range" Payne (1968: 136). And, since the obtained reliability coefficients are greater than .70, it is possible to use the questionnaires with a relatively high level of confidence. Hence, after some minor modifications by taking the comments into consideration, the questionnaires have been administered to the actual respondents directly by the investigator.

3.2.2. Interview. A structured interview consisting of 8 items was also made with the deputy directors and the directors of the three TTIs (a total of 6). The interview was mainly aimed at obtaining information regarding pedagogics instructors effectiveness in preparing and implementing lesson plans. Since deputy directors and directors are expected to

make continuous assessments of instructors teaching performance, it was necessary to collect information on pedagogics instructors effectiveness in preparing and implementing lesson plans when viewed by the deputy directors and the directors.

3.2.3 Classroom Observation: A direct classroom observation of the eleven pedagogics instructors teaching performance was carried out in the three TTIs. For this purpose, an observation checklist consisting of 22 items was prepared by the investigator which gave major emphasis for checking the correspondence of the planned and the actual classroom activities of the instructors. An observer (a graduate student) was, first, oriented in how to use the checklist; and then, the observer with the investigator have tested the checklist in Arba Minch TTI. To ascertain the content validity of the instrument, during the try out, the observer was requested to write his suggestion regarding the instructional activities that help to check the implementation of the objectives of the course and hence should be included in the checklist; and to give his comments on the items of the instrument that should be improved or discarded. Furthermore, like the above instruments, five graduate students and three instructors in the field of Curriculum and Instruction of the Addis Ababa University were consulted to give their comments on the checklist.

To check the reliability of the checklist, the trained observer and the investigator (both at a time) observed a pedagogics instructor for two consecutive classhours during the tryout of the study. After this, the inter raters' agreement- the correlation between scores based on observations made by the observers at the same time; and the intrarater's agreement-the correlation between scores based on observations made by the same observer at different lessons were calculated. As Medley and Mitzel (1965: 253-254) pointed out the reliability of an observation checklist can be determined by finding the above two correlation coefficients;

that is, by calculating both the coefficient of observers (inter raters') agreement and the stability coefficient (intrarater's agreement).

The result of the correlation coefficients is summarized in Table I below.

TABLE I
Inter raters' and Intrarater's Reliability Coefficients

		Sessions (S)			Average
		S ₁	S ₂	S ₁ S ₂	
Observers(o)	O ₁ O ₂	0.93	0.95	-	0.94
	O ₁ O ₁			0.88	
	O ₂ O ₂			0.92	
Average				0.90	

Table I shows that the average inter raters' reliability coefficient is +0.94 and the average intrarater's reliability coefficient is +0.90. Since the two coefficients are relatively high, the checklist was used consistently by the two observers (O₁O₂) at the same time (S₁ or S₂) and by an observer (O₁O₁ or O₂O₂) at different times (S₁S₂); that is, the checklist was reliable.

After the checklist was tested, minor improvement was made based on the comments given by the observer, the five graduate students and the three instructors of Addis Ababa University. Lastly, the observer and the investigator (both at a time) observed each pedagogics instructor three times in a classroom for a duration of 45 minutes each in the final study; that is, the observers observed the eleven pedagogic^S instructors of the three TTIs for thirty three classhours. This was so because of the assumption that observing an instructor more than twice will help the investigator to see the instructor's consistency of

performances in his different lessons. In other words, the use of repeated observations by one or more observers minimizes the effect of a change in the instructor's instructional activities that might take place due to the presence of the observers (Bennett and Mc Namara, 1979: 126). Moreover, to minimize the subjective judgement of the observers that might be made on the evaluation of instructors effectiveness, an audio recording technique was used in the classrooms.

3.2.4 Documentary Analysis: To check the instructors effectiveness in: preparing lesson plans that have specific and behavioral objectives; formulating lesson objectives in line with Unit and Course objectives; and including lower and higher level objectives of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (as required) in their various lessons; the investigator thoroughly analysed the objectives of pedagogics syllabus, the annual plans of the instructors which comprise the unit objectives, and the instructors consecutive lesson plans of three months (from October to December). The documentary analysis was made based on the research findings of the majority of scholars in the literature review.

3.3 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Depending on the nature of the basic questions of the study and the data collected, different statistical methods were employed. The first-four basic questions were tested by a thorough analysis of documents; that is, lesson and annual plans as well as the pedagogics syllabus. Responses obtained from the interview have also contributed much to answer these basic questions. For this purpose, a simple percentage distribution with verbal

explanation was used.

Instructors' and trainees' responses of the questionnaires, and results of the classroom observation were also used to test the third and the last two basic questions. Here, the averages of the scores of the instructors', trainees', and observers' evaluation of instructors for each item were calculated. Since the obtained average scores are within the numbers that represent the scale of the study, analysis of the results was made on the basis of the verbal expression which corresponds to the obtained average score, that is, to the number in the scale of the study.

In addition, a statistical test called Fisher's one-way Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed for the third basic question to check the presence of a statistically significant difference in the use of the various levels of objectives of the different domains with Alpha 0.05 level of significance. Moreover, to identify the level(s) of the objectives whose mean(s) contributed much to the overall significance of F, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) method of Post Hoc comparison was used with Alpha 0.05 level of significance.

To this end, first, the instructors' and trainees' responses for each item were summed and averaged, and then, a split-half reliability test was used to check the consistency of the respondents' responses in the final study. This was done by taking the odd and even halves of each questionnaire. The statistical test showed +0.85 and +0.96 coefficients of correlations for the instructors and trainees questionnaires respectively. Since these coefficients are relatively high, they show that the questionnaires were also reliable in the final study.

Furthermore, the scores of each observer for each instructor per item were summed and averaged, and the inter raters' as well as intrarater's agreement were calculated by using

the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The average result gave correlation coefficients of +0.97 and +0.98 between observers and within an observer respectively. Again, here, since the two coefficients are high, the check list was used consistently by the two observers at the same time and by an observer at different times in the final study.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the data collected through questionnaires, interview, classroom observation and documentary analysis is presented with the help of tables followed by interpretation and discussion of the results thereby giving answers to the six basic questions raised in the first chapter of this study.

4.1 RESULTS

4.1.1 Preparation of Lesson Plans

A documentary analysis was made to check whether or not each instructor consistently prepares lesson plans. To this end, lesson plans which were prepared in three months (from October to December) were collected and the following result was obtained.

TABLE II
Instructors' Preparation of Lesson Plans Per
Week in Three Months, in each TTI.

		TEACHERS' TRAINING INSTITUTES										
		DEBREBIRHAN				DESSIE				GONDAR		
INSTRUCTORS		I ₁	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₁	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₁	I ₂	I ₃
Month	Week											
OCTOBER	1 st	✓				✓				✓		
	2 nd		✓				✓				✓	
	3 rd			✓				✓				✓
	4 th				✓				✓	✓		
NOVEMBER	1 st	✓				✓					✓	
	2 nd		✓				✓					✓
	3 rd			✓				✓		✓		
	4 th				✓				✓		✓	
DECEMBER	1 st	✓				✓						✓
	2 nd		✓				✓			✓		
	3 rd			✓				✓			✓	
	4 th				✓				✓			✓
TOTAL		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4

Key : " ✓ " indicates that the instructor corresponding to this mark prepared lesson plans in the respective week.

As table II shows, each instructor of Debre Birhan and Dessie TTIs prepared lesson plans for a week once in a month whereas each instructor of Gondar TTI prepared lesson plans for a week once in three weeks. However, as the responses of all the directors and deputy directors of the three TTIs in the interview indicated, each instructor is considered as he is preparing lesson plans for every day-to-day instruction. This is because of the reason that while the instructors are preparing the lesson plans every week turn by turn, the instructor- the one whose turn it is - writes the plans in sufficient copies so that each

instructor in a TTI will have a copy of the lesson plans for his own. It was also observed from the documents that an instructor prepares five lesson plans- because pedagogics has five credit hours per week- every Friday for the coming week.

4.1.2 The Nature of the Prepared Lesson Objective

To determine whether the formulated lesson objectives are behavioral or non behavioral as well as to check the specificity or generality of these lesson objectives, a thorough documentary analysis was made. Table III depicts the result of this documentary analysis in detail.

TABLE III

*Classification of the formulated lesson objectives into non behavioral and behavioral as well as specific and general objectives.

OBJECTIVES															
NON BEHAVIORAL		BEHAVIORAL												Total	
		Specific										General			
		only behaviour	Both content and behaviour		Standard of performance		Testing condition		content and behaviour; standard of performance; and Testing condition		Both content and behaviour				
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4	1.9	1	0.5	194	93.3	7	3.4	4	1.9	2	1	9	4.3	208	100

*To obtain a detail information, see appendix - I.

As Table III reveals, of the 208 lesson objectives which are formulated by the pedagogics instructors, 4(1.9%) are not written in trainees' terminal behaviour. That is, 204

TABLE V

Classification of Behavioral Objectives based on the Emphasis
given by Instructors while teaching.

Means of Evaluation	OBJECTIVES	INSTRUCTORS											Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Instructors' self Evaluation	Lower cognitive	5	4	4	5	3.5	4	5	5	5	4	4.5	4.45
	Higher cognitive	3.5	4	3.5	4	2.5	3	3	5	5	5	4	3.86
	Affective	4	4	3	4	2	4	2	4	4	4	4	3.55
Trainees' evaluation of instructors	Lower cognitive	4.6	4.13	3.18	4.8	4.31	2.13	4.15	2.23	4.37	3.47	4.58	3.81
	Higher cognitive	4.2	3.02	3.08	3.6	3.02	1.92	3.46	1.64	1.5	2.1	3.46	2.82
	Affective	3.18	2.6	3.00	2.23	2.13	4.00	3.02	4.00	3.02	4.00	2.13	3.03
Observers' evaluation of instructors'	Lower cognitive	5	4	3.25	4.83	4.75	1.25	3.75	1.83	3.17	1.75	4.75	3.48
	Higher cognitive	4	4	3	3.25	2.5	1.5	3.5	1	1	1.25	2.5	2.5
	Affective	2	2.5	3	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	3	3.14
Average	Lower cognitive	4.87	4.04	3.48	4.88	4.19	2.46	4.3	3.02	4.18	3.07	4.61	3.92
	Higher cognitive	3.9	3.67	3.19	3.62	2.67	2.14	3.32	2.55	2.5	2.78	3.32	3.06
	Affective	3.06	3.03	3.0	3.08	2.38	4.00	3.01	4.00	3.01	4.00	3.04	3.24

Table V indicates that 7 of the 11 instructors were given, by the three groups of evaluators, average scores between 4 and 5 in dealing with lower level cognitive objectives. That is, these instructors usually encourage their trainees to memorize facts, symbols, and concepts.

the lower level
ively are greater than
al calculation, see
e and the affective
of means, that is, the
ives as well as the
ificantly different.
verall significance

ors made by
cognitive objectives,
2 which is near to 4.
ervers, trainees, and
cognitive objectives.

f the scale of the
ave evaluation scores
velopment of trainees
lenotes a verbal

lesson

abus

tructors attempt to
bjectives of the

syllabus. This was done, first, by examining the relation between the lesson objectives and the unit objectives of the syllabus. Finally, the correspondence of the lesson objectives to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus was investigated. The result is presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI
Distribution of the Lesson Objectives Over the Unit and
General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI

TTIs	LESSON OBJECTIVES			Unit objectives of the syllabus	General objectives of the Syllabus
	Debre Birhan	Dessie	Gondar		
	*1-6	1-3	1-5	U ₁	G ₁
	7-13	4-10	6-13	U ₂	
	14-18	11-24	14-19,21-24, 27-31,33-38,40,42-52	U ₃	
	-	-	20,25,26,32,39,41, 51	U ₄	
	19-23	25-30	54-63	U ₅	G ₂
	24-30	31-34	64-69	U ₆	
	-	-	70-74	U ₇	
	31,32	35,36	76,77	U ₈	G ₃
	33	-	78	U ₉	
	34	37,40	79	U ₁₀	G ₄
	35,37	38,39,41-46	75,80,81	U ₁₁	
	38,39	48,49	83-85	U ₁₂	
	-	47	-	U ₁₃	
	-	-	82	U ₁₄	
	42 - 49	50	86	U ₁₅	G ₅
	-	53	87	U ₁₆	
	50 - 52	51,52,54-56	88	U ₁₇	
	-	-	-	U ₁₈	
	-	-	89,91-94,96-100	U ₁₉	
	-	-	-	U ₂₀	
	-	-	90,95	U ₂₂	
	-	-	-	U ₂₃	G ₆
	-	-	-	U ₂₄	
	40,41	-	-	U ₂₅	
	-	-	-	U ₂₆	
	-	-	-	U ₂₇	
Total	52	56	100	27	6

* The numbers indicate consecutive roll numbers of the objectives presented in appendix E-H. This way of usage is also continued in Table VII and VIII

As Table VI reveals, every lesson objective of the three TTIs is within the unit and general objectives of the syllabus. But there are unit objectives of the syllabus such as U₄, U₇, U₁₄, U₁₉, and U₂₂ which do not have corresponding lesson objectives in both Debre Birhan and Dessie TTIs. Similarly, U₉ and U₁₆ have no corresponding lesson objectives in Dessie and Debre Birhan TTIs respectively. Instructors of Debre Birhan and Gondar TTIs did not also prepare lesson objectives which describe U₁₃. Moreover, instructors of all the three TTIs did not prepare lesson objectives which describe some of the unit objectives of the syllabus like U₁₈, U₂₀, and U₂₃. In general, 14 of the unit objectives of the syllabus are not described by lesson objectives of Debre Birhan TTI. And, instructors of Dessie TTI did not prepare lesson objectives which describe 14 of the unit objectives of the syllabus. There are also 9 unit objectives of the syllabus which are not described by lesson objectives of Gondar TTI.

