Full Length Research Paper

Implication of Method of Teaching for quality of Learning: A Case Study of Samara University, Afar Region, Ethiopia

Anbesaa Bekele Nora

Samara University, Samara, Afar Region, Ethiopia

Abstract
The main purpose of this study was to assess methods of teaching and their implications for quality of student learning. 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. 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. It was noted that teachers were not allowing their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work. Regarding quality indicators, teachers' use of various teaching methods, the existence of academic staff-to-student ratio and the relevance of the curricula to students' learning were moderate. Teachers were assessing the performances of their students using continuous and summative assessment methods. This implies that there is good quality of student learning even though there are some problems to be solved. 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, quality of learning

Introduction
Teaching encompasses course design, course management and methods of face-to-face teaching, provision of other learning opportunities, assessment and feedback to students. It is concerned with providing students with opportunities to learn. It is an intentional activity and an interactive process involving teachers, students, tasks and the process by which the teacher imparts knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the students (Ellis, 1995: 213). Teaching is the action of a person imparting knowledge, skill or giving instruction; or the job of a person who teaches using the appropriate methods. MoE (1999:4) note that teaching is an attempt to assist students in acquiring or changing some skills, knowledge, ideal, attitude, or appreciation. Therefore, teaching is a set of processes and procedures used by the teacher to emphasize on aspects of student's development such as physical, spiritual, emotional, social, and cognitive aspects. Fry, Ketteridge, and Marshall, (2003:26) have also noted that teaching involves helping students to know something not known before, and constitutes a process of change. Therefore, teaching is a process of facilitating student learning.

Supporting this, Azeb (1984:74) states that teaching is an act of providing, directing, checking and following-up activities to facilitate formal or informal learning. It is a collection of practical activities aimed at bringing about learning or understanding. To her, teaching is not dictating, ruling, conditioning, forcing, indoctrinating or taming. Instead, it aims at bringing about learning and is practiced in such a way that it takes into consideration the student's intellectual capacity and ability for independent judgment.

Therefore, teaching is the interaction of the teacher with a group or individual students using different methods of teaching appropriate to the content to be delivered which has a positive implication for quality of student learning. It is a process by which both teachers and students establish a shared environment of values, beliefs, knowledge and appreciation that have impact on their perception of what is real. Teaching becomes effective if teachers develop and use different methods of teaching which are appropriate to the content to be delivered. The development of methods of teaching has been traced back to ancient Greece. The most long-lived and widespread set of teaching methods are those associated with the study of language and literature MOE (1999:62). Ancient teaching

methods emphasized memorization and analogical reasoning, a form of reasoning in which one thing is inferred to be similar to another thing in a certain respect, on the basis of the known similarity between the things in other respects MOE (1999:62). According to Biadgelign (2010:99), methods of teaching are general means, manners, ways, procedures, or steps by which a particular order is imposed upon teaching or presentation of activities. Methods of teaching also signify a constellation of systematic arrangements and techniques cast to fit curricular elements consisting of educational goals, objectives and outcomes in line with the maturity and readiness level of students.

Hence, it includes procedures, instructional devices, and direction of instructions intentionally selected to help the teacher to achieve the intended teaching and learning objectives (Obanya, Shabani and Okebukela, 1996:17). In clearer terms, methods of teaching refer to construction of how teaching ought to be done to bring quality of student learning which requires the capacity and commitment of the teacher. It is also a purposeful pedagogical organization of activities and implementing them according to certain rules in order to make learners reach at specified objectives. Supporting this, Biadgelign (2010:99) notes that teaching methods may be viewed as a series of discrete steps that the teacher uses or takes so as to achieve the predetermined objectives.

Therefore, the quality of teaching is determined by the quality of student learning as the teacher uses appropriate and relevant methods of teaching. This is because it does not only affect students' performance but also the community in particular and the society at large. Learners should pass through effective teaching to serve the society as intended. This can be achieved or mastered if the teacher uses the teaching methods that suit to the content of the instruction and if problems related to quality are solved. It is stated in the ministry of education (MoE) that the main objective of the teaching-learning process in our country is to create problem solving citizens (MoE, 1994:7). One of the measures by which this quality is assured is through employing appropriate teaching methods.

To play this role, the quality of teachers is then a must to be attained. That is, they need to consider the following basic things before starting to teach their students. They include stated instructional objectives, content of the instruction, characteristics of teachers and learners, and specific conditions of the instruction that can play a great role in the teaching method selection/choice. These factors might affect the quality of students' learning in many ways if not appropriately considered by the teachers. 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 tries to answer the following basic questions:
1. What are the implications of the teaching methods used for quality of student learning?
2. What are the mechanisms being employed by teachers and faculty deans to ensure quality of student learning?

