SJIF IMPACT FACTOR: 2.996 CRDEEP Journals
International Journal of Social Sciences Arts and Humanities Anbessa B. Nora Vol. 6 No. 3 ISSN: 2321 – 4147
International Journal of Social Sciences Arts and Humanities Vol. 6 No. 3. 2018. Pp. 29-39

Full Length Research Paper

An Assessment of Teaching Methodology used in Ethiopian University: A Case Study of Samara University

Anbesaa Bekele Nora
Samara University, Samara, Afar Region, Ethiopia

Article history
Received: 18-04--2018
Revised: 25-05-2018
Re Revised: 25-06-2018
Accepted: 30-08-2018

Corresponding Author
Anbesaa Bekele Nora
Samara University, Ethiopia.

Abstract
The main purpose of this study was to assess methods of teaching frequently used in Samara University. In order to meet the objectives of the study, a descriptive survey design was employed. From the total population of 256 teachers and 2579 students, 128 teachers and 516 students were randomly selected for this study. Four faculty deans were also selected using availability sampling. Questionnaires and interview were used for collecting data. Documents were also analyzed to supplement the data. The data obtained through the questionnaires were analyzed using frequency, percentages, mean, standard deviations, t-tests, and rank correlation. The information obtained through open-ended questionnaires and the interviews were qualitatively analyzed to supplement the quantitative data. The findings revealed that lecture method was found to be the most commonly employed method of teaching followed by discussion, individualized and demonstration methods. Therefore, it is recommended that mediated materials and multimedia, and various teaching methods should be used for the betterment of students' learning.

Key words: *Method of teaching, effective teaching,*

Cite this article as: Anbesaa B. Nora (2018). An Assessment of Teaching Methodology used in Ethiopian University: A Case Study of Samara University. *International Journal of Social Sciences Arts and Humanities*, 6(3), 29-39. Retrieved from www.crdeepjournal.org/ijssah

Introduction

It is important to use different teaching methods at Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the teaching learning process to produce students who are responsible and competent in teaching, research and community services. According to Rao (2003:268) institutions of Higher Education (HE) have the main responsibility for equipping individuals with advanced knowledge and skills required for positions of responsibility in government, business and academic areas. These institutions produce new knowledge through research, and disseminating this knowledge. HE in modern society seeks to preserve, transmit and advance knowledge and is committed to change. Therefore, the importance of teaching as an instrument of change and progress had been underlined by various educational experts, committees and commissions.

According to Daniel (2004:63), HEIs are expected to produce graduates who are capable of bringing changes and improvements in the society. With regard to this, graduates of HEIs are expected to employ different teaching methods which have implications for the quality of student learning. This is because quality of student learning is the issue or the agenda of all educational institutions. Therefore, teaching requires good planning of activities.

Assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in HE has become a major concern all over the world (Firdissa, 2009:19). The society and employers need graduates who are capable of solving problems and who bring quality to student learning by employing appropriate methods of teaching to deliver contents. Therefore, this expectation can be achieved as HEIs prepare students who are well equipped with knowledge, skill, understanding and attitude. It is unfortunate that some teachers teach students without having much formal knowledge of how students learn. Many lecturers know how they learn best, but do not necessarily consider how their students learn and if the way they teach is predicated on enabling learning to happen. As a result, the learning environment in which learners learn within affects the outcomes.

Students have different ways of absorbing information and of demonstrating their knowledge. Their exposure to different methods of teaching affects the way they grasp knowledge. When the teacher lacks control of the methods of teaching to be used, it does not bring quality to student learning. If teachers do not commit themselves to use the teaching method suited to the content to be delivered, it

will result in less skilled manpower production that becomes less effective in solving the problems of the community in particular and society in general. In the teaching learning process, the methods of teaching employed bring a great impact for the quality of student learning.

Teaching without using appropriate method affects the quality of student learning. As a result, this might bring poor graduates that are not capable of solving societal problems. This initiated me to assess the methods of teaching and their implications for quality of student learning at Samara University.

Research Questions
The study focuses on assessing and identifying the teaching methods at Samara University. Therefore, the study tries to answer the following basic questions:
1. What are the teaching methods most commonly employed by teachers at Samara University?
2. To what extent are teachers effective in bringing good practice of teaching in the University?
3. To what extent teachers consider factors that affect the choice of teaching methods?

Objectives of the study
The study attempts to:
1. Identify the teaching methods most commonly employed by teachers at Samara University.
2. Investigate the extent to which teachers are effective in bringing good practice of teaching in the University.
3. Identify the extent to which teachers consider factors that affect their choice of teaching methods.

Materials and Methods
Study area
The study was conducted at Samara University, Afar Regional State, Ethiopia.

Data Collection Methods
A questionnaire, an interview, and document analysis were the main data gathering instruments. This was because of the need to collect adequate data and for triangulation purpose. Therefore, employing multiple data collection instruments helps the researcher to combine, strengthen and amend some of the inadequacies of the data and for triangulating it (Cresswell, 2003:62).