While examining the correspondence of the lesson objectives to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus, a disparity was observed in the emphasis given to the unit objectives of the syllabus by the instructors of the three TTIs- when they formulate the lesson objectives. This lack of uniformity for the emphasis given to the unit objectives of the syllabus has something to imply for the emphasis given to the general objectives of the syllabus. To show this disparity vividly, the result of the documentary analysis is presented in the form of percentage distributions in Table VII.

higher level cognitive objectives - , and the first and the third group- the lower level cognitive and the affective objectives- which are 4.53 and 3.58 respectively are greater than the critical value of $q(3, 30)$ at $\alpha = 0.05$, which is 3.49 (For the statistical calculation, see appendix L-2). This implies that the means of the higher level cognitive and the affective objectives are not significantly different. But the other two differences of means, that is, the means of the lower level cognitive and the higher level cognitive objectives as well as the means of the lower level cognitive and the affective objectives are significantly different. And, hence, the two differences of the means contributed much to the overall significance of F.

In addition, Table V shows that the evaluation scores of instructors made by observers, trainees, and instructors themselves, in attaining lower level cognitive objectives, are 3.48, 3.81, and 4.45 respectively. The average of these scores is 3.92 which is near to 4. 2.5, 2.82 and 3.86 are also evaluation scores of instructors made by observers, trainees, and instructors themselves respectively, in attempting to attain higher level cognitive objectives. The average of these scores is 3.06 which is a bit above the mid value of the scale of the study (1 to 5). Again, observers, trainees, and instructors themselves gave evaluation scores of 3.14, 3.03, and 3.55 respectively for instructors, in enhancing the development of trainees affective behaviour. Here also the average of the scores is 3.24 which denotes a verbal expression within sometimes and often.

4.1.4 Correspondence of the Specific Objectives of each lesson to the General Objectives of the Pedagogics Syllabus

Documents were critically analyzed to check whether or not instructors attempt to create a correspondence between the lesson objectives and the general objectives of the

syllabus. This was done, first, by examining the relation between the lesson objectives and the unit objectives of the syllabus. Finally, the correspondence of the lesson objectives to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus was investigated. The result is presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI
Distribution of the Lesson Objectives Over the Unit and
General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI

TTIs	LESSON OBJECTIVES			Unit objectives of the syllabus	General objectives of the Syllabus
	Debre Birhan	Dessie	Gondar		
	*1-6	1-3	1-5	U ₁	G ₁
	7-13	4-10	6-13	U ₂	
	14-18	11-24	14-19,21-24, 27-31,33-38,40,42-52	U ₃	
	-	-	20,25,26,32,39,41, 51	U ₄	
	19-23	25-30	54-63	U ₅	G ₂
	24-30	31-34	64-69	U ₆	
	-	-	70-74	U ₇	
	31,32	35,36	76,77	U ₈	G ₃
	33	-	78	U ₉	
	34	37,40	79	U ₁₀	G ₄
	35,37	38,39,41-46	75,80,81	U ₁₁	
	38,39	48,49	83-85	U ₁₂	
	-	47	-	U ₁₃	
	-	-	82	U ₁₄	
	42 - 49	50	86	U ₁₅	
	-	53	87	U ₁₆	G ₅
	50 - 52	51,52,54-56	88	U ₁₇	
	-	-	-	U ₁₈	
	-	-	89,91-94,96-100	U ₁₉	
	-	-	-	U ₂₀	
	-	-	-	U ₂₁	
	-	-	90,95	U ₂₂	
	-	-	-	U ₂₃	G ₆
	-	-	-	U ₂₄	
	40,41	-	-	U ₂₅	
	-	-	-	U ₂₆	
	-	-	-	U ₂₇	
Total	52	56	100	27	6

* The numbers indicate consecutive roll numbers of the objectives presented in appendix E-H. This way of usage is also continued in Table VII and VIII

As Table VI reveals, every lesson objective of the three TTIs is within the unit and general objectives of the syllabus. But there are unit objectives of the syllabus such as U₄, U₇, U₁₄, U₁₉, and U₂₂ which do not have corresponding lesson objectives in both Debre Birhan and Dessie TTIs. Similarly, U₉ and U₁₆ have no corresponding lesson objectives in Dessie and Debre Birhan TTIs respectively. Instructors of Debre Birhan and Gondar TTIs did not also prepare lesson objectives which describe U₁₃. Moreover, instructors of all the three TTIs did not prepare lesson objectives which describe some of the unit objectives of the syllabus like U₁₈, U₂₀, and U₂₃. In general, 14 of the unit objectives of the syllabus are not described by lesson objectives of Debre Birhan TTI. And, instructors of Dessie TTI did not prepare lesson objectives which describe 14 of the unit objectives of the syllabus. There are also 9 unit objectives of the syllabus which are not described by lesson objectives of Gondar TTI.

While examining the correspondence of the lesson objectives to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus, a disparity was observed in the emphasis given to the unit objectives of the syllabus by the instructors of the three TTIs- when they formulate the lesson objectives. This lack of uniformity for the emphasis given to the unit objectives of the syllabus has something to imply for the emphasis given to the general objectives of the syllabus. To show this disparity vividly, the result of the documentary analysis is presented in the form of percentage distributions in Table VII.

TABLE VII
Percentage Distribution of the Lesson Objectives over the Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI.

TTIs	LESSON OBJECTIVES						Unit (U) Objectives of the Syllabus	General (G) objectives of the Syllabus
	DEBREBIRHAN		DESSIE		GONDAR			
	NO.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
	6	11.6	3	5.3	5	5	U1	G1
	7	13.5	7	12.5	8	8	U2	
	5	9.6	14	25	33	33	U3	
	-	-	-	-	7	7	U4	
	5	9.6	6	10.7	10	10	U5	G2
	7	13.5	4	7.1	6	6	U6	
	-	-	-	-	5	5	U7	
	2	3.8	2	3.6	2	2	U8	G3
	1	1.9	-	-	1	1	U9	
	1	1.9	2	3.6	1	1	U10	G4
	3	5.8	8	14.3	3	3	U11	
	2	3.8	2	3.6	3	3	U12	
	-	-	1	1.8	-	-	U13	
	-	-	-	-	1	1	U14	
	8	15.4	1	1.8	1	1	U15	
	-	-	1	1.8	1	1	U16	G5
	3	5.8	5	8.9	1	1	U17	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U18	
	-	-	-	-	10	10	U19	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U20	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U21	
	-	-	-	-	2	2	U22	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U23	G6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U24	
	2	3.8	-	-	-	-	U25	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U26	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U27	
Total	52	100	56	100	100	100	27	6

Table VII shows the disparity of the emphasis given for each unit objective of the syllabus by the instructors of each TTI. In connection to this, U3 is given high emphasis (33%) by instructors of Gondar TTI but less (9.6%) by instructors of Debre Birhan TTI. There is also a vast difference in the emphasis given by the instructors of the three TTIs to the unit objectives: U4,U6,U7,U11,U15,U17, and U19 of the syllabus.

The correspondence of the lesson and unit objectives of instructors to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus implies that the instructors give due consideration for the latter objectives while formulating the former ones. This correspondence, in turn, has a considerable advantage to attain the general objectives of the syllabus. And, hence, a further documentary analysis was made to check the presence of the aforementioned correspondence. The result is presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
Distribution of the Lesson and Unit Objectives of the Instructors Over the Unit and
and General Objectives of the Syllabus in each TTI

TTIs	LESSON OBJECTIVES			INSTRUCTORS' UNIT OBJECTIVES			UNIT OBJECTIVES OF THE SYLLABUS	GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE SYLLABUS
	DEBRE BIRHAN	DESSIE	GONDAR	DEBRE BIRHAN	DESSIE	GONDAR		
	1-6	1-3	1-5	1	1	1-3	U1	
	7-13	4-10	6-13	2,3	-	4,13	U2	
	14-18	11-24	14-19, 21-24, 27-31, 33-38, 40, 42-52,	3,5	-	6,7	U3	G ₁
	-	-	20, 25, 26,32, 39,41, 51	4,5	-	5,6	U4	
	19-23	25-30	54-63	6	2	8,9	U5	
	24-30	31-34	64-69	7	-	-	U6	
	-	-	70-74	-	3	10	U7	G ₂
	31,32	35,36	76,77	8	-	11,12	U8	
	33	-	78	9	4,5	-	U9	G ₃
	34	37,40	79	-	6	14	U10	
	35-37	38, 39, 41-46	75, 80, 81	10, 11	7,8	16	U11	
	38,39	48,49	83-85	12	-	17	U12	
	-	47	-	11,12	-	15,18	U13	G ₄
	-	-	82	-	-	-	U14	
	42-49	50	86	13	9	19	U15	
	-	53	87	13	-	20	U16	
	50-52	51,52,54-56	88	13	-	20	U17	
	-	-	-	14	-	20	U18	
	-	-	89, 91-94, 96-100	13-15	-	-	U19	G ₅
	-	-	-	-	10	-	U20	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U21	
	-	-	90,95	-	11	-	U22	
	-	-	-	-	12	21	U23	
	-	-	-	16	-	21,22	U24	
	40,41	-	-	-	13	23-25	U25	G ₆
	-	-	-	17	14	25	U26	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	U27	
Total	52	56	100	17	14	25	27	6

As Table VIII shows, each lesson and unit objectives of the instructors is comprised in the unit and general objectives of the syllabus. However, there are lesson objectives

which have no corresponding instructors' unit objective. For instance, lesson objectives number 4-10, 11-24, 31-34, 35, 36, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, and 54-56 (a total of 35, that is, 62. 5%) of Dessie TTI have no corresponding instructors' unit objectives. Lesson objectives number 34, 40, and 41 (a total of 3, that is, 5.8%) of Debre Birhan TTI have not also represented any instructors' unit objective. And, lesson objectives number 64-69, 78, 82, 90, 91-94, 95, and 96-100 (a total of 19, that is, 19%) of Gondar TTI have no corresponding instructors' unit objective.

On the other hand, Table VIII reveals that there are instructors' unit objectives which are not described by lesson objectives. For instance, instructors' unit objectives number 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17 (a total of 8) of Debre Birhan TTI; 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 (a total of 8) of Dessie TTI; and 15, 18, 21, 22, and 23-25 (a total of 7) of Gondar TTI have not been represented by any corresponding lesson objective. There are also unit objectives of the syllabus which have no corresponding instructors' unit objective. For instance, the syllabus unit objectives number U2, U3, U4, U6, U8, U12, U13, U14, U16, U17, U18, U19, U21, U24, and U27 in Dessie TTI; U7, U10, U14, U20, U21, U22, U23, U25, and U26 in Debre Birhan TTI; and U6, U9, U14, U19, U20, U21, U22, and U27 in Gondar TTI have not been described by any instructors' unit objective.

Referring to the unit and general objectives of a syllabus when they prepare lesson plans is the major duty of instructors to keep up the correspondence of the lesson objectives to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus. Due to this reason, instructors were asked to reveal the extent to which they are referring to the unit and general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus while preparing the lesson plans. The responses of the instructors to the questions are presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX

Instructors' Response on to what extent they are referring to the
Unit and General Objectives of the Syllabus while Preparing Lesson Plans

Instructors' Self Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Unit Objectives	5	3	5	3	2	3	1	3	4	3	5	3.36
General Objectives	3	3	4	3	3	5	2	5	4	3	5	3.64

As Table IX depicts, 4 of the 11 instructors gave evaluation scores of 4 and 5 for themselves in referring to the unit objectives of the syllabus while preparing lesson plans; 5 of the instructors gave a score of 3; and the rest 2 instructors gave evaluation scores below 3. Moreover, Table IX shows that 5 of the instructors gave evaluation scores of 4 and 5 for themselves in referring to the general objectives of the syllabus while preparing lesson plans, 5 of the instructors gave a score of 3; and an instructor gave a score of 2 for himself.

Attainment of the general objectives of a syllabus is possible if the unit and general objectives of the syllabus are fully described by specific lesson objectives and if these specific lesson objectives are put into practice as they are planned. Concerning this, instructors were asked "yes" or "no" questions on whether or not they formulate lesson objectives, in their various lesson plans, which describe fully the unit and general objectives of the syllabus. Their responses are presented in Table X.

TABLE X

Distribution of Instructors' Response in Formulating
Lesson Objectives which can fully describe each Unit and
General Objective of the Syllabus.

Instructors' self Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
Unit Objectives	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
General Objectives	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1.73

Note: In Table X, 2 and 1 (responses of the instructors; that is, the numbers corresponding to unit and general objectives) denote "Yes" and "No" respectively.

Table X depicts that when instructors were asked whether or not they formulate lesson objectives - in their various lesson plans - which describe each of the unit objectives of the syllabus, all of them responded by saying "Yes". That is, the instructors agreed that they write representative lesson objectives, in their various lesson plans, for each unit objective of the syllabus. In other words, there is no unit objective of the syllabus which the instructors did not fully express by corresponding lesson objectives - as to the instructors' responses. In addition, table X indicates that when instructors were asked whether or not they formulate lesson objectives, in their various lesson plans, which describe each of the general objective of the syllabus, the responses of 8 of the instructors were the same with the above, "yes". That is, they responded that they formulate a sufficient number of lesson objectives, at different times, which represent each of the general objective of the syllabus.

4.1.5 Trainees' Awareness of the Intended Objectives
of Each Lesson

One of the major instructional activities which the instructors are expected to perform at the beginning of each session is informing the trainees about the lesson objectives. To examine the extent to which the instructors are performing this activity, the instructors and trainees were asked and direct classroom observation was carried out. The result of the three means of evaluation is described in Table XI.