Objectives of the study
The study attempts to:
1. Identify the implications of the teaching methods used for quality of student learning.
2. Identify the mechanisms being employed by managers and teachers to ensure quality of student learning.

Materials and methods
Sample Site
The study was conducted at Samara University, Afar Regional State, Ethiopia.

Sample Design
Simple random sampling design was used to select a sample from the total population (teachers and students) for the study. In addition to this, availability sampling design was also used to collect data from faculty deans.

Sample 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 and their implications for quality of student learning 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 and their implications for quality of student learning 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.

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.

Analysis of the Data
Effectiveness of Teachers' Teaching Practices
This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents on the effectiveness of teachers' day-to-day teaching practice. The effectiveness of teachers' day-to-day teaching practice was presented to respondents through questionnaires that they were required to rate the level of teachers' accomplishment 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 their teaching practices based on the responses of the respondents 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.

It can be seen from Table 2 item 1 that, teachers and students were asked to give their agreement or disagreement regarding teachers' knowledge of each of their students by names. The mean score of teacher respondents is 3.10 and that of the student respondents is 3.01, with mean difference of 0.09. The t-test result with p-value 0.49 > 0.05 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. Similarly, the t-value (0.70) which is less than the t-critical (1.96)

proves that the two groups of respondents do not significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This shows that teachers' knowledge of each of their students by their names was moderate.

Regarding item 2 in the same Table, teachers' arrangement of consultation hours to their students was also rated by each group of the respondents. The mean scores of the teacher and student respondents were 3.85 and 3.58 respectively, with mean difference of 0.27. The t-test result with p-value 0.05 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. Similarly, the t-value (1.97) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents do not significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This, therefore, shows that the arrangement of consultation hours by teachers to their students was high. In the same way, the data obtained from interviews shows that teachers arrange consultation hours to their students.

Table 2: Teachers' and Students' Mean Scores on the Effectiveness of Teachers' Teaching Practices

Item	Respondent	N	Mean	Std.	MD	t	p
1. Teachers know each of their students by their names	Teachers	110	3.10	1.03	0.09	0.70	0.49
	Students	440	3.01	1.23			
2. Teachers arrange consultation hours for their students	Teachers	110	3.85	1.20	0.27	1.97	0.05
	Students	440	3.58	1.30			
3. Teachers use examples, illustrations and demonstrations to explain and clarify lessons	Teachers	110	4.19	0.91	0.35	2.97	0.00
	Students	440	3.84	1.15			
4. Teachers inform their students the lesson objectives	Teachers	110	4.25	0.99	0.17	1.41	0.16
	Students	440	4.09	1.13			
5. Teachers give a summary at the end of each lesson	Teachers	110	4.06	1.10	0.80	5.72	0.00
	Students	440	3.26	1.36			
6. Teachers use attention gaining activities, ideas, concepts and devices while teaching their students	Teachers	110	4.12	0.88	0.39	3.23	0.00
	Students	440	3.73	1.18			
	Teachers	110	3.93	1.09	0.34	2.59	0.01
Average	Students	440	3.59	1.28			

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

As to the use of examples, illustrations and demonstrations by teachers to explain and clarify the lessons or contents they teach, Table 2 item 3 depicts that the teachers' and students' mean scores were 4.19 and 3.84 respectively, with mean difference of 0.35. The t-test result with p-value of $0.00 < 0.05$ proves that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. The t-value (2.97) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) shows that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This shows that teachers' use of examples, illustrations and demonstrations to explain and clarify the lessons or contents they teach was high even though the level of agreement by the teacher respondents was greater than that of the student respondents.

Similarly, the data obtained from faculty deans reveals that teachers use examples, illustrations and demonstrations to explain and clarify the lesson or contents they teach. Regarding this, Gurney (2007:1) state that effective teacher is the one who engages with the students in the class by using examples and demonstrations in a way that highlights mutual respect and an acknowledgement of the learning process that is taking place.

With regard to item 4 in the same Table above, the mean scores of teachers and students were 4.25 and 4.09, with mean difference of 0.17. The t-test result with p-value of $0.16 > 0.05$ indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. The calculated t-value (1.41) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) proves that the two groups of respondents do not significantly differ in their agreement on the item. That is both groups agree that the teachers mostly communicate the lesson objectives to their students. This, therefore, reveals that teachers' informing of the lesson objectives to their students was high.