Data Analysis
Different statistical techniques were employed on the basis of the nature of the data collected. Consequently, the data collected from the respondents were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. In analyzing the quantitative data, respondents were categorized and frequencies were tallied. Moreover, mean scores, standard deviations, independent sample t-tests, and rank correlation were used for analyzing the questionnaires with five point Likert scales. In analyzing the data obtained through an interview, first summary sheets were prepared and field notes were written and the content of the responses were analyzed. The documents such as journals, books, and articles were also used in data analysis.

Design of the Study
A descriptive survey design was used so as to assess the teaching methods at Samara University. The design was selected on the assumption that it is helpful to gather enough information from many people on the issues under study. The appropriateness of this design for such study was noted by many scholars. For example, Koul (1996:405) states that descriptive survey design becomes useful particularly where one needs to understand some particular information. Best and Khan (1989:18) have noted that a descriptive survey research design involves a clearly defined problem and definite objectives. In this study, both primary and secondary sources were used to gather adequate information about the teaching methods at Samara University. The University comprises 256 teachers of which 243 were males and 13 were females; 2579 students (second and third year) of which 2289 were males and 290 were females; 18 departments; and 4 faculties. All faculty deans were included using availability sampling technique because their number is very small. A questionnaire, an interview, and document analysis were the main data gathering instruments. This was because of the need to collect adequate data and for triangulation purpose. Therefore, employing multiple data collection instruments helps the researcher to combine, strengthen and amend some of the inadequacies of the data and for triangulating it (Cresswell, 2003:62). In analyzing the quantitative data, respondents were categorized and frequencies were tallied. Percentage and frequency counts were used to analyze the characteristics of the population as it helps to determine the relative standing of the respondents. Moreover, mean scores, standard deviations, independent sample t-tests, and rank correlation were used for analyzing the questionnaires with five point Likert scales to assess methods of teaching and their implications on quality of student learning at Samara University.

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data
Background Characteristics of the Respondents
The questionnaires were administered to 516 students and 128 teachers. From these, 469 students and 114 teachers returned, of which 440 and 110 papers were used for analysis and representing an overall response rate of 85.27 % and 85.94% respectively. The

background information of teachers (n = 110) and students (n = 440) who completed properly and returned the questionnaires were indicated hereunder.

Table 1: Background information of sample teachers in the study by educational level, teaching experience and workload

Variables	Category	n	Percent (%)
Educational level	BA/BSc/BED	41	37.3
	MA/MSc	69	62.7
	Total	110	100.0
Teaching experience in year	< 2 years	60	54.5
	2-5 years	50	45.5
	Total	110	100.0
Workload	< 6 chr/week	14	12.7
	6-11 chr/week	64	58.2
	12-18 chr/week	31	28.1
	> 18 chr/week	1	0.9
	Total	110	100.0

With regard to the educational level of the respondents, 37.3% of the teachers were first degree holders and 62.7% of them were second degree holders. Regarding this, the Senate Legislation of Samara University (2008:31) stated that the University staffs shall endeavor to attain the required level of qualification/competence and expertise in their respective discipline; and maintain and improve such competence and expertise by keeping abreast with the new developments and changes in their respective fields of study.

As to the teaching experience of the respondents, the majority of the teachers (54.5%) had teaching experience of less than two years, and 45.5% of them had teaching experience between two and five years. This, therefore, indicates that the majority of the teachers had relatively little teaching experience. Regarding the teachers' workload in credit hour/week, 12.7% of the teachers had a workload less than six credit hours/week while 58.2% of them had a workload between six to eleven credit hours per week. Twenty eight point one percent and 0.9 % of teachers had a workload between 12 and 18, and above 18 credit hours per week respectively. This, therefore, shows that the majority of teachers (58.2%) had a workload between 6-11 credit hours per week.

Table 2: Background information of sample students in the study

Variables	Category	n	Percent (%)
Faculty	Social Science and Humanities	145	33.0
	Natural and Computational Science	121	27.5
	Business and Economics	93	21.1
	Dry Land Agriculture	81	18.4
	Total	440	100.0
Gender	Male	315	71.6
	Female	125	28.4
	Total	440	100.0
Age	15-20	167	38.0
	21-25	228	51.8
	26-30	13	3.0
	31-35	27	6.1
	Above 35	5	1.1
	Total	440	100.0
Year	Second	237	53.9
	Third	203	46.1
	Total	440	100.0

Table 2 shows that 33%, 27.5%, 21.1%, and 18.4% of students were from faculties of Social Sciences and Humanities; Natural and Computational Science; Business and Economics; and Dry Land Agriculture respectively. This shows that the majority of the students were in the faculties of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Natural and Computational Science. Regarding the gender of the respondents, 71.6% of students were males and 28.4% of students were females. Therefore, the number of female students is fewer than that of male students. Hence, this indicates that the majority of the students in the sample areas of the study were males showing that the learning environment was male dominated. Regarding the age of the respondents, 38% of the students were between 15 and 20 years and 51.8% of the students were between 21 and 25 years. The rest of the students 3%, 6.1% and 1.1% were between 26 and 30 years, 31 and 35 years, and above 35 years respectively. This shows that the vast majority of the students were very young. Table 2 also shows that 53.9% of the students were second year and 46.1% of the students were third year. This indicates that there are a

proportional number of students from the two batches with slight difference. That means the number of students from second year is greater than that of third year students.