TABLE XI

Evaluation Scores of Instructors

On their Attempt to Make their Trainees Aware of the Lesson Objectives

Means of Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Instructors' self evaluation	4	1	3	4	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.82
Trainees' evaluation of instructors	1.16	1.06	1.04	1.10	1.04	1.13	1.19	1.10	1.10	1.04	1.06	1.09
Observers' evaluation of instructors	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Average	2.05	1.02	1.68	2.03	1.35	1.71	1.73	1.37	1.70	1.68	1.69	1.64

All the 11 instructors, as Table XI reveals, were given average scores below 2.1 by the three groups of evaluators on their attempt to make their trainees aware of the intended lesson objectives. All the average scores of the instructors are, hence, below the mid score of the scale of the study which shows that little or no effort was made by each instructor in

TABLE XII

Evaluation Scores of Instructors on their
Performance to Match the Instructional Activities of themselves
and their Trainees to the Objectives of each Lesson

Means of Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Instructors' self Evaluation	5	5	1.5	4	2	4	4	4.5	5	3	4	3.82
Trainees' Evaluation of Instructors	4.47	4.17	4.09	4.47	4.2	3.68	4.45	4.23	4.06	4.27	4.25	4.21
Observers' Evaluation of Instructors	4.91	3.91	3.56	4.65	4.06	3.44	4.87	3.19	3.41	3.30	3.09	3.85
Average	4.79	4.36	3.05	4.37	3.42	3.71	4.44	3.9	4.16	3.52	3.78	3.96

The average evaluation scores of 5 of the instructors in performing instructional activities that correspond to the lesson objectives and in enhancing their trainees' instructional activities which are, again, aimed at the attainment of the lesson objectives, as Table XII shows, are above 4. And, the average evaluation scores of the rest 6 instructors are between 3 and 4. Table XII also shows almost equal average scores for instructors' self evaluation (3.82) and observers' evaluation of instructors (3.85). However, the average score of trainees' evaluation of instructors (4.21) is greater than the aforementioned average evaluation scores (3.82 and 3.85).

In addition all the six respondents of the interview said, regarding the general instructional process, that the instructors' and trainees' instructional activities are aimed at

the accomplishment of the objectives of the course.

The instructors' firmness in following their lesson plans was also examined by means of questionnaires and classroom observation. Table XIII depicts the result of these different means of evaluation.

TABLE XIII
Evaluation Scores of Instructors
in Following their Lesson Plans

Means of Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Instructors' Self Evaluation	4.67	4.33	4	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4	4.33	4.42
Trainees' Evaluation of Instructors	4.01	3.51	3.1	3.95	3.4	3.28	3.74	3.41	3.32	3.59	3.59	3.54
Observers' Evaluation of Instructors	5	4	4.83	4.08	4	2.08	5	4.92	5	5	5	4.45
Average	4.56	3.95	3.98	4.23	3.91	3.23	4.47	4.33	4.33	4.2	4.31	4.14

As Table XIII indicates, the average evaluation scores of 7 of the instructors, in following their lesson plans while teaching, are between 4 and 5. The rest 4 instructors have average evaluation scores between 3 and 4. Furthermore, the average scores for instructors' self evaluation (4.42) and observers' evaluation of instructors (4.45) are almost equal. But, the average score of trainees' evaluation of instructors (3.54) is by far less than the

aforementioned evaluation scores (4.42 and 4.45).

In this study, the instructors' effort in using the instructional time for the appropriate instructional activities, that is, their effort in shortening the instructional time that can be spent for routine activities was assessed by means of questionnaires and classroom observation. Table XIV also depicts the result of these different means of evaluation.

TABLE XIV

Evaluation Scores of Instructors in Shortening
the Instructional Time that can be Spent for Routine Activities

Means of Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Instructors' Self Evaluation	3	4	1	3	2	2	4	3	3	3	4	2.91
Trainees' Evaluation of Instructors	3.5	3	3.5	3	1.5	3	1.5	2	2.5	2.5	4	2.73
Observers' Evaluation of Instructors	2.83	3.08	3	2.75	2.29	4.13	4	4.13	4	3.63	3.75	3.42
Average	3.11	3.36	2.5	2.92	1.93	3.04	3.17	3.04	3.17	3.04	3.92	3.02

Table XIV reveals that it is only the average evaluation score of an instructor (3.92), in using the instructional time appropriately for the accomplishment of objectives, which is near to 4 but 7 of the instructors have average evaluation scores between 3 and 3.5, and the rest 3 instructors were given average evaluation scores less than 3. Moreover, Table XIV

shows that instructors were given average evaluation scores: 2.91, 2.73, and 3.42 by instructors themselves, trainees, and observers respectively.

To check the interrelation between the instructors' performance to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the intended objectives of the lessons; the extent to which the instructors follow their lesson plans; and the degree to which they minimize the instructional time that can be spent in routine matters; the Pearson Product - Moment correlation method was employed. The statistical result showed a coefficient of +0.5 between the performance of the instructors to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of the lessons; and the extent to which the instructors follow their lesson plans. A coefficient of + 0.46 was also obtained between the performance of the instructors to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of their lessons; and the extent to which the instructors minimize the instructional time that can be spent in routine activities. Moreover, a coefficient of + 0.29 was obtained between the degree to which the instructors follow their lesson plans; and the degree to which they minimize the instructional time that can be spent in routine matters.

4.2 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

From the data gathered through questionnaires, interview, direct classroom observation, and documentary analysis, the necessary information were obtained regarding the nature of the objectives which instructors formulate in their lesson plans; the correspondence of the formulated lesson objectives to the course objectives; the awareness of the trainees about the intended lesson objectives; and the correspondence of the

aforementioned evaluation scores (4.42 and 4.45).

In this study, the instructors' effort in using the instructional time for the appropriate instructional activities, that is, their effort in shortening the instructional time that can be spent for routine activities was assessed by means of questionnaires and classroom observation. Table XIV also depicts the result of these different means of evaluation.

TABLE XIV

Evaluation Scores of Instructors in Shortening
the Instructional Time that can be Spent for Routine Activities

Means of Evaluation	INSTRUCTORS											Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Instructors' Self Evaluation	3	4	1	3	2	2	4	3	3	3	4	2.91
Trainees' Evaluation of Instructors	3.5	3	3.5	3	1.5	3	1.5	2	2.5	2.5	4	2.73
Observers' Evaluation of Instructors	2.83	3.08	3	2.75	2.29	4.13	4	4.13	4	3.63	3.75	3.42
Average	3.11	3.36	2.5	2.92	1.93	3.04	3.17	3.04	3.17	3.04	3.92	3.02

Table XIV reveals that it is only the average evaluation score of an instructor (3.92), in using the instructional time appropriately for the accomplishment of objectives, which is near to 4 but 7 of the instructors have average evaluation scores between 3 and 3.5, and the rest 3 instructors were given average evaluation scores less than 3. Moreover, Table XIV

shows that instructors were given average evaluation scores: 2.91, 2.73, and 3.42 by instructors themselves, trainees, and observers respectively.

To check the interrelation between the instructors' performance to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the intended objectives of the lessons; the extent to which the instructors follow their lesson plans; and the degree to which they minimize the instructional time that can be spent in routine matters; the Pearson Product - Moment correlation method was employed. The statistical result showed a coefficient of +0.5 between the performance of the instructors to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of the lessons; and the extent to which the instructors follow their lesson plans. A coefficient of + 0.46 was also obtained between the performance of the instructors to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of their lessons; and the extent to which the instructors minimize the instructional time that can be spent in routine activities. Moreover, a coefficient of + 0.29 was obtained between the degree to which the instructors follow their lesson plans; and the degree to which they minimize the instructional time that can be spent in routine matters.

4.2 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

From the data gathered through questionnaires, interview, direct classroom observation, and documentary analysis, the necessary information were obtained regarding the nature of the objectives which instructors formulate in their lesson plans; the correspondence of the formulated lesson objectives to the course objectives; the awareness of the trainees about the intended lesson objectives; and the correspondence of the

instructors' and trainees' instructional activities to the intended objectives of the lessons. This section discusses the obtained results based on the related literature.

Concerning the instructors' consistency of preparing lesson plans, though all the directors and the deputy directors of the three TTIs said that the instructors consistently prepare lesson plans, the documentary analysis showed a different result. That is, eight of the instructors of the two TTIs, four in each TTI, prepare five lesson plans for a week once in a month and the rest three instructors of the third TTI prepare five lesson plans for a week once in three weeks. This variation occurred due to the presence of different number of pedagogics instructors in the first two TTIs (Debre Birhan and Dessie), and the third TTI (Gondar) - when they prepare the lesson plans turn by turn. As it is mentioned in the first part of this chapter, there are four pedagogics instructors in each of Debre Birhan and Dessie TTIs but three in Gondar TTI.

Two problems can appear in the instructors' preparation of lesson plans. The first problem is while preparing five lesson plans once for the coming five sessions of a week, one assumes that all the lesson plans will be carried out on the planned time limits. However, this assumption did not consider those unexpected happenings that may occur in the actual classroom. For instance, trainees may ask many questions in a session so that the session will be over by the interesting class discussion without covering the planned lesson. In this case, the next lesson plan should include those lesson objectives which were not accomplished in the preceding lesson. Not only the inclusion of objectives and instructional activities but also the modification of the succeeding lessons based on the preceding ones may sometimes be necessary. That is, an instructor may realize the benefit of some methods and techniques of teaching for a certain group of trainees from a lesson, and hence the need for applying these methods and techniques of teaching in the succeeding lessons may arise.

In both of the aforementioned cases, preparing five lesson plans once for the succeeding five sessions will be impractical or will have little value.

The second problem which is investigated in the study of instructors' preparation of lesson plans is that while the instructors prepare the lesson plans turn by turn, the instructor- the one whose turn it is- may not consider all the possible classroom conditions in which the other instructors teach. That is, the trainees' learning pace and the instructors' methods of teaching in two or more groups of trainees (sections) may not always correspond. So, the lesson plan, at most, can be helpful for the instructor who prepared it. Hence, a lesson plan prepared by an instructor is seldom helpful for two or more instructors at the same time. No literature is also found which is in favour of the instructors' way of lesson plan preparation. Though the instructors were using the lesson plans which were prepared by their colleagues- while the investigator was observing the actual classroom instruction- this does not imply that the instructors are always preparing lesson plans.

The above finding is not in line with the assertion of many educators (example: Arends (1991: 37); Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 31); Davies (1981: 79); and Clark and Starr (1986: 174). Callahan and Clark (1988: 20) have also pointed out the difficulty of attaining instructional objectives without a well developed plan. Moreover, the failure of the instructors to prepare plans ahead of each lesson for themselves, not turn by turn, is contrary to the findings of Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 74) which are about the liveliness of a properly planned instruction.

As to the nature of the prepared lesson objectives, the result of the study showed that the majority of the lesson objectives (93.3%) contain both behaviour and content. These objectives are also specific and expressed in terms of the trainees terminal behaviour. These are good criteria for formulating lesson objectives. Many educators- example: Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 143); Payne (1968: 14); Popham (1981: 25); and Kibler and

Others (1981: 4)- are also in support of this way of writing objectives. Moreover, the findings of Serafin (1990: 16); Clayman (1980: 36); and Block (1971), Block and Anderson (1975), and Duchastel and Merrill (1973) as cited by Kibler and Others (1981: 7) showed that those objectives which are expressed in clear and specific terms are more attainable by trainees than ambiguous ones.

Since clearly defined objectives which contain both content and behaviour, as to Tyler (1949: 44) and Taba (1962: 201), are more useful for the instructor and the trainees than ambiguous ones, the majority of the lesson objectives, in this respect, are written in acceptable ways. This result- the majority of the lesson objectives contain both behaviour and content - is also similar with the findings of Abebe (1986: 51) in the objectives of only three secondary school subjects: Geography, Biology and Chemistry; and one elementary school subject: Social Studies, among eleven subjects in which the study was concentrated.

Nevertheless, it is only 2 out of 208 lesson objectives (nearly 1%) which contain content, behaviour, standard of performance, and testing conditions simultaneously. Arends (1991: 56); Borich (1988: 84-89); Callahan and Clark (1988: 41); Clark and Starr (1986: 143-144); Mager (1984: 23); and Popham (1981: 18-19), among other educators, are the ones who advocate the idea that objectives- particularly at the lesson level- should comprise the above elements: content, behaviour, standard of performance, and testing condition. In this case, the majority of the lesson objectives failed to include the aforementioned elements which contribute for a considerable degree of precision and measurability.

Concerning the classification of the objectives of the lesson plans into the various categories of the three domains, the result of this study showed that most of the lesson objectives (94.9%) fall under the lower levels of the cognitive domain: knowledge (62.6%) and comprehension (32.3%). However, this finding is not in agreement with the assertion of

Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 147). These educators and others like Callahan and Clark (1988: 54-55), Clark and Starr (1986: 58), and Payne (1968: 20-21) advocate that lesson planning should aim for an appropriate balance of lower and higher level objectives. Ofcourse, the inclusion of lower level objectives is a starting point for comprising higher level objectives because the attainment of the former is necessary for attaining the latter. But, giving much emphasis only for lower level objectives makes the instruction too trivial. Here, the development of the trainees' higher abilities, skills, and attitudes in the different spheres; that is, intellectual, physical, and social, will be ignored.