Similarly, the data collected from the faculty deans through interview showed that as they arrange meeting time to discuss about the effectiveness of the teaching learning with the students, teachers inform their students the lesson objectives they are expected to achieve at the end of the lesson for better learning. It can be seen from Table 2 item 5 that, teachers and students were asked to give their agreement or disagreement regarding teachers' giving of summary at the end of each lesson. The mean scores of the teacher respondents and student respondents were 4.06 and 3.26 respectively, with mean difference of 0.80. The t-test result with p-value of $0.00 < 0.05$ shows that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents towards the item. The calculated t-value (5.72) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This indicates that teachers have higher level of agreement and students have moderate level of agreement to the item. The data obtained from the interview shows that teachers give summary at the end of each lesson. With regard to item 6 in the same Table, the mean scores of teacher and student respondents were 4.12 and 3.73, with mean

difference of 0.39. 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 (3.23) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that the two groups of respondents significantly differ in their agreement on the item. This shows that teachers' use of attention gaining activities, ideas, concepts, and devices was high even though teachers have higher level of agreement to the item than the students.

An overall effectiveness of teachers' teaching practices computed by aggregating the responses of the six effectiveness items resulted in average mean scores of 3.93 and 3.59 by teachers and students respectively with mean difference of 0.34. This indicates that, there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents (p-value of 0.01 < 0.05) in the computed average agreement for the overall effectiveness of teachers' teaching practices. The t-value (2.59) 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 both groups of respondents tend to have high level of agreement to the overall effectiveness of teachers' teaching practices even though teacher respondents have higher level agreement to the item.

Teachers and students were asked to give their responses whether teachers use rewards and reinforcers (such as verbal praise, extra credit, etc) to motivate their students who are performing very well or not. Eight point two percent of the teacher respondents responded that they did not use rewards and reinforcers to motivate their students who are performing very well whereas 91.8% of the teacher respondents replied that they use rewards like verbal praises and extra marks or bonuses to motivate their students. One of the teacher respondents replied:

> I usually use words like 'excellent', 'keep it up', 'exactly', 'very good', 'good', 'you are right', 'definitely', 'absolutely', etc to either approve or express appreciation or motivation. I tell them success stories. I also give pen, books, exercise books, bonus marks, etc to my students who are performing well.

Nineteen point five percent of the student respondents replied that teachers did not use rewards and reinforcers in motivating their students whereas the rest of the respondents (80.5%) said that they used rewards and reinforcers particularly verbal praises in motivating their students' performances. One of the respondents replied:

> Teachers use rewards (verbal praises) and say 'excellent', 'keep it up', 'very good', 'very nice', 'good', 'thank you', and etc when, for example, we respond to questions correctly. They also reward us by giving pens, exercise books, books, marks, etc to motivate us whenever we perform well.

Therefore, from this it can be understood that teachers were using rewards and reinforcers particularly verbal praises and extra credits to motivate their students who are performing very well in their learning.

Teachers and students were asked to give their responses whether teachers were creating situations in which appropriate learning was taking place or not. Thirteen point six percent of the teacher respondents did not create situations in which appropriate learning was taking place while the rest 86.4% of them were creating situations in which appropriate learning was taking place by maintaining good relationship with students, respecting them, helping them in their learning, arranging their sitting and appropriate time of teaching, making resources available, objectives clear and wise use of the allocated time, preparing course outline and lesson plans, guiding them, employing the appropriate method of teaching, identifying their backgrounds, giving freedom of asking and participation, avoiding disturbances during the time of teaching, etc. One of the teacher respondents said:

> I believe that in order to have a better teaching learning process, the relationship between the teachers and the students is crucial. So, I usually try to maintain a good relationship with my students, I respect them genuinely, I try to listen and solve their problems, and I also try to understand their concerns as much as possible. I used to re-arrange the sitting arrangements of students, and make them feel comfortable (physically and emotionally). I also make the resources available, the objectives clear, and use the allocated time wisely and appropriately.

Another teacher respondent also replied:

> As you know, in this University, there is hardship related to the environmental conditions. That is, there is high temperature. As a result, it is difficult to teach in the mid-day especially from 12:00 to 4:00 pm. Therefore, I arrange appropriate time for teaching my students in the morning either before 12:00 pm or at the evening after 4:00 pm. I also arrange make-up and tutorial classes to help them learn. I did not teach my students when there is no light for ventilation service.