Analysis of the Data

Considerations in Choosing Teaching Methods

This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents on the considerations in choosing teaching methods. The considerations in choosing teaching methods were presented to respondents through questionnaires that they were required to rate the level of accomplishment of the teachers on the basis of a five point Likert scale. These five point scales range from strongly agree (= 5) to strongly disagree (= 1). Mean scores, standard deviations and t-test results were calculated from the responses. Within the five point ranges, three trisecting scores were used to make the analysis clear. These scores were 2.49, 3.49 and 4.49. Thus, teachers' performances on tasks with a mean value from 1.00 to 2.49 were low, from 2.5 to 3.49 were moderate, from 3.50 to 4.49 were high, and from 4.50 to 5.00 were very high. Open-ended questions were also analyzed to strengthen the close-ended ones separately. Besides, responses from the interview were used to validate the findings during the process of presentation and analysis of all data in each close-ended item as necessary.

Table 3: Teachers' and Students' Mean Scores on the Considerations in Choosing Methods of Teaching

Item	Respondent	N	Mean	Std.	MD	t	p
Teachers consider the age and maturity level of their students	Teachers	110	3.66	1.05	0.83	6.00	0.00
	Students	440	2.83	1.36			
Teachers recognize students' background knowledge and existing skills	Teachers	110	4.02	0.94	0.53	4.15	0.00
	Students	440	3.49	1.26			
Teachers consider content of the subject matter or the instruction	Teachers	110	4.63	0.52	0.59	5.89	0.00
	Students	440	4.04	1.02			
Teachers consider learning objectives or outcomes to be achieved	Teachers	110	4.71	0.50	0.78	7.19	0.00
	Students	440	3.93	1.11			
Average	Teachers	110	4.25	0.90	0.68	5.27	0.00
	Students	440	3.57	1.29			

Denotes significant at α =0.05 level, t-critical value (1.96) df= 548

It can be seen from Table 3 item 1 that teachers and students were asked to rate teachers' consideration of age and maturity level of students. The mean scores of the teacher and student respondents were 3.66 and 2.83 respectively, with mean difference of 0.83. The t-test result with p-value of 0.00 < 0.05 indicates that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. The t-value (6.00) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This shows that teachers have higher level of agreement to teachers' consideration of the age and maturity level of their students than the students who support moderate consideration. Similar to the student respondents, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans revealed that as they discuss with the students and teachers themselves on a meeting about the teaching learning process, teachers consider the age and maturity level of their students before choosing teaching methods.

The mean scores of the teacher and student respondents for the teachers' consideration of students' background knowledge and existing skills were 4.02 and 3.49 respectively with mean difference of 0.53. The t-test result with p-value of 0.00 < 0.05 indicates that there is statistically significant difference between both groups of respondents on the item. The t-value (4.15) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This indicates that teachers have higher level of agreement to the item than the students. That is, students' response indicates that teachers' consideration of the students' background knowledge and existing skills was moderate.

Similar to the teacher respondents, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans revealed that, as deans make a discussion with teachers, teachers consider their students' background knowledge and existing skills before choosing teaching methods. The mean scores of the teacher and student respondents for the teachers' consideration of the content of the subject matter or the instruction (item 3) were 4.63 and 4.04 respectively with a mean difference of 0.59. The t-test result with p of 0.00 < 0.05 shows that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. The t-value (5.89) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This indicates that teachers' level of agreement to the item was very high and that of the students was high.

Similarly, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans showed that, as they make a discussion with both teachers and students, teachers consider the content of the subject matter or the instruction before choosing teaching methods. Teachers and students were asked to rate on the teachers' consideration of the learning objectives or outcomes to be achieved (item 4). The mean scores of the teacher and student respondents were 4.71 and 3.93 respectively with mean difference of 0.78. The t-test result

with p of 0.00 < 0.05 shows that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. The t-value (7.19) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This reveals that teacher respondents' have a very high level agreement on teachers' consideration of learning objectives or outcomes to be achieved compared to the student respondents' average agreement which is near to the high level of agreement. Similarly, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans showed that teachers consider the learning objectives or outcomes to be achieved before choosing teaching methods. The evidence is deans make discussion with teachers on a meeting about students' learning. An overall consideration in choosing methods of teaching was computed by aggregating the responses of the six considerations in choosing methods of teaching items resulted in average mean scores of 4.25 and 3.57 by teachers and students respectively, with a mean difference of 0.68. This shows that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents (p-value of 0.00 < 0.05). The t-value (5.27) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the items. These results indicate that teachers have higher level of agreement to the items than the students. Students, if not as to the level of their teachers' agreement, do have above moderate level of agreement except the low level agreement (2.83) given to item 1 that their teachers consider the age and maturity level of their students.