In the instructors' lesson plans, only 0.5, 1.5, and 3 per cent of the objectives fall under application, analysis (of the cognitive), and affective domains respectively. In fact, it is mentioned by Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 147) that the inclusion of objectives of the affective and psychomotor domains in different lesson plans of a course depends on the nature of the general objectives of the course. And, one of the six general objectives in which the lesson objectives were derived falls under the affective domain. Hence, if it was seen in terms of proportion, 33 of the 195 specific behavioral objectives of the lesson plans (that is, 18%) should have fallen under the affective domain. On the other hand, since five of the six general objectives of the course are more of cognitive in nature, the rest 62% of the lesson objectives are expected to be in the various categories of the cognitive domain- but not exclusively in the lower levels. Nevertheless, the result of this study showed, as explained above, that the majority of the lesson objectives are lower level objectives of the cognitive domain. That is, the instructors failed to include sufficient number of the affective and the higher level cognitive objectives in their lesson plans.

Through the instructors' and trainees' questionnaires, and the calssroom observation, further information was also obtained on whether or not the instructors emphasize at the

attainment of the formulated lesson objectives. The average evaluation results of 7 of the 11 instructors in dealing with lower level objectives are between 4 and 5. These numbers are representations of "often" and "always" (in order) in the scale of the study. Hence, this result shows that 7 of the 11 instructors focus more often on the attainment of lower level cognitive objectives than the higher level cognitive objectives and the affective ones. Three of the instructors focus more often on the attainment of the affective objectives than the lower level and the higher level cognitive objectives- each of the three instructors were given average scores between 4 and 5. And, one of the instructors gives almost similar degree of emphasis for the attainment of the aforementioned classification of objectives- since he was given average evaluation scores: 3, 3.19, and 3.49 for his performance on the attainment of the affective, higher level cognitive, and lower level cognitive objectives respectively. Still, here, the instructor's emphasis on the attainment of lower level cognitive objectives is somewhat greater than the rest objectives. Generally, the average evaluation scores of all the instructors in attaining lower level cognitive, higher level cognitive, and affective objectives are 3.92, 3.06, and 3.24 respectively. This indicates the presence of a certain variation in the emphasis given to the above objectives. This variation is also statistically significant because the computed value of $F(2,30) = 5.34$ is greater than the critical value of $F(2,30) = 3.32$ at $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

Moreover, the statistical results in the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) method of Post Hoc Comparison showed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the use of the lower level and the higher level cognitive objectives because the computed value of $q(3,30) = 4.53$ is greater than the critical value of $q(3,30) = 3.49$ at $P < 0.05$ level of significance. The Post Hoc Comparison also revealed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the use of the lower level cognitive objectives and the

affective objectives because the computed value of $q(3,30) = 3.58$ is greater than the critical value of $q(3,30) = 3.49$ at $P < 0.05$ level of significance. But there was no a statistically significant difference in the use of the higher level cognitive objectives and the affective objectives since the computed value of $q(3,30) = 0.95$ is less than the critical value of $q(3,30) = 3.49$ at $P < 0.05$ level of significance.

The above statistical results depict that from the three classifications of the objectives, the use of the lower level cognitive objectives made a considerable effect on the significance of F. That is, the instructors are aimed at the attainment of the lower level cognitive objectives more often than the higher level cognitive objectives and the affective ones. But, the instructors give almost equal attention to the higher level cognitive objectives and the affective objectives though their focus on the attainment of these objectives is not high.

In this study, a certain gap is seen between the results of the documentary analysis; and the instructors' and the trainees' questionnaire and the classroom observation in the same issue-in the instructors' emphasis on the attainment of higher level cognitive objectives and affective objectives. That is, the result of the documentary analysis showed that the instructors give very little emphasis on the inclusion of higher level cognitive and affective objectives in their lesson plans. But, the result of the instructors' and trainees' questionnaires as well as the classroom observation showed that the instructors give a considerable degree of emphasis on the attainment of the higher level cognitive objectives and the affective objectives when they teach- though not as high as the lower level cognitive objectives. This gap may be observed because of the reason that the instructors may try to attain higher level cognitive and affective objectives which they did not express in their lesson plans. That is, the instructors may attempt to accomplish instructional objectives of

objectives of the syllabus which do not have corresponding lesson objectives in the TTIs. This shows the lack of lesson objectives which should have been formulated by the instructors to form a many to one relationship with the unit objectives. That is, there should have been a considerable number of lesson objectives which can express each unit objective. Since attaining the general objectives of a syllabus is possible through attaining unit objectives, failure to describe some unit objectives by respective lesson objectives is a failure to attain some of the general objectives of the syllabus.

In addition, there are instructors' unit objectives (a total of 23 out of 56; that is 41.07%) which have not been described by lesson objectives and there are lesson objectives (a total of 57 out of 208, that is, 27.4%) which do not have a corresponding instructors' unit objective in the three TTIs. This clearly shows that the instructors did not take care of their unit objectives while formulating some of their lesson objectives. That is, the instructors sometimes fail to refer to their unit objectives in preparing their lesson plans. The responses of 7 of the instructors, in the questionnaire, in referring to unit objectives while preparing lesson plans were also designated by 3 and below 3 which indicate that most of the instructors occasionally refer to their unit objectives in preparing their lesson plans. This result is almost similar with the above statement which is deduced from the results of the documentary analysis. On the other hand, all of the instructors have also responded in the questionnaire that they write a considerable number of lesson objectives, in their different lesson plans, which can fully describe each unit objective. However, this response is not in harmony with the result of the documentary analysis and with most of the instructors' (themselves) responses because most of them said that they refer to the unit objectives sometimes in preparing lesson plans. If the instructors refer sometimes to the unit objectives in preparing lesson plans, they cannot describe each unit objective with a

performance. Even the instructors' average evaluation score of themselves, by itself, is not a satisfactory result to say that they make their trainees aware of the intended objectives of each lesson.

A failure in making the trainees aware of the intended objectives of each lesson is a set back of attaining these objectives. This idea is also proved in the research findings of Duchastel and Brown (1974)- as cited in Arends (1991: 37-38)- and Dawley and Dawley (1974); Hauck and Thomas (1972); Houston and Warner (1977); Wolk (1973); and Morse and Tellman (1972)- as mentioned by Kibler and Others (1981: 7). Since the trainees are not informed about each lesson objective, they may face a problem of selecting and focusing their attention on those parts of instructional activities which lead them to the attainment of the desired objective. This assertion is proved in the findings of Mager and McCann (1961) - as mentioned by Jenkins and Deno (1973:9) - and supported by Mager (1984:6); Deterline (1973: 3); and Ryburn and Forge (1969: 11). Moreover, although informing the trainees about each lesson objective has a great advantage to achieve the objectives with the minimum possible instructional time, Mager and McCann (1961) as mentioned by Jenkins and Deno (1973: 9), the result of this study clearly shows that the trainees are not fortunate to receive this benefit because of the failure of their instructors in giving due consideration for the issue.

Lastly, as to the correspondence of the instructional activities of instructors and trainees to the intended objectives of their lessons, the result of this study shows that 5 of the instructors usually perform instructional activities that correspond to the lesson objectives and enhance their trainees' instructional activities towards the attainment of the lesson objectives- since they were given average evaluation scores between 4 and 5 that represent "often" and "always" respectively. The rest 6 instructors were given average

evaluation scores between 3 and 4 which designate "sometimes" and "often" respectively. Therefore, these 6 instructors do not perform instructional activities that correspond to the lesson objectives as often as the former 5 instructors. The 6 instructors do not also enhance their trainees' instructional activities towards the attainment of the lesson objectives as frequently as the former 5 instructors. Concerning this, Nacino-Brown, Oke, and Brown (1989: 136) pointed out that if instructional activities are not directed to the attainment of the objectives, then these activities will lead to chaos and little or no learning. Nevertheless, since the average evaluation score of each instructor is greater than the mid value (3) of the scale of the study, it is possible to say that the instructors' and trainees' instructional activities are not as such apart from the attainment of the lesson objectives. The difference lies on the degree of the emphasis given by each instructor to aim at the objectives and to restrict their trainees' instructional activities towards the accomplishment of the objectives.

In dealing with instructional activities that correspond with the lesson objectives, the average evaluation scores of instructors given by the instructors themselves (3.82) and the observers (3.85) are nearly equal. The average evaluation score of instructors given by trainees (4.21) is in fact greater than the above average evaluation scores. But this variation is not as such very high. Particularly, the agreement of the average evaluation scores given by instructors (themselves) and observers indicates that the two groups of evaluators are genuine enough in giving the scores which in turn strengthens the reliability of the obtained result.

For the instructors' and trainees' instructional activities to aim at the attainment of the lesson objectives, careful planning of the instructional activities in accordance with the specific behavioral objectives of the lesson is necessary on the part of the instructors. This concept is supported by Arends (1991: 53-54); Clark and Starr (1986: 147); Davies (1981:

29); and Woodruff (1962: 291-292). Classroom observations made by Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 74) in a sixth grade Social Studies class have also proved the difficulty of reaching at success in using a certain instructional activity- particularly, here, a group work- if the instructional activity is not planned in accordance with the lesson objective prior to the instruction.

It was difficult, in this study, to check whether or not there is a correspondence between the specific objectives; and the trainees' and instructors' instructional activities in the lesson plans. The reason is that almost in all the lesson plans, the instructional activities of the instructors and trainees are expressed in very general and vague terms such as introducing the topic, presenting the new subject matter, stabilizing, and revising the lesson. Here, the specific activities the instructor intends to do while introducing, presenting, stabilizing, or revising the subject matter should have been pointed out in the lesson plans. However, it becomes a common practice of the instructors to use the aforementioned general terms on the column of "Instructional Activities" in the lesson plan. The only instructional activities which are somewhat specific- but can be used in any subject matter and were used in many of the lesson plans of which this study dealt- that the investigator encountered while examining the lesson plans are explaining, asking, answering, listening, and writing notes. And, these instructional activities were put in the lesson plans in line with the formulated specific behavioral objectives. However, other methods and techniques of teaching of the instructors, and the respective instructional activities of trainees are not written in detail in the lesson plans.

As the result of the study revealed the majority (7) of the instructors usually follow their lesson plans while teaching- since their average evaluation scores are between 4 and 5. The rest 4 instructors were given average evaluation scores between 3 and 4 which indicates

that the former 7 instructors execute their lesson plans more often than the latter 4 instructors. Three of the latter 4 instructors were also given average evaluation scores above 3.9 that is almost 4 which shows that the instructors do not very much depart from their lesson plans while teaching. It is also mentioned earlier in this section that the instructors attempt to attain some affective and higher level cognitive objectives, when they teach, which they did not write in their lesson plans. And, the average of averages of the evaluation scores of all the instructors in following their lesson plans is 4.14. Therefore, the remaining 0.86 (5 - 4.14) score, which is an indicator of the instructors' instructional activities that are out side of their lesson plans, can be attributed to the instructors' attempt in attaining the aforementioned objectives. The average evaluation scores of all the instructors given by the observers (4.45) and the instructors themselves (4.42), in carrying out their lesson plans, are almost equal. Though the average evaluation score given by trainees (3.54) is less than the above two scores, the agreement of the two scores (given by the observers and the instructors themselves) is a good indicator of the genuiness of the responses and the trustworthiness of the obtained result.

It is remarked by Clark and Starr (1986: 195) that following the lesson plan is the only way to do what the instructors have intended to do. In this respect, the majority of the instructors (of this study) have a good quality and this leads them to a better position in attaining their lesson objectives thereby attaining the course objectives. The finding of this study is also similar with the findings of Neely (1986), as mentioned in Bellon, Bellon, and Blank (1992: 39).

On the other hand, the result of this study indicates that only an instructor was given an average evaluation score of 3.92, which is near to 4, in the use of the instructional time appropriately for the attainment of the lesson objectives by minimizing the instructional

time that can be spent in routine activities. This indicates that the instructor does not spend much instructional time to do administrative tasks, routine aspects of class management, and those activities which can be done by trainees such as distributing and collecting instructional materials and assignments, cleaning the chalkboard, and the like. In this respect 7 of the instructors were given average evaluation scores between 3 and 3.5, and the rest 3 instructors were given average evaluation scores less than 3. Though the evaluation scores of the 7 instructors are indicators of a moderate use of the instructional time to attain lesson objectives, the evaluation scores of the 3 instructors are not satisfactory to say that the instructors use the instructional time appropriately to perform the activities that facilitate the accomplishment of the objectives of their lessons by minimizing the instructional time to be spent in routine activities.

The average evaluation scores of all the instructors given by the observers, trainees, and instructors themselves, in using the instructional time appropriately to attain the lesson objectives, were 3.42, 2.73, and 2.91 respectively. Though the difference between the last two scores is not as such high, the first score (which is given by the observers) is by far greater than the rest two scores. This may be because the instructors might have intentionally used the instructional time appropriately to attain the lesson objectives in the presence of the observers.

It is believed that those instructors who plan the main instructional activities according to the lesson objectives ahead of the instruction and who carry out their plan are in a better position to use the instructional time in attaining the lesson objectives by lessening the instructional time that can be spent for routine activities. Arends (1991: 54-55) have also supported the above concept by saying that instructors who do not plan instructional activities in line with the lesson objectives or who fail in carrying out their

plans usually waste instructional time in routine activities. However, in this study, the statistical result shows a low correlation (+ 0.29), that is, definite but small relationship (as to Guilford, 1950: 94) between the instructors' firmness in following their lesson plans, and their performance in using the instructional time appropriately for the accomplishment of the lesson objectives by minimizing the instructional time that can be spent in routine activities. In other words, in this study, those instructors who usually follow their lesson plans do not show a highly significant difference, in using the instructional time appropriately to accomplish the objectives of their lessons, from those instructors who moderately carry out their lesson plans. And, this result is inconsistent with the above assertion of Arends (1991: 54-55). The obtained low relationship- between following lesson plans, and using the instructional time appropriately for the attainment of lesson objectives by minimizing the instructional time to be spent in routine activities- may show that those instructors who moderately follow their lesson plans perform instructional activities (outside of their lesson plans) that help them for the attainment of their lesson objectives and use the instructional time for achieving their instructional objectives or for routine activities almost as equally as those instructors who usually follow their lesson plans.