Some student respondents (33.2%) replied that teachers did not create situations in which appropriate learning was taking place. One of the student respondents said that "I did not see a teacher who creates this kind of situation for our learning." In contrast to this, 66.8% of them replied that teachers were creating situations in which appropriate learning was taking place by establishing good rapport, using method of teaching appropriate to the content, providing the necessary materials, adjusting the class time and avoiding disturbances. One of the student respondents said:

> Most of our teachers make the teaching-learning process favorable or conducive by changing the time which is not suitable for appropriate learning to take place. As it is known, the temperature is too hot particularly between 12:00 pm to 3:30 pm which is very challenging to our learning. As a result of this, our teachers shift the time either to the

morning or to the evening when the temperature becomes relatively moderate. If there is no light they arrange a make-up class for ventilation purposes. If the situation is not comfortable or there is disturbance around, our teachers avoid the disturbances or find other classes to make the learning situation conducive and interesting.

This, therefore, indicates that teachers were creating situations in which appropriate learning was taking place. That is, they were doing their best as much as possible in making the teaching learning process conducive, effective, efficient, and attractive to their students.

Teachers and students were also asked to give their responses whether teachers ask their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work or not. Eighty-nine point one percent of the teacher respondents replied that they did not ask their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work whereas 10.9% of them replied that they "sometimes/as needed" allow their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work. One of the teacher respondents said that:

For me feedback is the breakfast of champions. This is my principle and I sometimes encourage my students to give valuable feedback on other students' work orally in the class. When some issues arise from one student, I give a chance of answering to other students. Then, I sometimes let other students comment on those answers given by other students.

Eighty-two point three percent of the student respondents said that teachers did not ask their students to give constructive feedback on each other's work. One of the student respondents replied that "I didn't see such like activity up to now instead they themselves give feedback or comments on the works of students rather than giving the opportunity to other students to give feedback on other students' work." In contrast to this, 17.7% of them reported that teachers sometimes ask or allow their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work.

Therefore, one can understand that teachers did not ask or allow their students to give constructive feedback on each other's work or performances especially in the classroom when questions arise.

Quality Indicators of Student Learning
This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents on the quality indicators of student learning. The quality indicators of student learning 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.

Table 3: Teachers' and Students' Mean Scores on the Quality Indicators of Student Learning

Item	Respondent	N	Mean	Std.	MD	t	p
1. Teachers use various teaching methods to teach students	Teachers	110	3.39	1.07	0.16	1.21	0.23
	Students	440	3.23	1.31			
2. There is good academic staff-to- student ratio	Teachers	110	3.06	1.21	-0.09	-0.67	0.51
	Students	440	3.15	1.29			
3. The curricula are relevant to students' learning	Teachers	110	3.30	1.17	0.00	0.02	0.99
	Students	440	3.30	1.18			
4. Students acquire necessary skills and knowledge as a result of their learning	Teachers	110	3.59	0.93	0.10	0.83	0.41
	Students	440	3.49	1.21			
5. There is a good leadership and management system that facilitate student learning	Teachers	110	2.15	1.16	-0.47	-3.33	0.00
	Students	440	2.61	1.35			
6. Learning is highly integrated with the use of technologies	Teachers	110	1.96	1.30	-0.09	-0.66	0.51
	Students	440	2.05	1.25			
Average	Teachers	110	2.91	1.31	-0.06	-0.44	0.66
	Students	440	2.97	1.36			

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

It can be seen from Table 3 item 1 that, teachers and students were asked to give their agreement or disagreement regarding the teachers' use of various teaching methods to teach their students. The mean scores of the teacher respondents 3.39 and that of the student respondents 3.23, with the resulting mean difference of 0.16, is tested for its significance beyond zero. The test result with t-

value= 1.21 and p-value of 0.23 > 0.05 shows that the mean difference is not significantly different from zero. This indicates that, the average agreement levels by teachers and students have no statistically significant difference to one another. That is, teachers' use of various teaching methods to teach students was moderate. Derebssa (undated:1) states that student learning requires the teachers' use of different methodologies and pedagogies. Similarly, Firdissa (2005:50) posited that since the same method does not work for every student, HEI teachers should be able to use a variety of teaching methods so as to address the individual needs and preferences of the students they teach.

For item 2 in the same Table, the mean scores of teacher and student respondents were 3.06 and 3.15, with mean difference of 0.09. The t-test result with p-value of 0.51 > 0.05 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the presence of academic staff-to-student ratio. The t-value (0.67) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This indicates that the existence of academic staff-to-student ratio was moderate. Similarly, the data obtained from faculty deans revealed that there is no good academic staff-to-student ratio because the ratio of academic staff-to-students was averagely 1:40.

