

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ABOUT THE LECTURE AS A METHOD OF TEACHING IN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS. VIEWS OF STUDENTS FROM COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION, KUMASI (COLTEK).

By

Alex Amartei Marmah

Lecturer, University of Education, Winneba
College of Technology Education, Kumasi

ABSTRACT

Teaching in universities is performed in large groups with more than 100 students present. In view of the large number of students at a particular teaching period, the most preferred teaching method is the lecture. Despite the fact that new approaches to teaching and learning have been promulgated in higher institutions, the lecture remains a prominent feature of many courses. Although many researchers have spoken against the use of the lecture, it continues to be the main method used in tertiary institutions and with the increasing intake of students; the lecture will remain to a very large extent the main tool for teaching. The primary purpose of this study was to determine students' preference for the lecture as a method of teaching in tertiary institutions.

The study was a descriptive research conducted at the College Of Technology Education, Kumasi. The main instrument used for the study was the questionnaire. To answer the six research questions formulated for the study, 197 undergraduate students made up of 97 males and 100 females were selected. The respondents were selected from levels 200 and 300 students both part time and full time.

Data collected were analysed using mean, standard deviation and the t' test. The result of the study shows that there is no statistical difference between gender and level in terms of preference for the lecture. However, there is statistical significance difference between full-time and part-time and age of students in terms of their preference for the lecture method. In general, the study revealed that undergraduate students in this study do not totally share with education experts negative views of the lecture method.

Key words: traditional lecture method, active teaching methods.

1. Introduction

Despite the development of new approaches to teaching and learning in higher education, lectures remain a prominent feature of many courses. The lecturers are the source of information while students have to remember what the lecturer says (Newton, Driver & Osborne, 1999). Research conducted in American classrooms indicates that approximately 80% of talk time is taken up by the teacher and thus, the teacher controls what happens in the classroom (Wertsch & Toma, 1995). Research also indicates that by the time students complete four years of university education they will have endured almost 2000 hours of classroom instruction (Eble, 1976). Without question, most of that time will have been spent listening to lectures.

A lecture has its own merits, otherwise this method would have ceased. It is almost inevitable that undergraduate students will continue to experience the lecture, as the number of students attending tertiary

institutions is too large in comparison to the teaching staff and other resources available. Hence, as Walton (1972) said 'the lecture is here to stay' so it is imperative to make it effective as possible.

Concern regarding the use of the lecture as a teaching strategy in tertiary educational institutions continues to surface from time to time without any apparent solution. The pedagogical value of the lecture continues to be questioned, specifically whether students gain knowledge, or learn sufficiently from the lecture. To what extent the lecture contributes to the learning process of students and under what circumstances the lecture may prove a viable component of the teaching process remain unresolved for most academics. There are certain courses which are common to virtually all year groups. This has resulted in large numbers, 200 to 700, of students being packed in a lecture hall and the lecture continues to be the teaching strategy for delivering the basic curriculum to as many students as will fit in a lecture theatre given the constraints on teachers, facilities and students. The major factor which contributed to the adoption of the lecture method was (and still is) the ability to deal with a large number of students at one time. Opposition to the lecture can be traced to the research of Simmons (1959) who found that superior results were achieved by smaller classes when teaching intermediate algebra.

As teaching is the primary function of university life, which carries a high cost factor, it seems sensible to address ways in which lecturers' could 'teach smarter' and reduce the cost factor.

There are very few studies which attempt to look at lectures as they are experienced by students. The present study focuses on students' preference for the lecture as a method of teaching in tertiary educational institutions- views of students from College of Technology Education, Kumasi (COLTEK).

2. Literature Review on the lecture method

The lecture is one of the oldest and, maybe still, the most widely used teaching method in tertiary educational institutions. It has been a primary component in the teaching and learning programmes of Universities since the very early days of university education (Bligh, 2000; McKeachie, 1986). Given the increasing funding pressures facing higher education worldwide, the lecture will more than likely continue to be used extensively in higher education for many years to come (Laurillard, 1993; Bates, 2000).

Originally, lecturing was the major channel through which knowledge stored in books was transmitted to a large group of students. The word lecture comes from the Latin word 'legere which translate 'to read.'

A lecture is defined as one person speaking, more or less continuously, to a group of people on a particular subject or theme. For the university administrator, a lecture is "a slot in the timetable where students are taught in a designated space, a lecture theatre, in a group which size can vary from 20 to 800 and more, and where one lecturer has the primary responsibility for 'delivering content'" (Edwards, Smith and Webb, 2001).

Lecture is a teaching method where an instructor is the central focus of information transfer. Typically, an instructor will stand before a class and present information for the students to learn. Sometimes, they will write on a board or use an overhead projector to provide visuals for students. Students are expected to take notes while listening to the lecture. Usually, very little exchange occurs between the instructor and the students during a lecture. Ramsden (2003) describes this didactic method as education through the transmission of information and suggests that this theory of learning assumes that students are passive recipients of knowledge transmitted by the lecturer

The lecture method bases itself upon the transmissive teaching model- that is knowledge is an object that can be transferred from the teacher to the learner. Practically it implies a lecturer holding a lecture for a group of people. A strength is that it is possible to educate large number of people at once, thereby lowering costs. A limitation is that it yields less deep knowledge compared to other teaching methods such as case-based learning. (Chaplin 2009, White et al. 2009, Grunwald & Hartman 2010).