The statistical result also shows a moderate correlation (+ 0.5), that is, a substantial relationship between the instructors' firmness in following their lesson plans, and the effort made by the instructors to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of the lessons. In other words, those instructors who usually follow their lesson plans also perform instructional activities in line with the objectives of their lessons and restrict their trainees instructional activities to aim at the accomplishment of the lesson objectives. Moreover, the statistical result indicates a moderate correlation (+ 0.46), that is, again a substantial relationship between the effort made by instructors to

correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of their lessons; and the instructors' performance in using the instructional time appropriately for the accomplishment of the lesson objectives by minimizing the instructional time that can be spent in routine activities.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

This study was intended, as repeatedly said, to examine the TTI instructors' ability in translating the objectives of Pedagogics syllabus into practice. To this effect, the study attempted to:

- check whether or not instructors prepare lesson plans for each instructional period;
- investigate whether or not the desired objectives of the prepared lesson plans are stated in specific and behavioral terms;
- assess the extent to which instructors are including higher level objectives in the various lessons of the course;
- examine whether or not the specific objectives prepared by the instructors are in harmony with the general objectives of the course;
- investigate whether or not the instructors are making their trainees aware of the specific objectives of the lessons at the beginning of each instructional period; and
- examine the extent to which instructors' and trainees' instructional activities correspond with the desired lesson objectives.

To this end, the descriptive survey approach was employed as the method of the study. All the pedagogics instructors (11 in number), the deputy directors, the directors, and a total of 550 out of 1163 trainees (50 trainees for each instructor) in the three TTIs of Region Three- Debre Birhan, Dessie, and Gondar- were the sources of information. The

trainees were selected by using simple random sampling technique. The data collection instruments used in the study were questionnaire, interview, classroom observation, and documentary analysis. And, the data collected were analysed using percentages, averages, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Tukey Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Method, and Pearson Product - Moment correlation.

On the basis of the analysis made on the data gathered through the aforementioned instruments, the major findings of the study are summarized as follows:

1. All the eleven pedagogics instructors did not prepare consecutive lesson plans but use the lesson plans prepared by their colleagues in every instruction. It was ascertained that the majority of the instructors (8 out of 11) prepare five lesson plans once for a week in every month, and the rest 3 instructors prepare five lesson plans once for a week in every three weeks.
2. The majority of the lesson objectives (93.3%) contain both content and behaviour, and are specific as well as written in terms of students' terminal behaviour.
3. An insignificant number of the lesson objectives (1%) contain content, behaviour, testing condition, and standard of performance.
4. Most of the lesson objectives (94.9%) are lower level cognitive type; that is, knowledge and comprehension.
5. In the actual classroom instruction, instructors were also observed in making a significant effort towards the attainment of lower level cognitive objectives than the higher level cognitive objectives and affective objectives - the absolute computed q values of the first and the second (4.53); and the first and the third groups of objectives (3.58) are greater than the critical value of

- $q(3,30) = 3.49$ at Alpha 0.05 level of significance.
6. Instructors made more effort for the attainment of higher level cognitive objectives and affective objectives when they teach than they plan.
 7. All the lesson objectives are comprised in the unit and general objectives of the syllabus.
 8. A considerable number of unit objectives of the syllabus (51.85%; that is, 14 out of 27 in both Debre Birhan and Dessie TTIs; and 33.33%; that is 9 out of 27 in Gondar TTI) were not described by the lesson objectives.
 9. There was a considerable degree of disparity in the emphasis given for eight unit objectives of the syllabus by the instructors of each TTI.
 10. Some of the lesson objectives (27.4%) did not have corresponding instructor-made unit objectives.
 11. 41.07% (23 out of 56) of the instructor-made unit objectives were not described by the lesson objectives.
 12. There was lack of correspondence between the instructor-made unit objectives and the syllabus unit objectives.
 13. Instructors sometimes did not refer to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus.
 14. All of the instructors did not make a significant attempt to inform their trainees about the lesson objectives of each instructional period.
 15. Five of the instructors usually performed instructional activities that correspond to their lesson objectives and enhanced their trainees' instructional activities to aim at the attainment of these lesson objectives- the instructors' average evaluation scores were greater than 4. The rest six

instructors sometimes performed instructional activities that do not correspond to their lesson objectives, and they sometimes did not restrict their trainees' instructional activities to aim at the attainment of the lesson objectives- the average evaluation scores of these instructors were between 3 and 4.

16. Seven of the instructors usually followed their lesson plans when they teach and the rest four instructors sometimes performed instructional activities out side of their lesson plans.
17. Most of the instructors (8) spent some of the instructional time by performing routine activities like distributing and collecting instructional materials and assignments, cleaning the chalkboard, managing class disturbances, and so on. The rest three instructors spent most of the instructional time by performing the aforementioned routine activities.
18. There was a low but positive correlation (+ 0.29) between the instructors' firmness in following their lesson plans and their effort in using the instructional time appropriately for the accomplishment of the lesson objectives by minimizing the instructional time that can be spent in routine activities.
19. There was a moderate correlation (+ 0.5) between the instructors' firmness in following their lesson plans and their effort to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of the lessons.
20. There was also a moderate correlation (+ 0.46) between the instructors' effort to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the objectives of the lessons, and the instructors' effort in using the

instructional time appropriately for the accomplishment of the lesson objectives by minimizing the instructional time that can be spent in routine activities.

5.2 CONCLUSION

From the above findings, it can be concluded that the TTI instructors effectiveness in implementing the general objectives of the pedagogics syllabus was not as much as it should be. The failure of the instructors to prepare lesson plans ahead of each instructional session for themselves, their emphasis on the attainment of lower level cognitive objectives, their failure in referring consistently to the unit and course objectives as well as the absence of lesson objectives which correspond with some of the unit objectives of the syllabus, and the instructors' failure to inform the trainees about the lesson objectives of each instructional session have contributed for the ineffectiveness of the instructors in implementing the general objectives of the syllabus properly.

On the other hand, the instructors' ability of formulating specific and behavioral lesson objectives while preparing lesson plans- though the instructors would have been in a better position to attain the objectives of the syllabus more easily if the lesson objectives had included content, behaviour, testing condition, and standard of performance simultaneously- and the instructors' effort in performing instructional activities that correspond to their lesson objectives as well as in enhancing their trainees' instructional activities to aim at the attainment of the lesson objectives have had a positive influence on the effectiveness of the instructors in implementing the general objectives of the syllabus. The instructors' effort in following their lesson plans when they teach has, in fact, contributed much for the

instructors to perform instructional activities in line with the lesson objectives and to restrict the trainees' instructional activities to aim at the attainment of the objectives. However, the instructional time that has been spent by most of the instructors in performing routine activities has had a considerable negative effect on the instructors' effort to correspond the instructional activities of themselves and their trainees to the lesson objectives.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings and the experience of the investigator, it is recommended that:

1. Instructors should prepare lesson plans, for only themselves, ahead of every instruction. Using a lesson plan prepared by another instructor; that is, preparing lesson plans turn by turn, does not help for the maximum possible attainment of the objectives.
2. Instructors should formulate lesson objectives which include content, behaviour, testing condition, and standard of performance simultaneously.
3. Instructors should give a considerable emphasis for the lower and higher level objectives of the different domains when they plan as well as they teach - which should be, in fact, in line with the need for the attainment of the objectives of the course.
4. Instructors should always refer to their unit objectives, and to the unit and general objectives of the syllabus while formulating their lesson objectives so that there will be a sufficient degree of correspondence between the lesson, the unit, and the syllabus objectives.

5. Instructors should formulate a considerable number of lesson and unit objectives for each unit according to the emphasis given to the unit in the syllabus in the form of period allotment.
6. Instructors should also inform their trainees about the lesson objectives at the beginning of each period so that the trainees can achieve the intended objectives with a minimum of time and effort.
7. Moreover, if instructors write each of the major instructional activities of themselves and their trainees in the lesson plans in detail, and follow the lesson plans as much as possible; they will be in a better position to perform instructional activities which correspond with the lesson objectives when they teach. This also helps the instructors to lead the trainees' instructional activities towards the attainment of the lesson objectives.
8. Instructors should also allow the trainees to perform some of the routine activities so that much instructional time will not be spent by instructors in performing the routine activities.
9. For the instructors to accomplish all the aforementioned duties effectively, concerned officials in the Ministry of Education, Regional Education Bureau and Administrative Zone Education Departments should give the appropriate technical, financial and professional support. For instance, Educational Seminars and workshops which invite all the instructors should be given in each semester so that the instructors will always be conscious of their instructional responsibilities. The necessary instructional materials which facilitate the attainment of the objectives of the course should also be available in each TTI. Here, the directors and deputy directors can play the major role-in fulfilling the appropriate instructional materials.

10. While recruiting TTI instructors, officials should give due consideration for the instructors' previous work efficiency in preparing lesson plans consistently which have desirable objectives and in translating these lesson objectives into practice in the actual classrooms.
11. Concerned officials in the program of teacher education at college level should give due emphasis to equip the would-be teachers with the skill in formulating lesson objectives which include both lower level and higher level objectives of the different domains. These officials should also equip the would-be teachers with the belief on the necessity of preparing lesson plans consistently ahead of every instruction and of informing students about the lesson objectives at the beginning of each instructional period.
12. Further study should also be carried out particularly on the investigation of the factors which made the instructors not to perform the aforementioned duties.

REFERENCES

A. BOOKS

- Arends, Richard I. (1991), learning to Teach, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Bellon, Jerry J.; Elner C. Bellon; and Mary Ann Blank (1992), Teaching from a Research Knowledge Base: A Development and Renewal Process, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Bennett, Neville and David McNamara (1979), Focus on Teaching: Readings in the Observation and Conceptualization of Teaching, London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Biddle, Bruce J. (1964), "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness Research" in Biddle and Ellena (eds.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Bloom, B.S. (ed.) (1956), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain, New York: McKay.
- Borich, Gary D. (1988), Effective Teaching Methods, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Callahan, Joseph F. and Leonard H. Clark (1988), Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools: Planning for Competence, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Clark, Leonard H. and Irving S. Starr (1986), Secondary and Middle School Teaching Methods, New York: Mcmillan Publishing Company.
- Cullingford, Cedric (1995), The Effective Teacher, London: Cassell.
- Davies, Ivork K. (1981), Instructional Technique, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Deterline, William A. (1973), "The Secrets we keep from Students," in The Educational Technology Reviews Series, No. 7, Performance Objectives in Education, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Farrant, J.S. (1968), Principles and Practices of Education, London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd.
- Fullan, Michael (1981), "The Relationship between Evaluation and Implementation," in Lewy and Nevo (eds.), Evaluation Roles in Education, New York: Gordon and Breach, Science Publishers, Inc.
- Gagne', Robert M., Leslie J. Briggs, and Walter W. Wager (1988), Principles of Instructional Design, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Good, Thomas L. and Jere E. Brophy (1987), Looking in Classrooms, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- Gronlund, Norman E. and Robert L. Linn (1990), Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching, New York: Mcmillan Publishing Company.
- Jenkins, Joseph and Stanley L. Deno (1973), "A Model for Instructional Objectives: Responsibilities and Advantages", in The Educational Technology Reviews Series, No.7, Performance Objectives in Education, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Kibler, Robert J. and others (1981), Objectives for Instruction and Evaluation, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Krathwohl, David R.; Benjamin S. Bloom; and Bertram B. Masia (1964), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook II: Affective Domain, New York: David McKay Company Inc.

- (1984)
- Mager, Robert F., Preparing Instructional Objectives, Belmont: Pitman Learning Inc.
- Medley, Donald M. (1979), "The Effectiveness of Teachers", in Peterson and Walberg (eds.), Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications, Berkeley: Mc Cutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Medley, Donald M. and Harold E. Mitzel (1965), "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation", in Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Mehrens, William A. and Irvin J. Lehmann (1991), Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Nacino-Brown, R.; Festus E.Oke; and Desmond P.Brown (1989), Curriculum and Instruction: An introduction to Methods of Teaching, London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Payne, David A. (1968), The Specification and Measurement of Learning Outcomes, Massachusetts : Blaisdell Publishing Company.
- Perrott, Elizabeth (1986), Effective Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improving your Teaching, New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Popham, W.James (1981), "Probing the Validity of Arguments Against Behavioral Goals", in Kibler and Others, Objectives for Instruction and Evaluation, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Ryburn, W.M. and K.B.Forge (1969), Principles of Teaching, London: Oxford University Press.
- Salia-Bao, Kemoh (1989), Curriculum Development and African Culture, London: Edward Arnold.
- Shepherd, Gene D. and William B. Ragan (1982), Modern Elementary Curriculum, New York: CBS College Publishing.
- Simpson, J.S. (1981), "The Classification of Educational Objectives in the Psychomotor Domain", in Kibler and Others, Objectives for Instruction and Evaluation, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Stenhouse, Lawrence (1991), An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development, London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Sullivan, Howard J. (1973), "Developing Effective Objectives-Based Instruction" in The Educational Technology Reviews Series, No. 7, Performance Objectives in Education, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Taba, Hilda (1962), Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Tyler, Ralph W. (1949), Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woodruff, Asahel D. (1962), Basic Concepts of Teaching with Brief Readings, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

B. JOURNALS

- Abebe Bekele (1986), "Insights into the Concepts of the Curriculum", The Ethiopian Journal of Education, Vol. 10, No. 1
- _____ (1974), "Some Thoughts on Bases for Development of Educational Objectives", The Ethiopian Journal of Education, Vol. 7, No.1.