Teachers were asked whether they were considering their teaching characteristics (such as their knowledge, skills, experiences, etc) before choosing teaching methods or not. Fourteen point five percent of teacher respondents replied that they did not consider their teaching characteristics such as their knowledge, skills, experiences, competencies, etc before choosing teaching methods. In contrast to this, 85.5% of them responded that teachers consider their teaching characteristics such as their knowledge, skills, experiences, competencies, etc before choosing teaching methods. One of the teacher respondents said:

Choosing teaching method depends on the experience, skill, competence, and knowledge of the teacher. I used to ask myself the following questions before embarking on an actual lesson delivery. How detail is my knowledge on this topic? Am I well read, skillful or experienced on this issues and tasks? How my previous teachers taught me?

This, therefore, indicates that teachers were considering their teaching characteristics such as their knowledge, skills, experiences, competencies, etc before choosing teaching methods that they are going to use to teach their students.

Teachers were also asked whether they were considering the time, space/class size, facility, and resources before choosing teaching methods or not. Twenty-five point five percent of the teacher respondents said that teachers did not consider the time, space/class size, facility, and resources before choosing teaching methods. One of the teacher respondents replied:
I do not consider these things at all. The reason behind this is that there are no adequate classes, facilities and resources. In this environment it is unthinkable, for me, to consider about these issues. Therefore, I merely teach my students by not considering these considerations.

Whereas 74.5% of the respondents replied that teachers were considering the time, space/class size, facilities and resources before choosing teaching methods to be employed. One of the teacher respondents said:

I consider these things as much as possible. For instance, I mostly prefer to use lecture method if there are no facilities of demonstration, if the time is too short, and if the class size is large. But I use other interactive methods (discussion method, for example), if class size is small and if there is adequate time for it. I also consider the available resources for teaching my students.
From this, one can understand that teachers were considering the time, space/class size, facilities and resources before choosing the teaching method they use or employ to teach their students even though few of them did not consider them.

Teachers' Methods of Teaching
This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents on the teachers' methods of teaching. The teachers' methods of teaching were presented to respondents through questionnaires that they were required to rate the level of accomplishment of the teachers on the basis of a five point Likert scale. These five point scales range from strongly agree (= 5) to strongly disagree (= 1). Mean scores, standard deviations and t-test results were calculated from the responses. Within the five point ranges, three trisecting scores were taken to make the analysis clear. These scores were 2.49, 3.49 and 4.49. Thus, teachers' performances on tasks with a mean value from 1.00 to 2.49 were low, from 2.5 to 3.49 were moderate, from 3.50 to 4.49 were high, and from 4.50 to 5.00 were very high. Open-ended questions were also analyzed to strengthen the close-ended ones separately. Besides, responses from the interview were summarized to validate the findings during the process of presentation and analysis of all data in each close-ended item as necessary.

To assess teachers' method of teaching both respondent groups were asked to give their ratings regarding eleven (11) methods of teaching items as presented in table 6 below. In this table, the average agreement level given by the two respondent groups regarding each item is computed and presented with statistical t-test results.

Table 4: Teachers' and Students' Mean Scores on the Teachers' Methods of Teaching

Item	Respondent	N	Mean	Std.	MD	t	p
Teachers teach large number of students at a time	Teachers	110	3.68	1.26	0.29	2.06	0.04
	Students	440	3.39	1.35			
Teachers create learners' interest, enthusiasm and appreciation	Teachers	110	4.04	0.79	0.32	2.69	0.01
	Students	440	3.72	1.18			
Teachers encourage students' participation/involvement and success in their learning	Teachers	110	4.58	0.68	0.56	5.38	0.00
	Students	440	4.03	1.03			
Teachers provide students with demonstrations to make them good observers	Teachers	110	3.76	1.08	-0.07	-0.61	0.54
	Students	440	3.84	1.13			
Teachers enhance students' critical thinking and skills of scientific investigation	Teachers	110	4.05	0.81	0.00	0.00	1.00
	Students	440	4.05	1.09			
Teachers support/help their students to learn how to discover and organize things	Teachers	110	4.18	0.79	0.47	3.82	0.00
	Students	440	3.71	1.23			
Teachers use textbooks, handouts & other printed materials to teach their students	Teachers	110	4.26	0.75	0.27	2.25	0.03
	Students	440	4.00	1.19			
Teachers use audiotapes, videotapes, slides, photographs, models, practical kits & tools in their classroom	Teachers	110	2.27	1.19	0.19	1.37	0.17
	Students	440	2.08	1.33			
Teachers use multimedia such as text, graphics, motion, sound, images, animations & digital video while teaching	Teachers	110	2.29	1.21	0.25	1.72	0.09
	Students	440	2.05	1.37			
Teachers give individual assignments and projects to their students	Teachers	110	4.33	0.80	0.29	2.57	0.01
	Students	440	4.04	1.12			
Teachers encourage their students to develop group learning skills (discussion and interpersonal skills)	Teachers	110	4.28	0.80	0.34	2.87	0.00
	Students	440	3.95	1.16			
Average	Teachers	110	3.79	1.21	0.26	1.81	0.07
	Students	440	3.53	1.40			