Regarding the curricula's relevance for student learning (item 3), both respondent groups have an equal average agreement to the level with a mean score of 3.30. The t-test result with p-value of 0.99 > 0.05 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item. The t-value (0.02) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This, therefore, indicates that the relevance of the curricula to students' learning was moderate.

For item 4 in the same Table, the mean scores of teacher and student respondents were 3.59 and 3.49 respectively with mean difference of 0.10. The t-test result with p-value of 0.41 > 0.05 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. The t-value (0.83) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This indicates that the acquisition of the necessary skills and knowledge of students as a result of their learning was relatively good.

Regarding item 5 in Table 3, the existence of good leadership and management system that facilitate student learning was also rated by each group of respondents. The mean scores of the teacher respondents and student respondents 2.15 and 2.61 respectively with mean difference of 0.47. Similarly, the t-test result with p-value of 0.00 < 0.05 shows that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents towards the item.. The t-value (3.33) 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. This shows that both respondent groups have low level of agreement towards the item even though teachers have higher level of disagreement to the item. That is, the existence of good leadership and management system that facilitate student learning was low.

Teachers and students tend to disagree to item 6 that learning is highly integrated with the use of technologies. The mean scores of teacher and student respondents were 1.96 and 2.05 respectively with mean difference of 0.09. The t-test result with p-value of 0.51 > 0.05 confirms lack of statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. The t-value (0.66) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents. This indicates that the integration of learning with the use technologies was very low.

An overall quality indicator of student learning was computed by aggregating the responses of the six quality indicators of student learning items resulted with an average mean scores of 2.91 and 2.97 by the teacher and student respondents respectively with mean difference of 0.06. The two groups of respondents have no statistically significant difference (p-value of 0.66 > 0.05) in the computed average agreement for the overall quality indicators of student learning items. Both groups of respondents tend to have moderate level of agreement to the overall quality indicators of student learning items except teachers' response on item 5 with a mean score of 2.15, and teachers' and students' responses on item 6 with mean scores of 1.96 and 2.05 respectively. The t-value (0.44) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) also proves that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the two groups of respondents.

Teachers and students were asked the way teachers were assessing the performances of their students in their learning. Twelve point seven percent of the teacher respondents responded that they were assessing the performances of their students using the summative assessment methods such as mid and final examinations whereas 87.3% of the teacher respondents replied that they were assessing the performances of their students using the formative/continuous assessment methods such as tests, quizzes, group and individual assignments (presentations, term paper and project works), attendance, and participation on day-to-day activities and summative assessment method such as mid exam as needed and final examination most of the time.

Regarding this, 18.9% of the student respondents replied that teachers were assessing the performances of their students using the mid and final examinations most of the time and assignments sometimes. In contrast to this, 81.1% replied that teachers were using both continuous assessment methods (quizzes, tests, group and individual assignments/work, projects, attendance, and participation) and summative assessments methods (mid-term exam sometimes and final examination) to assess the performances of their students.

This, therefore, indicates that teachers were assessing the performances of their students by using continuous assessment methods such as tests, quizzes, assignments (individual and group), project work, attendance and participation. They were also using final examination and mid-term exam sometimes to assess the performances of their students. This idea is similar to the idea found on ICDR (1999) which state that today schools and universities are turning to continuous assessment where by recording of the students' performance in nearly everything s/he does during her/his course are kept. Blake (2006:3) also stated that meaningful assessment is both formative and summative.

The data obtained from the interviews made with the faculty deans about the actual teaching practice shows that even though there are many challenges to quality of student learning, the actual teaching learning process in ensuring quality of student learning was at a medium level. This was the result of teachers' commitment in helping their students to achieve what they are expected to achieve. Some of the challenges to quality of student learning at the University, according to the faculty deans, include lack of adequate classrooms, lack of adequate offices, and lack of adequate educational facilities and services. Therefore, to solve these challenges teachers were using the available educational facilities and resources wisely, and prepare modules and handouts for their students. The faculty deans were discussing with the higher officials or management bodies to fulfill the necessary educational facilities and resources for student learning, and to arrange situations in which adequate classrooms are constructed for students and offices for teachers.