- Bargar, Robert (1974), "Evaluation and Decision Making for the Classroom", Theory into Practice, Vol. 13, No. 1.
- Clayman, Linda (1980), " Objectives of Link Courses: Importance and Attainment," The Vocational Aspect of Education, Vol. 32, No. 82.
- Fullan, Michael and Alan Pomfret (1977), "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 47, No.2.
- Furst, Edward J. (1981), "Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives for the Cognitive Domain: Philosophical and Educational Issues", Review of Educational Research, Vol. 51, No. 4.
- Gage, N.L. and Jacob S. Orleans (1952), "Guiding Principles in the Study of Teacher Effectiveness", The Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 3, No. 4.
- Hurst, Barbara Martin (1980), "An Integral Approach to the Hierarchical Order of the Cognitive and Affective Domains", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 72, No.3.

C. ENCYCLOPEDIAS

- Husen, Torsten and T. Neville Postlethwaite (eds.) (1985), The International Encyclopedia of Education: Research and Studies, London: Pergamon Press, Ltd., Vol. 2.
- Smith, Edward W.; Stanley W. Krouse; and Mark M. Atkinson (1964), The Educator's Encyclopedia, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

D. UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS

- Abebe Bekele (1992), " Principles of Curriculum Inquiry", Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University, Education Faculty, Department of Curriculum and Instruction.
- _____ (1973), " Rational for the Development of Educational Objectives for Elementary Schools in Ethiopia", Los Angeles: University of California (Dissertation).
- Azeb Desta (1984), "Elements of General Methods of Teaching (knowledge and Competencies for Teachers)" Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University, Education Faculty, Department of Curriculum and Instruction.
- Getachew Endalamaw (1994), " An Evaluation of the Implementation of the Lower Primary School Social Studies Syllabus: The Case of North Shewa Administrative Zone", Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (Post Graduate Thesis).
- Getachew G/Eyesus (1992), " Evaluation of the Teaching skill of Pedagogical Course Instructors in Some Selected Teacher Training Institutes of Ethiopia", Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (Post Graduate Thesis).
- Hailu Dinka (1991), "Assessment of Teachers' Performances on Curriculum Implementation Illubabor Senior Secondary Schools in Focus)", Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (Post Graduate Thesis).
- Serafin, Ana Gil (1990), "Course Syllabi and their Effects on Students' Final Grade Performance", Venezuela: Pedagogical University of Caracas.

Zughoul, Mohammad Raji (1986), " The Prospective English Language Textbooks for the Compulsory Cycle in Jordan: Guidelines for the Implementation Phase", ~~Am~~ **Aman** (A paper presented at the Conference on Compulsory Education in Jordan Status and Prospects).

APPENDIX - A

DATE _____

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
QUESTIONNAIRE

(TO BE FILLED ONLY BY PEDAGOGICS INSTRUCTORS OF TTIs)

PURPOSE: The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about pedagogics instructors effectiveness in implementing the objectives of pedagogics syllabus thereby forwarding valuable suggestions that facilitate the instructional process. Since your responses for the given questions have a paramount importance to reach at a right conclusion, you are kindly requested to give your honest responses for each question. Of course, all the responses which you provide will be kept confidential and used only for research purpose.

Thank you in advance.

- Directions:-
1. No need of writing your name.
 2. Please read the following items carefully and put a tick mark against one of the following choices that you feel appropriate.
 3. In conditions where your extended response is demanded, please write it on the space provided.

Section One

1. Name of the TTI _____
2. Sex: Male / ___ / Female / ___ /
3. Age: Below 26 years old _____ 26-30 _____ 31-35 _____
4. Qualification: Diploma _____ 12 + 3 _____ BA/B.Ed. _____
MA _____ If any other, specify _____
5. Area of specialization: Major _____
Minor (if any) _____
6. Total years of Teaching Experience _____
7. Total years of teaching experience in TTI _____
8. Years of experience in teaching this course in the TTIs _____
9. Number of sections you teach _____
10. Number of periods you teach per week _____

Section Two

1. Do you ever inform your trainees of the lesson objectives at the beginning of the period?
Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
2. If your response for question number "1" is not "Never", in what form are you making the trainees aware of the intended lesson objectives?
By writing on the chalkboard / /
By explaining orally / /
By both writing on the chalkboard and explaining orally / /
If any other, specify _____

3. Do you ever refer to the course objectives while formulating the objectives of your lesson plan?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
4. Do you formulate unit objectives which describe (or can represent) all the course objectives?
- Yes / / No / /
5. Do you ever refer to the unit objectives of the course while formulating the objectives of your lesson plan?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
6. Do you formulate lesson objectives, in your various lesson plans, which describe (or can represent) all the unit objectives?
- Yes / / No / /
7. Do you ever follow your lesson plan strictly while teaching?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
8. Do you ever come across a classroom situation, such as trainees' questions, that hinders the implementation of your lesson plan and enforces you to teach according to the immediate needs of the trainees?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
9. Do you ever respond by saying "We will come-back to it" or "This is not the concern of our today's lesson" for some of the questions raised by your trainees?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
10. Do you ever restrict your instructional activities for instance, your explanations, questions, answers etc. to gear directly towards the attainment of your lesson objectives?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /

11. Do you ever restrict your trainees' instructional activities (for instance, trainees' questions, answers, etc.) to gear directly towards the attainment of your lesson objectives?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
12. Do you ever ask your trainees - for instance, the monitor to do the routine activities such as taking attendance, collecting assignments, and the like?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
13. Do you ever encourage your trainees to memorize the major facts of the lessons?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
14. Do you ever permit your trainees to express their views freely using their own words?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
15. Do you ever encourage your trainees to focus on their cognitive (knowledge) development?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
16. Do you ever encourage your trainees to focus on their skill development?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
17. Do you ever initiate the development of your trainees' affective behavior, that is, trainees' positive feelings, interests, attitudes, etc. in your various lessons?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /

APPENDIX - B-1

በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

የድህረ ምረቃ ት/ቤት

የካሪኩለምና ኢንስትራክሽን ትምህርት ክፍል

የጽሁፍ መጠይቅ

/በእጩ መምህራን ብቻ የሚሞላ/

የመጠይቁ አላማ:-

የዚህ የጽሁፍ መጠይቅ ዋና አላማ የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህራን የትምህርቱን አጠቃላይ አላማዎች በክፍል ውስጥ ለመተርጎም የሚያደርጉትን ጥረት ለማዎቅና አስፈላጊ የሆኑትን የማጠቃለያ ሀሳብና አስተያየት በመስጠት የትምህርቱን የመማር ማስተማር ሂደት ለማጎልበት ነው። ሁሉም የጽሁፍ መጠይቁ ጥያቄዎች በእጩ መምህራን ከተሞሉ በኋላ የጥያቄዎች መልሶች ለጥናቱ አላማ ከማገልገል ውጭ ሌላ ምንም አይነት አላማ የላቸውም። በመሆኑም መልሶቹ በአጥጋቅ ብቻ ይነበባሉ። ስለዚህ እርስዎ ለጥያቄዎች የሚሠጡት መልስ ትክክለኛ ማጠቃለያ ላይ ለመድረስ ወሳኝነት ስላለው ትክክል ነው ብለው የሚያምኑበትን መልስ በመስጠት እንድትተባበሩኝ እጠይቃለሁ።

ለትብብርዎ በቅድሚያ አመሰግናለሁ።

መመሪያ:-

- ሀ/ ስምዎን መፃፍ አስፈላጊ አይደለም።
- ለ/ ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች የሚስማሙበትን መልስ በመምረጥ በተሰጠው ቦታ ላይ / / ምልክት ያስቀምጡ።
- ሐ/ የተሠጠው ጥያቄ የእርስዎን አስተያየት ወይም ተጨማሪ ገለፃ የሚጠይቅ ከሆነ በተሰጠው ባዶ ቦታ ላይ ባጭሩ ይግለፁት።

ክፍል አንድ

1. የተቋሙ ስም _____
2. ምሥሪ :- ስም / / ስም / /
3. እድሜ:- ከ18 አመት በታች / / ከ18-22 / / ከ23-27 / /
ከ28-32 / / ከ32 አመት በላይ / /

ክፍል ሁለት

1. የፕሮግራሙ አጠቃላይ መግቢያዎ የየአለቱን የትምህርት አላማ በክፍል ጊዜው መጀመሪያ ላይ ይገልጽልዎታል?
ፈጽሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁልጊዜ / /
2. ለጥያቄ “1” መልስዎ ከ“ፈጽሞ” ጭንቀት ከሆነ በምን ሁኔታ ነው የሚገልጽልዎት?
ጥቂር ሰሌዳ ላይ በመጻፍ / /
በቃል በመግለጽ / /
ጥቂር ሰሌዳ ላይ በመጻፍና በቃል በመግለጽ / /
ሌላ ካለ ይገለጹ _____
3. የፕሮግራሙ አጠቃላይ መግቢያዎ ከአለቱ የትምህርት ርዕስ ጋር ያልተዛመዱ ሥራዎችን /ለምሳሌ:- በገለጻ፣ በጥያቄና መልስ፣ በዘተ ጭንቀት/ ይሠራሉ?
ፈጽሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁልጊዜ / /
4. እርስዎ ከአለቱ የትምህርት ርዕስ ጋር ያልተዛመዱ ሥራዎችን /ለምሳሌ:- መምህርዎ በሚያስረዳበት ጊዜም የቡድን ስራ በምትሠሩበት ጊዜም / ይሠራሉ?
ፈጽሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁልጊዜ / /
5. የፕሮግራሙ አጠቃላይ መግቢያዎ በሚማሩበት ጊዜ የየአለቱን የትምህርት ዋና ዋና ነጥቦች በትክክል ይገነዘባሉ?
ፈጽሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁልጊዜ / /
6. እርስዎ ጊዜም የክፍል ጓደኞችዎ በክፍል ውስጥ ጥያቄ በሚጠይቁበት ጊዜ የፕሮግራሙ አጠቃላይ መግቢያዎ “ ይህ ጥያቄ በሌላ ጊዜ ይመለሳል” ጊዜም “ጥያቄው ከአለቱ የትምህርታችን ጋር አይዛመድም” ብለው ለጥያቄው መልስ ያልሰጡበት ቀን አለ?
አለ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 7. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ የእለቱን ርዕስ ትምህርት በመተባበር ክፍል ለስጥ በተነሳ ሌላ የትምህርት ርዕስ ላይ ገለፃ ያደርጋሉ? ወይም ከእርስዎና ከክፍል ጓደኞችዎ ጋር ውይይት ያደርጋሉ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 8. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ እርስዎን ወይም የክፍል ጓደኞችዎን አንዳንድ ስራዎችን /ለምሳሌ:- ጥቁር ሰሌዳ ለማፅደቅ፣ ቀሪ ተማሪዎችን ለመቆጣጠር፣ የክፍል ወይም የቤት ስራዎችን ለመሰብሰብና የመሳሰሉትን/ እንድትሰሩ ያደርጋሉ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 9. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ በእየለቱ የምትማሩትን ዋና ዋና ቃላት፣ ምልክቶችና ነጥቦች እንድታስታውሱ ያበረታቷችኋል?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 10. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ እርስዎን ወይም የክፍል ጓደኞችዎን አጫጭር ጥያቄዎችን በመጠየቅ የተማራችሁትን ቃል ወይም ሐረግ እንድትመልሱ ያደርጋሉ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 11. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ እርስዎን ወይም የክፍል ጓደኞችዎን በእራሳችሁ ቃላት ተጠቅማችሁ ህሳባችሁን በሰፊ እንድትገልፁ ያበረታታሉ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 12. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ በእየዕለቱ ስለሚሰጡት ርዕስ ትምህርት ጥሩ ግንዛቤ፣ ፍላጎትና እመነት በእርስዎ ላይ እንዲዳብር ያደርጋሉ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 13. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ የሚሰጡዎት ምሳሌዎች ከእለቱ ርዕስ ትምህርት ጋር የተዛመዱ ናቸው?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /
 14. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ የሚጠይቁዎት ጥያቄዎች ከእለቱ ርዕስ ትምህርት ጋር የማይገናኝበት ጊዜ አለ?

ፈዕሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁል ጊዜ / /

15. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ የሚሰጡዎት የክፍልና የቤት ሥራዎች ከእለቱ ርዕሰ ትምህርት ጋር የተዛመዱ ናቸው?

ፈፅሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁልጊዜ / /

16. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህርዎ የትምህርት ክፍለ ጊዜዎን አንዳንድ አስተዳደራዊ /ቢሮ ውስጥ መሠራት የሚገባቸውን/ ስራዎችን ለመስራት ይጠቀሙበታል?

ፈፅሞ / / በጣም ጥቂት ጊዜ / / አንዳንድ / / ብዙ ጊዜ / / ሁልጊዜ / /

APPENDIX - B-2

DATE _____

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

QUESTIONNAIRE

(TO BE FILLED ONLY BY TRAINEES)

PURPOSE: The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about pedagogics instructors effectiveness in implementing the objectives of pedagogics syllabus thereby forwarding valuable suggestions that facilitate the instructional process. Since your responses for the given questions have a paramount importance to reach at a right conclusion, you are kindly requested to give your honest responses for each question. Of course, all the responses which you provide will only be read by the investigator-kept confidential-and used only for research purpose.

Thank you in advance.

- Directions:
1. No need of writing your name.
 2. Please, read the following items carefully and put a tick \surd mark against one of the following choices that you feel appropriate.
 3. In conditions where your extended response is demanded, please write it on the space provided.