Denotes significant at α0.05 level, t-critical value (1.96) df= 548

From the data in Table 4 item1, the mean scores of teacher and student respondents were 3.68 and 3.39, with mean difference of 0.29. The t-test result with p-value of 0.04 < 0.05 indicates that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their average agreement towards the item. In the same way, the calculated t-value (2.06) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) confirms that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This shows that teachers' teaching of large number of students at a time was high to teacher respondents and was moderate to student respondents. Similarly, the data obtained from interviews made with faculty deans revealed that teachers teach large number of students at a time. As it is indicated on item 2 in Table 4, the computed mean scores of teachers and students on teachers' way of teaching creates learners' interest, enthusiasm and appreciation were 4.04 and 3.72 respectively, with mean difference of 0.32. The t-test result with p-value of 0.01 < 0.05 indicates that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents towards the item. In the same way, the calculated t-value (2.69) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) confirms that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This indicates, even though the responses of both groups of respondents was high teachers' level of agreement to the item was higher than that of the students.

Similarly, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans reveals that teachers were creating their students' interest, enthusiasm and appreciation for the betterment of their students' learning. As indicated in Table 4 item 3, the respondents' agreement or disagreement to the extent to which teachers encourage students' participation or involvement and success in their learning was considered. Hence, the mean scores of the teacher and student respondents were 4.58 and 4.03 respectively, with mean difference of 0.56. The t-test result with p-value of 0.00 < 0.05 indicates that the two groups of respondents do significantly vary in their average agreement towards the item. In the same way, the calculated t-value (5.38) which is greater than the t-critical value

(1.96) confirms that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This reveals that teachers' encouragement of students' participation or involvement and success in their learning was very high to teacher respondents and was high to student respondents. Supporting this, Biggs (1996) and Kember (1996) have stated that students will learn more when they are actively engaged in the teaching learning process. Similar to this, Blake (2006:3) also states that students' active involvement and interaction facilitate their learning.

Regarding item 4 in Table 4, the mean scores of both the teachers and students were 3.76 and 3.84 respectively, with mean difference of 0.07. The t-test result with p-value of 0.54 > 0.05 indicates that both groups of respondents do not significantly differ in their average agreement towards the teachers' provision of the students with demonstrations which make them good observers. Similarly, the calculated t-value (0.61) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This confirms that teachers' provision of the students with demonstrations which make them good observers was high.

In the same Table item 5, the calculated mean scores of the two groups of respondents were 4.05 and 4.05 respectively, with mean difference of 0.00. Therefore, the t-test result with p-value of 1.00 > 0.05 proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. In the same way, the calculated t-value (0.00) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This shows that the teachers' way of teaching in enhancing critical thinking and skills of scientific investigation was equally high which indicate teachers enhance learners' critical thinking and skills of scientific investigation.

With regard to item 6 in Table 4, the mean scores of the teacher and student respondents were 4.18 and 3.71 respectively, with mean difference of 0.47. For the purpose of comparing the average level of agreement of the two groups of respondents, an independent sample t-test was computed. To this end, the t-test result with p-value of 0.00 < 0.05 indicates that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents in their average rating of the item. Similarly, the t-value (3.82) is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) implying that there is statistically significant difference in perception of rating this task between the teachers and the students. This shows that teachers' support or help of their students to learn how to discover and organize things was high even though the degree of agreement by the teachers is higher than that of the students.

As it was depicted in Table 4 item 7, the mean scores of the two groups of respondents were 4.26 and 4.00 respectively, with mean difference of 0.27. The t-test result with p-value of 0.03 < 0.05 shows that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in their ratings towards the item. The t-value (2.25) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) similarly proves that the respondents do have a significant difference in perception of rating the task. This indicates that teachers' use of textbooks, handouts and other printed materials to teach their students was high even though the degree of agreement by the teachers is higher than that of the students.

Concerning item 8 in Table 4, the mean scores of the teachers and the students were 2.27 and 2.08 respectively, with mean difference of 0.19. The computed t-test result with p-value of 0.17 > 0.05 shows that the teacher respondents and student respondents do not significantly differ in their average ratings. This can also be proved by the t-value (1.37) which is less than the t- critical value (1.96). This clearly showed that the teachers' use of audiotapes, videotapes, slide sequences, photographs, models, practical kits and tools in their classroom was low.