Major Findings
With regard to the effectiveness of teachers' teaching practices, the teacher and student respondents with their average mean values 3.93 and 3.59 respectively showed their agreement that teachers' teaching practices were effective. Similarly, the data revealed that there was statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents with t-value (2.59) which is greater than the t-critical value (1.96) at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Regarding the teachers' use of rewards and reinforcers, 91.8% of the teacher respondents replied that teachers were using rewards like verbal praises and extra marks or bonuses to motivate their students and 80.5% of the student respondents indicated that teachers were using rewards and reinforcers particularly verbal praises in motivating their students' performances.

With respect to teachers' asking/allowing of their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work, 89.1% of the teacher respondents replied that teachers did not ask their students to give constructive feedback on each others' work and 82.3% of the student respondents said that teachers did not ask their students to give constructive feedback on each other's work.

Quality Indicators of Student Learning
Regarding the quality indicators of student learning, the teacher and student respondents revealed with their average mean values 2.91 and 2.97 respectively that both groups of respondents had a moderate level of agreement to the quality indicators of student learning items with the exception of teachers' response on item 5 with a mean score of 2.15, and teachers' and students' responses on item 6 with mean scores of 1.96 and 2.05 respectively. The data confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents with t-value (0.44) which is less than the t-critical value (1.96) at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Concerning the teachers' assessment of the performances of their students, 87.3% of the teacher respondents replied that teachers were assessing the performances of their students using the formative/continuous assessment methods such as tests, quizzes, group and individual assignments (presentations, term papers and project works), attendance, and participation on day-to-day activities, and summative assessment methods such as mid exam as needed and final examination most of the time. Besides this, 81.1% of the student respondents reported that teachers were using both continuous assessment methods (quizzes, tests, group and individual assignments, projects, attendance, and participation) and summative assessments methods (mid-term exam sometimes and final examination) to assess the performances of their students.

The data obtained from the interview about the actual teaching practice showed that even though there are many challenges to quality of student learning the actual teaching learning process in ensuring quality of student learning was at a medium level because of teachers' commitment in helping their students. Some of the challenges to quality of student learning at the University were lack of adequate classrooms, lack of adequate offices, and lack of adequate educational facilities and resources. In solving these challenges, teachers were using the available educational facilities and resources wisely, and prepare modules and handouts for their students. The faculty deans were discussing with the higher officials or management bodies to fulfill the necessary educational facilities and resources for student learning, and to arrange situations in which adequate classrooms are constructed for students and offices for teachers.

Conclusion
Based on the major findings, the following conclusions were drawn:
➢ With regard to the teaching effectiveness, teachers were highly arranging consultation hours; and using examples, illustrations and demonstrations to explain and clarify the lessons or contents they teach. Teachers were also highly informing the lesson

objectives; giving summary at the end of the lesson; and using attention gaining activities, ideas, concepts, and devices while teaching their students. This shows that teachers were effective in their day-to-day teaching practices.

➢ 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.

➢ With regard to quality indicators of student learning, teachers' uses of various teaching methods in teaching their students, the existence of academic staff-to-student ratio, and the relevance of the curricula to students' learning were moderate. The acquisition of the necessary skills and knowledge of students as a result of their learning was relatively good. The existence of good leadership and management system that facilitate student learning, and the integration of learning with the use of technologies were very low. This shows that teachers were not highly effective in bringing quality of student learning.

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.

BiadgelignAdeme (2010).*General Learning-Teaching Methods and Techniques*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.

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.

Derebssa, D. (undated.). *Quality of Teaching and Learning in Ethiopian Primary Schools: Tension Between Traditional and Innovative Teaching-Learning Approaches*. Retrieved from: http://home.hiroshima-a.u.ac.jp/cice/paper68.pdf10/02/2011.

Ellis, R. (1995). *Quality Assurance for University Teaching*. London: Open University Press.

MOE (1994).*Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Press.

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 ወይይት 4th Series Vol. 1, Oct. 2009, pp. 15-35.

Fry, H., Ketteridge, S. and Marshall, S. (2003). *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Great Britain: Bell and Bain Limited, Glasgow.

Gurney, P. (2007).Five Factors for Effective Teaching.*New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work.* Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 89-98.

ICDR (1999).*Teacher Education Handbook*. Addis Ababa.

Koul, L. (2008). *Methodology of Educational Research.* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Agency.

Koul, L. (1996). *Methodology of Educational Research*.New Delhi; Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

MOE (1999).*Teacher Education Handbook*.EMPDA (Unpublished Material).

Obanya, P., Shabani, J. and Okebukela, P. (1996).*Guide to Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.* Dakar: UNESCO.