Section One

1. Name of the TTI _____

2. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

3. Age: Below 18 years old / / 18-22 / / 23-27 / /
28-32 / / Above 32 years old / /

Section Two:

1. Does your pedagogics instructor ever inform you of the lesson objectives at the beginning of the period?
Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
2. If your response for question number "1" is not "Never", in what form does your pedagogics instructor make you aware of the intended lesson objectives?
By writing on the chalkboard / /
By explaining orally / /
By both writing on the chalkboard and explaining orally / /
If any other, specify _____
3. Does your pedagogics instructor ever perform instructional activities-in his explanations, demonstrations, questions, etc.-which are outside of the lesson topic?
Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
4. Do you ever perform instructional activities - in your individual work, groupwork, questions etc. - which are out side of the lesson topic?
Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
5. Do you ever understand the major points; that is, knowledge, skills, and values of each lesson (of pedagogics course)?
Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
6. When you or your classmates ask questions, does your pedagogics instructor ever respond by saying "We will come-back to it" or "this is not the concern of our today's lesson"?
Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /

7. Does your pedagogics instructor ever explain or discuss with you about any topic raised in the class which is out side of the lesson topic?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
8. Does your pedagogics instructor ever ask you or your classmates to do routine activities such as cleaning the chalkboard, taking attendance, collecting assignments, etc.?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
9. Does your pedagogics instructor ever encourage you to memorize the major facts, symbols, and concepts of the various lessons?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
10. Does your pedagogics instructor ever ask you questions which look for a short and precise response like a word, a phrase, or a symbol?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
11. Does your pedagogics instructor ever initiate you to express your views freely using your own words?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
12. Does your pedagogics instructor ever initiate the development of your affective behaviour; that is, your positive feelings, interests, attitudes, etc. in the various lessons?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
13. Do the examples, which are given by your pedagogics instructor, ever correspond with the lesson topic?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /
14. Does your pedagogics instructor ever ask you questions which do not correspond with the lesson topic?
- Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /

15. Do the class works and homework, which are given by your pedagogics instructor, ever correspond with the lesson topic?

Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /

16. ^D Does your pedagogics instructor ever use the instructional time (the allocated periods) to do administrative tasks?

Never / / Seldom / / Sometimes / / Often / / Always / /

APPENDIX - C-1

በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
የድህረ ምረቃ ት/ቤት
የካሪኩለምና ኢንስትራክሽን ትምህርት ክፍል

ለተቋማት ርዕሳነ-መምህራንና ምክትል-ርዕሳነ መምህራን የሚቀርብ ቃለ-መጠይቅ

የመጠይቁ አላማ:- የዚህ ቃለ-መጠይቅ ዋና አላማ የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህራን የትምህርቱን አጠቃላይ አላማዎች በክፍል ውስጥ ለመተርጉም የሚያደርጉትን ጥረት ለማወቅና፣ አስፈላጊ የሆኑትን የማጠቃለያ ሀሳብና አስተያየት በመስጠት የትምህርቱን የመማረ ማስተማር ሂደት ለማጎልበት ነው።

ክፍል አንድ

1. ቃለ-መጠይቁ የተካሄደበት ቀን _____
2. የተቋሙ ስም _____
3. ያታ _____

ክፍል ሁለት

1. በተቋሙ ውስጥ የፔዳጎጂክስ “ሲለበስ” አለ?
2. “ሲለበስ” ካለ መምህራኑ እንዴት ነው የሚጠቀሙበት?
3. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህራን አመታዊና እለታዊ እንዲሁም በየምዕራፉ እቅዶችን ያዘጋጃሉ?
4. መምህራኑ እቅዶችን የሚያዘጋጁ ከሆነ እርስዎስ ያዩዋቸዋል?
5. እቅዶችን የሚያዩአቸው ከሆነ የመምህራኑ የትምህርት አላማ አነዳደፍ አጠቃላይነት ወይም ውሳኔነት እንዲሁም የተማሪዎችን ሁለንተናዊ የባህርይ ለውጥ ለማምጣት ካላቸው ብቃት አንፃር ያለዎትን አስተያየት ቢገልጹልኝ?
6. የመምህራኑ አመታዊ፣ እለታዊና በየምዕራፉ የሚዘጋጁት አላማዎች ተደጋጋፊነትን በተመለከተ ያለዎትን አስተያየት ቢገልጹልኝ?
7. የፔዳጎጂክስ መምህራንን የክፍል ውስጥ የማስተማር ሂደት ይገመግማሉ?
8. የሚገመግሙ ከሆነ አጠቃላይ የማስተማር ሂደታቸው የዕለቱን የትምህርት አላማ ከግብ በማድረስ ላይ ያተኩረ ወይም ያላተኩረ መሆኑን ቢገልጹልኝ?

ለትብብርዎ አመሰግናለሁ።

APPENDIX - C-2

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

INTERVIEW GUIDE

(TO BE PRESENTED ONLY FOR DIRECTORS AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS OF TTIS)

PURPOSE: The purpose of this interview is to collect information about pedagogics instructors effectiveness in implementing the general objectives of pedagogics syllabus thereby forwarding valuable suggestions that facilitate the instructional process.

- Section One
1. Date _____
 2. Name of the TTI _____
 3. Sex _____

Section Two

1. Is there a pedagogics syllabus in the TTI?
2. If there is a pedagogics syllabus in the TTI, how do the instructors use it?
3. Do the pedagogics instructors prepare lesson, unit, and annual plans?
4. If the pedagogics instructors are preparing lesson, unit, and annual plans, do you check it?
5. If you are checking the plans, would you please reveal your views about the instructors' way of formulating objectives in terms of specificity and generality as well as the usefulness of the objectives in bringing about all sided and

- desirable behavioral changes in trainees?
6. Would you please reveal your views about the correspondence of the objectives prepared by the instructors in the lesson, unit, and annual plans.
 7. Do you observe the actual classroom instructional process of the pedagogics instructors?
 8. If you are observing the actual classroom instructional process of the pedagogics instructors, would you please reveal your views about whether or not the instructional process is geared towards the attainment of the lesson objectives?

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX - D

ADDIS ABABA UNIVESTITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

PURPOSE: The purpose of this observation checklist is to collect information about pedagogics instructors effectiveness in implementing the objectives of pedagogics syllabus thereby forwarding valuable suggestions that facilitate the instructional process. Since your responses for the given items have a paramount importance to reach at a right conclusion, you are kindly requested to give your honest responses for each item. Ofcourse, all the responses which you provide will be kept confidential and used only for research purpose.

Thank you in advance.

- Directions:
1. No need of writing your name and the name of the observed instructor.
 2. Observe the instructor's instructional activities carefully and put an "X" mark against one of the following scales which you feel appropriate.
 3. In conditions where your extended response is demanded, please write it on the space provided.

Section One

1. Date _____
2. Name of the TTI _____
3. Section observed _____

4. Number of trainees in the observed class _____
5. Length of the observation period: form _____ a.m. (p.m.) to _____ a.m. (p.m)
6. Biodata regarding the observer:

Sex : Male _____ Female _____

Age : Below 26 years old / / 26-30 / / 31-35 / /

36 - 40 / / Above 40 years old / /

Qualification: Diploma / / 12+3 / / BA/B.Ed. / /

MA / / If any other, specify _____

Area of specialization: Major _____

Minor (if any) _____

Years of experience in teaching: in TTI _____

in another _____

Current Status _____

7. Biodata regarding the observed instructor:

Sex : Male _____ Female _____

Age: Below 26 years old / / 26 - 30 / / 31 - 35 / /

36 - 40 / / Above 40 years old / /

Qualification: Diploma / / 12 + 3 / / BA/B.Ed. / /

MA / / If any other, specify _____

Area of specialization: Major _____

Minor _____

Years of experience in teaching pedagogics _____

Years of experience in teaching other subjects _____

Key: 1 = extremely poor; 2 = below average; 3 = average;
4 = above average; and 5 = excellent.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Informs trainees of the lesson objectives at the beginning of the period -----					
2. Clarifies and discusses with the trainees about the objectives of the lesson -----					
3. Makes an agreement between the objectives of the lesson and what is actually taught -----					
4. Uses appropriate instructional methods and techniques for achieving the lesson objective being taught -----					
5. Uses appropriate instructional activities to carry out the desired objective -----					
6. Considers the type of the lesson objective in determining the nature and sequence of the instructional activities -----					
7. Gives examples which are appropriate to the desired objective					
8. Asks questions which are appropriate to the desired objective					
9. Gives classworks and homework which are relevant to achieve the desired objective -----					
10. Follows the lesson plan strictly -----					
11. Performs instructional activities according to the lesson plan					
12. Restricts trainees' activities to be in conformity with the lesson objective -----					

	1	2	3	4	5
13. Enhances trainees' participation in performing the appropriate instructional activities -----					
14. Permits trainees to give short and precise responses -----					
15. Permits trainees to express their views freely using their own words -----					
16. Encourages trainees' low level cognitive learning -----					
17. Encourages trainees' high level cognitive learning -----					
18. Encourages trainees' behavioral change in knowledge, skill, and attitude -----					
19. Uses trainees to help with the routine aspects of class management such as distributing and collecting materials, cleaning the chalkboard, etc. -----					
20. Permits little administrative interruptions in the classroom ---					
21. Uses little amount of instructional time to complete administrative tasks -----					
22. Stops or prevents misbehaviour with a minimum of class disruption -----					
Total					

APPENDIX - E

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PEDAGOGICS SYLLABUS IN WHICH THE STUDY WAS CONCENTRATED

1. Understand the overall historical, philosophical, and sociological foundations of education.
2. Analyse the historical development, problems, and challenges of the Ethiopian education.
3. Appreciate the historical development of pedagogics and its role in the teaching-learning process.
4. Understand concepts, developmental processes, and materials of the curriculum.
5. Apply teaching principles, methods, and techniques that are appropriate to specific teaching-learning situations.
6. Use appropriate instructional aids in promoting the student's learning.

APPENDIX - F

UNIT OBJECTIVES OF THE PEDAGOGICS SYLLABUS IN WHICH THE STUDY WAS CONCENTRATED

1. Defines the meaning, purpose and characteristics of education.
2. Analyses the purpose and forms of education in various socio-economic formations.
3. Identifies major philosophical schools that influence education.
4. Investigates the relationship or differences among the given philosophical views.
5. Examines Ethiopian traditional education in light of both church and koran education.
6. Investigates the introduction, problems and challenges that have faced modern Ethiopian education.
7. Realizes the causes, goals, and strategies of the New Education and Training Policy.
8. Explains the historical development of pedagogics.
9. Realizes roles and importance of pedagogics.
10. Defines the term "Curriculum".
11. Conceptualizes the process of curriculum development.
12. Contributes to the process of curriculum design, tryout, implementation evaluation and quality control.
13. Understands the importance of syllabi, textbooks, teacher's guides etc.
14. Properly utilizes syllabi, textbooks, and teacher's guides in the process of curriculum implementation.
15. Defines the concepts of teaching and other related terms.
16. Defines the phrase "teaching-learning principles".
17. Distinguishes the major characteristics of instructional principles.
18. Uses various principles of instruction during the instructional process.

19. Examines the major teaching methods and techniques.
20. Applies various teaching methods and techniques in classroom instruction.
21. outlines factors affecting selection and application of teaching methods.
22. Sorts out the advantages and limitations of the major teaching methods.
23. Defines instructional aids.
24. Realizes the importance of instructional aids.
25. Identifies various classification of instructional aids.
26. Prepares instructional aids from local materials based on the elementary school curriculum (1-4).
27. Uses appropriate instructional aids for specific topics and lessons.

APPENDIX - G-2

DESSIE TTI (PEDAGOGICS) INSTRUCTORS - MADE UNIT OBJECTIVES IN WHICH THE STUDY WAS CONCENTRATED

1. Recognize the concept of education.
2. Know when and how education began to take place in Ethiopia.
3. Understand the aims of the NETP.
4. Comprehend the meaning of the term pedagogics.
5. Analyze the importance of pedagogics for teaching profession.
6. Know the definition of curriculum.
7. Analyze the process of curriculum development.
8. Describe each steps in detail.
9. Know the meaning of the term.
10. Relate teaching principles to the practical situation.
11. Recognize the importance and disadvantage of each method.
12. Comprehend the meaning of the term.
13. Analyze the difference between the two classification of teaching aids.
14. Apply the knowledge in producing teaching aids locally.

20. Understand the roles and importance of teaching principles.
21. Know the meaning and importance of teaching aids.
22. State the function of teaching aids.
23. Identify the types of teaching aids.
24. Understand the concept of the chalkboard and two dimensional aids.
25. Know the locally prepared materials of teaching.

APPENDIX-H-1

DEBRE BIRHAN TTI (PEDAGOGICS) INSTRUCTORS - MADE LESSON OBJECTIVES

1. Define the term "Education" in different ways.
2. Discuss the points arising from the different definitions given by different educators.
3. Identify the major purposes of education.
4. Discuss the different concepts of education.
5. Explain each concept with an example.
6. Tell the differences between formal, informal and non formal education.
7. Explain the developmental history of education.
8. State the main evidence which serve as sources for scientific study about the past education system.
9. Describe the aim, contents and methods of education during the primitive and slavery society.
10. Outline the main types of schools in slavery.
11. Describe the education system in Feudalism.
12. Describe the education system in Capitalism.
13. Explain the development of education during Renaissance.
14. List the branches of Philosophy.
15. Relate the development of education with different philosophical trends.
16. Identify the major philosophical movement of education.