Similarly, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans showed that teachers did not use audiotapes, videotapes, slide sequences, photographs, models, practical kits, and tools while teaching their students. Similarly, as depicted in Table 4 item 9, the calculated mean value of the teachers and the students were 2.29 and 2.05, with mean difference of 0.25. The t-test result with p-value of 0.09 > 0.05 proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in their ratings towards the item. The t-value (1.72) which is less than the t- critical value (1.96) similarly proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This revealed that the teachers' use of multimedia such as text, graphics, motion, sound, images, animations, and digital video while teaching their students was low.

Similarly, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans showed that teachers did not use multimedia such as text, graphics, motion, sound, images, animations, etc for the teaching activities. Table 4item 10 depicts that the mean scores of both groups of respondents were 4.33 and 4.04, with mean difference of 0.29. When we compare the scores of the two groups of respondents with a t-test p-value of 0.01 < 0.05, it can be concluded that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. In the same way, the t-test value (2.57) is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proving that both groups of respondents do significantly differ in their average ratings. This revealed that teachers' provision or giving of individual assignments and projects to their students was high even though the teacher respondents have relatively higher level of agreement to the item than the student respondents. In the same way, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans revealed that teachers were giving individual assignments and projects to their students. As it is indicated in table 4 item 11 the mean scores of the teachers 4.28 and the mean scores of the students 3.95, with a mean difference of 0.37, reveals that teachers' encouragement of their students to develop group learning skills such as discussion and interpersonal skills was high. This indicates

that, even though both groups of respondents have high level of agreement to the item teacher respondents have relatively higher level of agreement to the item than the student respondents. The t-test result with p-value of 0.00 < 0.05 indicates that the two groups of respondents do significantly differ in their average ratings towards the item. The t-value (2.87) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.
An overall teachers' methods of teaching was computed by aggregating the responses of the eleven teachers' methods of teaching items resulted with an average mean scores of 3.79 and 3.53 by the teacher and student respondents respectively, with mean difference of 0.26. The two groups of respondents have no statistically significant difference (p-value of 0.07 > 0.05) in the computed average agreement for the teachers' methods of teaching items. Both groups of respondents tend to have high level agreement to all teachers' methods of teaching items with the exception of item 8 in which the mean scores of teachers and students were 2.27 and 2.08, and item 9 in which the mean scores of teachers and students were 2.29 and 2.05.

Rank Analysis
Teachers and students presented to rank in order seven teaching methods from 1st to 7th for the most to the least employed method of teaching by teachers. The table below presents the number of respondents rated each method of teaching in rank from the most employed to the least employed. The weighted average rank by each group of respondent is computed for each method of teaching. The weighted average rank is then used to generate the RANK for each method by each of the respondent groups.

Table 5: The rank of seven methods of teaching as per their employment in the classroom

Teaching Methods	Respondents	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Rank 5	Rank 6	Rank 7	Rank Avg.	RANK
Lecture	Teachers	90	11	2	0	1	4	2	1.46	1
	Students	314	38	25	15	16	6	26	1.87	1
Demonstration	Teachers	5	15	21	29	16	20	5	4.05	3
	Students	23	46	47	190	46	40	48	4.14	4
Inquiry	Teachers	0	9	16	17	24	24	20	4.89	5
	Students	5	27	37	62	91	151	67	5.11	7
Discovery	Teachers	0	4	12	13	24	35	22	5.27	6
	Students	4	33	37	36	131	133	66	5.09	6
Laboratory	Teachers	2	5	7	13	20	15	48	5.55	7
	Students	42	30	39	42	82	51	154	4.96	5
Individualized	Teachers	4	7	36	26	15	10	12	4.08	4
	Students	26	82	188	57	41	30	16	3.36	3
Discussion	Teachers	10	61	15	12	9	1	2	2.64	2
	Students	40	176	84	47	41	29	23	3.12	2

Lecture method was found to be ranked as the 1st mostly employed method of teaching by both teacher and student respondents. This method was rated as rank 1 by 90 of the teacher respondents and 314 of the student respondents. Teachers and students also have similar rank to the discussion method as the 2nd most employed teaching method in favor of the majority of teachers (61) and the majority of students (176). Supporting this, McKimm and Jollie (2007) note that lecture method is the most widely used teaching method in Higher Education Institutions. In the same way, Sajjad (2004) state lecture method is the most commonly used teaching method by many teachers of higher education.

For the 3rd most employed teaching method, teachers' rating identifies demonstration while students' ranking indentifies individualized method. Teachers' and students' ranking for the 3rd and 4th place was found to be interchangeable. That is, teacher respondents ranked demonstration method as the 3rd and individualized method as the 4th method employed whereas student respondents ranked individualized method as the 3rd and demonstration as the 4th employed method of teaching.

Inquiry method is placed as the 5th by teachers whereas it is 7th according to the student respondents ranking. Laboratory method is ranked 7th by the teacher respondents and the 5th by the student respondents. However, both respondent groups placed discovery method as the 6th employed method of teaching.