17. Tell the educational implications of each philosophical movement.
18. Explain the aims, methods, and procedures used in each philosophical trend.
19. Explain the structure of church education.
20. Explain the aims, methods, and contents used in each (Church and Quran) education system.
21. Identify the four phases of Nibab Bet.
22. Explain in detail (1, 2, 3, and 4th) division (stages) of Church and Quran education.
23. State the seven art of Knight.
24. Outline (mention) factors contribute for development of new problems of education in Ethiopia.
25. Identify the causes for the need of modern education in Ethiopia.
26. Identify the objectives of each period of educational practices.
27. Name the main problems of each period of educational practices.
28. List the specific dates or year's on which major developments were made.
29. Compare and contrast the objectives, methods, and structures of modern education in French, British, America and Germany periods.
30. Identify the major problems of Ethiopian education in these periods.
31. Define the term pedagogics.
32. List down the names of founders of pedagogy.
33. Identify the subject areas and roles of pedagogy.
34. Define the term curriculum in various ways.
35. Identify the main steps of curriculum development.
36. Discuss the approaches of curriculum development.
37. Explain how curriculum materials are developed.

38. Explain the processes of curriculum tryout and implementation.
39. Identify the concepts and types of curriculum evaluation.
40. Classify instructional aids into general and specific.
41. Discuss each teaching aid.
42. Define terms such as: teaching (imparting), Learning (acquiring), instruction, classroom interaction.
43. Name the three main functions of "Teaching".
44. Identify the three areas of classroom relation.
45. List down the four forms of cooperation within the instructional process.
46. Define terms.
47. Call the name of the three functions of teaching.
48. Identify the three areas of classroom relations.
49. Write the four forms of cooperation within instructional process.
50. Identify the characteristics of teaching principles.
51. Identify the eight principles of teaching.
52. Name the hints for implementing teaching principles.

APPENDIX - H-2

DESSIE TTI (PEDAGOGICS) INSTRUCTORS - MADE

LESSON OBJECTIVES

1. Define the term education.
2. Explain the purpose of education.
3. Identify the major characteristics of education
4. Describe the purpose of education in Primitive Communal Society.
5. Identify the aims, contents, and methods of education in Slavery System.
6. Explain the forms of education in Feudal and Capitalist Society.
7. Describe the educational system of the middle age.
8. Explain the educational system of the Renaissance.
9. Mention the major types of schools in Slavery.
10. Compare the educational systems of the different periods.
11. Define the term philosophy.
12. Explain different schools of thought.
13. Differentiate their educational stand.
14. Identify the relation between education and philosophy.
15. Define the educational philosophy.
16. Identify the basic characteristics of classical realism.
17. Explain the central idea of scientific realism.
18. State the aims of education in realism.
19. Describe the major elements of idealism.

20. Discuss the main features of existentialism.
21. Identify aims of education for scientific realism.
22. Describe the views of idealism.
23. Mention fundamental principles of idealism.
24. Explain the reason for the emergence of existentialism.
25. Discuss sample points of traditional education in Ethiopia.
26. Explain the history of church education.
27. Describe the structure and contents of church education.
28. Elaborate the origin of Mosque education.
29. Describe the contents of Mosque education.
30. Discuss methods of teaching in both schools.
31. State the factors that necessitated the call for modern education in Ethiopia.
32. Pinpoint the major features of education during the French period.
33. Explain the causes for the slow growth of education during the British period.
34. Describe the main characteristics of education during the American period and during the period of Eastern influence.
35. Define pedagogics.
36. Describe the historical origin of the term pedagogics.
37. Explain what curriculum mean.
38. Identify components of curriculum developments.
39. Explain the process of curriculum development.
40. Tell why curriculum is defined differently.
41. Describe components of curriculum development.
42. Explain the three distinct activities in the process of curriculum development.

43. State the different procedures/approaches of curriculum development.
44. Elaborate how ideal educational goals should be developed.
45. Explain "the how" of setting objectives of a curriculum.
46. Identify what conditions affect the selection and organization of curriculum content.
47. Identify the importance of developing curriculum materials.
48. Define curriculum evaluation differently.
49. Explain the concepts of evaluation.
50. Define terms like teaching, learning, instruction, and classroom interaction.
51. Identify characteristics of teaching principles.
52. State the main contents of teaching principles.
53. Define what teaching principles mean.
54. Identify the main characteristics of teaching principles.
55. Explain the contents of teaching principles.
56. Describe how teachers use teaching principles in the instruction process.

APPENDIX - H-3

GONDAR TTI (PEDAGOGICS) INSTRUCTORS - MADE

LESSON OBJECTIVES

1. Define the term education in different ways.
2. List down the definition of education given by different educators.
3. Compare one definition of education to the others.
4. Identify the objective of education on the basis of their environment.
5. State main ideas about the criteria of education.
6. Compare one form of education with the others.
7. Recall the four major sources of scientific work to study the history of education, without error by Wednesday.
8. Express an opinion about the sources of information to study the development of education whenever discussing social issues.
9. Listen to all of a primitive education without leaving his/her seat.
10. Express an opinion about a primitive education whenever discussing social issues.
11. Listen to all of a slavery education without leaving his/her seat.
12. Express an opinion about a slavery education whenever discussing social issues.
13. Identify the aims, contents, and methods of education in primitive communal system.
14. Point out types of schools in slavery.
15. describe the educational system of the middle age.
16. Differentiate the characteristics of education in two distinct classes.
17. Identify the effect of urbanization for the development of education.

18. Recite the movement Renaissance and its corresponding philosophy.
19. Describe the historical development of Renaissance Humanism.
20. Compare the spread of Renaissance and Humanism to other contents.
21. Identify the religious movement of the 1500's reformation.
22. Point out the causes of reformation.
23. Listen to all of education in early capitalism without leaving his/her seat.
24. Express an opinion about the early capitalist education whenever discussing social issues.
25. Discriminate between Humanism and Reformation from memory.
26. State the main events of each movement, without error, by Tuesday.
27. Recall the definition of philosophy.
28. State the importance of philosophy with 50% accuracy.
29. List down all branches of philosophy without error.
30. List down the major events in each philosophical movement.
31. Match each philosopher with philosophical periods, from memory, with 70% accuracy.
32. Compare between ancient and medieval philosophy from understanding.
33. List down the main events of medieval periods.
34. Define the term philosophy.
35. Point out some uses of studying philosophy.
36. Differentiate the meaning and the roles of the branches of philosophy.
37. Describe the history of western philosophy periods.
38. Understand ancient schools of philosophy of Greece.
39. Distinguish the differences of ancient schools of philosophy.
40. Identify the works of medieval philosophy.

41. Compare the philosophical outlooks of ancient and Medieval philosophy.
42. Point out the outcomes of Renaissance for the development of modern philosophy.
43. Identify famous philosophers who contributed for modern philosophy.
44. Identify the central idea of Rationalism and Empiricism.
45. Point out the main principles of pragmatism.
46. Describe the main ideas of Experimentalism.
47. Illustrate the aim of education in Realists view.
48. Identify the metaphysical assumptions of scientific Realism.
49. Name the aims of education of Realism.
50. Recite the central idea of idealism.
51. Point out aims and methods of teaching in idealism.
52. Describe the general outlook of Existentialism.
53. Compare methods of teaching of Existentialism to that of idealism.
54. Demonstrate for the class an application to real life of church and Quran education on Monday.
55. Discriminate between church and Quran, citing examples from the lecture and note.
56. Match each content of church education with the most character of the school with 80% accuracy, from memory.
57. Recall the four structure of church education without error, by Tuesday.
58. Listen the structure of Quran education presented by the teacher without leaving his/her seat.
59. Express an opinion about Quran contents whenever discussing social issues.
60. Express an opinion about teaching method of traditional education whenever discussing social issues.

61. Compare methods of teaching in traditional and the present ways of teaching inside church and Quran.
62. List down the contents of education of the Feudal Lords.
63. Compare the contents of education in Ethiopia during Feudalism with ancient Greek.
64. List down the factors that promote the development of new patterns of education.
65. Identify the development of modern education and its phases.
66. Understand the influence of Western Education System in our country's one.
67. Explain the Educational process of Ethiopia from 1950-1974.
68. Point out the foundation of higher education in Ethiopia between 1950-1974.
69. Differentiate the educational systems of Western and Eastern, and their outcome on our educational development.
70. Identify the Rational of the New Education and Training Policy.
71. Point out the main objectives of NETP of Ethiopia.
72. Understand the management and organization of education sector in NETP.
73. Illustrate the curriculum and language in NETP.
74. List down the proposed subjects for primary education.
75. Explain the development of curriculum materials and the process of curriculum tryout.
76. Identify the origin and the development of the term pedagogics.
77. Write the meaning of pedagogic~~s~~.
78. Explain the importance of pedagogics in the instruction.
79. Define the term "Curriculum" in different ways.
80. Identify the main steps or components of curriculum development.
81. Identify the importance of content selection and organization.
82. Point out elements of curricular materials.

83. Illustrate the concept of curriculum tryout.
84. Differentiate different types of evaluation.
85. Understand what quality control is.
86. Define terms such as teaching, learning, instruction and classroom interaction.
87. Identify some teaching principles.
88. Point out main contents of teaching principles.
89. Illustrate method and techniques of teaching.
90. Differentiate the merits and demerits of lecture method.
91. Identify the method and techniques of teaching.
92. Point out steps of the lecture method.
93. Illustrate the non traditional methods of teaching.
94. Identify situations which require the use of group discussion method.
95. Differentiate merits and demerits of discussion.
96. Understand the concepts of methods of teaching.
97. Understand the concepts of the lecture method.
98. Understand the steps in carrying out the lecture.
99. Understand the concepts of the demonstration method.
100. Understand the concepts of the group interaction method.

APPENDIX - I

The classification of the Lesson Objectives of the three TTIs into non-behavioral and behavioral as well as specific and general objectives.

		OBJECTIVES					
TTIs	Non-behavioral	Behavioral					
		Specific					General
		Only behavior	Both content and behavior	Standard of performance	Testing condition	Content and behavior, standard of performance, and testing condition	Both content and behavior
Debre-Birhan	-	46	1-45, 47-52	-	-	-	-
Dessie	-	-	1-56	-	-	-	-
Gondar	9, 11, 23, 58	-	1-8, 10, 12-22, 24-37, 39-57, 59-65, 67-71, 73-84, 86-95	7, 26, 28, 29, 31, 56, 57	25, 31, 55, 56	31, 56	38, 66, 72, 85, 96-100

Note: The number in the table indicate the consecutive roll numbers of the lesson objectives (of the three TTIs).

APPENDIX-J

The distribution of the lesson objectives of the three TTIs in the Bloom's, Krathwohl's, and Simpson's Classifications of Educational Objectives.

Domains	Levels	Teacher Training Institute		
		Debre Birhan	Dessie	Gonder
Cognitive	Knowledge	1,3,8-12, 14, 16,21,23-28,30- 35,39,42-52.	1,3-5,7,9,11,15, 16,18,19,21- 23,27,29,31,32, 34-36,38,41,43, 46-48,50-54,56.	1,2,4,5,7,9,13-15, 17-19,21,22,26- 28,30,31, 33-35,37,40,42- 46,48-52, 56,57,62,64,65,68,70, 71,74,76,77,79-82,86- 88,91,92,94.
	Comprehension	2,4-7,13,17- 20,22,29,36- 38,41.	2,6,8,10,12,13, 17,20,24- 26,28,30,33,37, 39,40, 42,44,45,49,55.	3,6,16,20,25,32,36,39 ,41, 47,53,55,61,63,67,69, 73, 75,78,83,84,89,90,93, 95.
	Application	-	-	54
	Analysis	- 15, 40	14	-
	Synthesis	-	-	-

	Evaluation	-	-	-
Affective	Receiving	-	-	
	Responding	-	-	
	Valuing	-	-	8,10,12,24,59,60.
	Organization	-	-	-
	Characterization by a value or value complex	-	-	-
Psychomotor	Perception			
	Set	-	-	-
	Guided response	-	-	-
	Mechanism	-	-	-
	Complex overt response	-	-	-
	Adaptation	-	-	-
	Origination	-	-	-

Note: The numbers in the table indicate the consecutive roll numbers of the lesson objectives (of the three TTIs)

APPENDIX-L

Statistical calculations for checking the presence of a significant variation on the attainment of lower level cognitive, higher level cognitive, and affective objectives while the instructors teach.

1. Computation of the Fisher;s one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)

Instructors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total
Lower level cognitive	4.87	4.04	3.48	4.88	4.19	2.46	4.3	3.02	4.18	3.07	4.61	43.1
Higher level cognitive	3.9	3.67	3.19	3.62	2.67	2.14	3.32	2.55	2.5	2.78	3.32	33.66
Affective	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.08	2.38	4.0	3.01	3.06	3.01	3.03	3.04	35.61

Grand Total (T) = 43.1+33.66+35.61 = 112.37

Number of Cells in the table (N) = 11x3=33

Number of Cells in a group (n) = 11 Total number of groups (J) = 3

The Sum of the Square of each Cell = $\sum x_{ij}^2 = (4.87)^2 + (4.04)^2 + (3.48)^2 \dots + (3.03)^2 + (3.04)^2 = 399.58$.

The Sum of the quotient of the square of each T_j and $n_j = \sum T_j^2 / n_j$
 $\sum T_j^2 / n_j = (43.1^2) / 11 + (33.66)^2 / 11 + (35.61)^2 / 11 = 387.15$.

T_j is a representation for the sum of cells in each group.

Sum of Squares between groups (SSb/n) = $\sum T_j^2 / n_j - T^2 / N = 387.15 - (112.37)^2 / 33 = 4.51$

Sum of Squares Within instructors (SSw/n) = $\sum x_{ij}^2 - \sum T_j^2 / n_j$

DECLARATION

I, Getnet Demissie, hereby declare that this thesis is my original work done under the guidance of Dr. Abebe Bekele, Associate Professor, Chairman of the Faculty Graduate Commission. All relevant sources used for the thesis are duly acknowledged.



Getnet Demissie

May 5, 1996