In order to see the congruence and consistence of the two groups of respondents' ranking, the rank correlation was computed and tested for its significance. The resulting rank correlation, r = 0.821, is a significant correlation with corresponding p-value of 0.023 < 0.05. This result shows the similarity, if not identical, of the ranks given to each method of teaching by teachers and students. Therefore, it can be inferred that there is high correlation between the rankings of the two groups of respondents. Similarly, the data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans shows that lecture method is the most commonly employed method of teaching by teachers at Samara University. Next to the lecture method, discussion and individualized methods are also most commonly employed by teachers at the University. In addition, demonstration, inquiry, discovery and laboratory methods of teaching

are sometimes employed by teachers. Teachers and students were asked how teachers use the aforementioned methods of teaching to address the different needs of students. Thirty point nine percent of the teacher respondents replied teachers did not know whether the teaching methods they employ or use addresses the needs of their students or not whereas 69.1% of them responded that teachers use the aforementioned methods of teaching to address the different needs of their students depending on the situation, the availability of teaching materials and resources, the nature of the course (the subject matter,) the topic to be delivered, objectives of the lesson, daily lessons, and the number of students within a class. One of the teacher respondents said:

I use different teaching methods as frequently as the subject matter requires in addressing the needs of my students. For instance, I give group projects, assignments and presentations whenever there is a need to do that. I use debate whenever the content is a debating issue. I also use demonstration method whenever the content is more of practical. If it is laboratory class I use laboratory method. I also use different teaching methods by identifying my students' background knowledge, prior experience, communication skills, their number within a class, and even environmental conditions for classroom arrangement.

Besides this, 22% of the student respondents responded that teachers did not address their different needs by using different methods of teaching while the rest 80% of them responded that teachers were addressing the different needs of their students as much as possible by using different teaching methods depending on the availability of teaching materials and resources, the nature of the course/content, the topic to be delivered, objectives of the lesson, and the number of students within a class. One of the student respondents said:

It depends on the content of the subject matter and the resources for teaching. For example, if the content is more of theoretical aspect the teacher uses the lecture method. If the content is more of practical aspect the teacher uses demonstration or laboratory methods. If the content needs students' collaboration the teacher uses discussion, debate and other methods relevant to the content. This could be done by knowing the understanding level of students and their prior experiences or backgrounds.

Therefore, this indicates that teachers were employing different teaching methods to address the different needs of their students depending on the availability of teaching materials and resources, the nature of the course/content, the topic to be delivered, objectives of the lesson, and the number of students within a class. Supporting this, Firdissa (2005:51) state that effectiveness in learning depends upon a teacher's ability to select and use the appropriate teaching strategy at the appropriate time.

Teachers and students were also asked whether teachers' were encouraging students to interact with each other in the learning activities or not. From the teacher respondents, 7.3% of them responded that teachers did not encourage their students to interact with each other in the learning activities whereas 92.7% of them responded that teachers were encouraging their students to interact with each other in the learning activities by giving group work/project, group discussion activities, group assignments and presentations, raising debating issues, using question and answer.

I encourage my students' interaction with each other by giving group discussion activities, question and answer, group assignments and presentations, debate, group and pair works, etc. For instance, I group students to discuss on a certain issue. I tell them to select a leader from each group. I give time for discussion. Finally, the leaders from each group are required to reflect on what they have discussed with their group members.

With regard to this, 9.8% of the student respondents replied that teachers did not encourage their students to interact with each other in the learning activities. One of the student respondents said that "our teachers did not encourage student interaction with each other even they did not appreciate it." The rest of the respondents (90.2%) responded that teachers were encouraging their students to interact with each other in the learning activities by using group discussion, projects, assignments, presentations, question and answer, debate, field trip, and worksheets.

Therefore, one can understand from this that teachers were encouraging their students to interact with each other in the learning activities using different mechanisms such as group discussion, question and answer, group projects, group assignments, group presentations, field trips, work sheets, and debate.

Major Findings

The following are the major findings of the study:

With regard to the considerations in choosing teaching methods, the teacher and student respondents showed agreement with their average mean values 4.25 and 3.57 respectively that teachers were considering those considerations in choosing methods of teaching before choosing them. The data revealed that there was statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents with t-value (5.27) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) at $\alpha = 0.05$. Concerning the teachers' consideration of their teaching characteristics (such as their knowledge, competencies, skills, experiences, etc), 85.5% of the teacher respondents replied that teachers were considering their teaching characteristics before choosing teaching methods. Equally, 74.5% of the teacher respondents indicated that teachers were considering the time, space/class size, facilities and resources before choosing teaching methods to be employed.

With respect to the teachers' methods of teaching, the teacher and student respondents with their average mean values 3.79 and 3.53 respectively revealed that they had higher level of agreement on teachers' methods of teaching items with the exception of item 8 in which the mean scores of teachers and students were 2.27 and 2.08, and item 9 in which the mean scores of teachers and students were 2.29 and 2.05. The data showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents with t-value (1.81) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) at $\alpha = 0.05$.

With regard to the teaching methods employed, lecture method was found to be the most commonly employed method as reported by both groups of the respondents. Discussion method was the second most commonly employed method of teaching as to the respondents. In addition, individualized and demonstration methods were employed as the third and fourth by the student respondents and vice versa by the teacher respondents. Inquiry, discovery and laboratory methods were also employed by teachers sometimes. Therefore, in order to see the congruence and consistency of the two groups of respondents' ranking, the rank correlation was computed and tested for its significance. The resulting rank correlation, $r = 0.821$, was a significant correlation with corresponding p-value of $0.023 < 0.05$. Similarly, the data obtained from the interview revealed that lecture method was the most commonly employed method of teaching. Discussion, individualized, and demonstration methods were also employed most commonly next to the lecture method.

Furthermore, 69.1% of the teacher respondents replied that teachers were using the aforementioned methods of teaching to address the different needs of their students depending on the availability of teaching materials/resources, the nature of the course/ subject matter, the topic to be delivered, objectives of the lesson, and the number of students within a class. Regarding this, 80% of the student respondents replied that teachers were using those methods of teaching to address the different needs of their students depending on the content of the subject matter and the resources available for teaching.

As to the teachers' encouragement of their students to interact with each other in the learning activities, 92.7% of the teacher respondents replied that teachers were encouraging their students to interact with each other in the learning activities by giving group work/project, group discussion, group assignments and presentations, raising debating issues, using questions and answers. Besides this, 90.2% of the student respondents said that teachers were encouraging their students to interact with each other in the learning activities by using group discussion, projects, assignments, presentations, questions and answers, debate, field trip, and worksheets.

Conclusion

Based on the major findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

With respect to the teachers' methods of teaching, teachers' teaching of large number of students at a time; creating learners' interest, enthusiasm and appreciation; and encouraging students' participation or involvement and success in their learning were high. The provision of the students with demonstrations which make them good observers, and teachers' way of teaching in enhancing critical thinking and skills of scientific investigation were also high. Teachers were highly supporting their students to learn how to discover and organize things, and using textbooks, handouts and other printed materials to teach their students. They were also highly providing or giving individual assignments and projects to their students, and encouraging their students to develop group learning skills such as discussion and interpersonal skills. This indicates that teachers were effective in helping their students to learn and understand the content.

Teachers' use of mediated materials such as audiotapes, videotapes, slide sequences, photographs, models, practical kits and tools in their classroom, and multimedia such as text, graphics, motion, sound, images, animations, and digital video while teaching their students was low. This shows that the absence of mediated materials and multimedia in teaching reduces the understanding, quality learning and retention capacity of the students.

With regard to the teaching methods employed, lecture, discussion, individualized and demonstration methods were found to be the most commonly employed methods of teaching as compared to the others (inquiry, discovery and laboratory methods). Teachers were using the aforementioned methods of teaching to address the different needs of their students depending on the availability of teaching materials/resources, the nature of the course and content/subject matter, the topic to be delivered, the objectives of the lesson, and the number of students within a class. This reveals that teachers use different methods of teaching to address the different needs of their students depending on different aspects of the instruction.

References

AzebDesta (1984). Elements of General Methods of Teaching (Knowledge and Competencies for Teachers). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.U. (1989).Research in Education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing Teaching through Constructive Alignment.Journal of Higher Education, 32(3), 347-364.
Blake, D. (2006). Teachers for a New Era. New York: Northridge.
Cresswell, J.W. (2003). Research Design, Quantitative and Mixed Approaches. (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publishing Inc.

Daniel Desta (2004). Observation and Reflection of the Higher Education Teachers on the quality of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education in Ethiopia, the Ethiopia Journal of Education, Vol. 1, pp. 63-81.
FirdissaJebessa (2005). Active Learning Versus the Traditional Lecture Methods of Teaching at Higher Education Institutions. The Ethiopian Journal of Education, 25(1), 49-77.
FirdissaJebessa (2009). Teachers' Roles in Quality Management Systems at Universities. Dialogue ውይይት 4th Series Vol. 1, Oct. 2009, pp. 15-35.
Kember, D. (1996). The Intention to Both Memorize and Understand: Another Approach to Learning? Journal of Higher Education, 31(3), 341-354.
Koul, L. (2008). Methodology of Educational Research. (3rded.). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Agency.
Koul, L. (1996). Methodology of Educational Research.New Delhi; Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
McKimm, J. and Jollie, C. (2007).Facilitating Learning: Teaching and Learning Methods. London: Imperial College Printing Press.
Rao, V. K. (2003). Quality Education. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.
Sajjad, S. (2004).Effective Teaching Methods at Higher Education Level. Pakistan: Karachi University Printing Press.