Many educators believe that the traditional lecture approach to teaching is ineffective compared to active learning methods (Marbach-Ad, Seal, & Sokolove, 2001; Jungst, Licklider, & Wiersema, 2003). Methods

that promote active learning by students are based on the constructivist view that, for meaningful learning to occur, students must actively engage with the content to be learned through such activities as discussion, hands-on activities, and problem solving. According to proponents of the use of active learning methods, one main weakness of the lecture method is that it allows students to be passive recipients of information that has been "predigested" by the professor (Hansen & Stephens, 2000). Thus, students become dependent on the professor to tell them what they need to know and can avoid taking responsibility for their own learning (Machemer & Crawford, 2007). Further, students accustomed to being passive have a "low tolerance for challenge" (Hansen & Stephens, 2000). Finally, according to active learning activists, learning as a result of lectures is relatively superficial and transient (Phipps, Phipps, Kask, & Higgins, 2001; Moust, Van Berkel, & Schmidt, 2005). Whereas Vedanayagam (1994) was of the view that lecture is largely a one-way process. There is not much interaction between the students and the teacher. It ignores individual differences; students are not attentive 40% of the time in class. Attention is high for the first 15 minutes then, attention levels decline rapidly until the final 10 minutes of class.

Other research indicates that the lecture method is superior (Struyven, Dochy & Janssen's, 2008). Druger, (1999), Khan and Akbar (1997) were of the view that in many developing countries lecturing is the dominant and traditional method of instruction. The reasons for their popularity are not farfetched. Lecture method is quite economically and it is possible to handle a large number of students at a time and no laboratory, equipment, aids, and materials are required (Yadav, 1992). They are easily changed and up-dated and are efficient in covering materials quickly.

3. Students' perception about the lecture method

Previous research is mixed regarding students' perceptions of the traditional lecture method as compared to teaching methods that require students to learn actively (Machemer & Crawford, 2007). On the one hand, many students report a preference for the lecture approach. For example, in one study, students in introductory economics classes preferred the lecture method compared to active learning and believed they learned more through lectures (Leeds, Stull, & Westbrook, 1998). Additionally, on student evaluations, these students negatively evaluated teachers who required more work, as with active methods, and positively evaluated lecture-style teachers.

Researchers have found that students prefer the lecture approach for many of the reasons that education experts believe it to be weak: it "enables them to listen passively," "organizes the subject matter for them," and "prepares them well for tests" (McKeachie, 1997,). Research conducted by Felder and Brent (1996), noted that students who are faced with a teacher's demands that they be active and take responsibility for their learning "may become sullen or hostile:" they complain "that they are paying tuition to be taught, not to teach themselves". Struyven, Dochy, and Janssen's (2008) found students' evaluations of the lecture method to be mostly positive.

A study by Qualters (2001) suggests that students do not favour active learning methods because of the in-class time taken by the activities, fear of not covering all of the material in the course, and anxiety about changing from traditional classroom expectations to the active structure. Casado (2000) examined students' perceptions across six teaching methods: lecture/discussion, lab work, in-class exercises, guest speakers, applied projects, and oral presentations. Students most preferred the lecture/discussion method.

A study conducted by Benson, et al (n.d.) provides evidence that students place greater emphasis on lecture. Most of the students rated lecture method as the best teaching method. Reasons given by the students included; teacher provides all knowledge related to the topic, it is a time saving method and students listen to the lecture attentively and take notes. On gender specific, the literature generally agrees that female instructors and students tend to use and prefer teaching techniques that are more interactive, such as class discussions, small-group discussions, and group projects. Such approaches are consistent with anti-hierarchical

organization and other elements of feminist pedagogy. Men are more likely to use less personal approaches such as lecture and in-class computer applications.

A study by Canter & Gallatin (1974) on student behaviour in relation to lectures as an effective method of instruction, found a noticeable difference between students attitude and behavior indicating a preference for discussions to lectures, however, when given the opportunity actually preferred the lecture to the discussion. Saljo (1975) emphasized perception as the reason for such behaviour. In a structured learning situation the university students prefer the "old school" approach of an engaging lecture over the use of the latest technological bells and whistles in the classroom. Baldwin (1993) found that students who were taught, introductory financial accounting in a mass-lecture format performed more favourably than students who were taught exclusively in small classes. Nolan (1974) found that students preferred lectures as they felt compelled to take notes.

Fry et al (1996) were of the view that students whose performance is below average may be used to passive learning and may be comfortable with it for which reason; they may prefer the lecture method to other teaching methods that would involve active participation of the learner. In the same vein Jarvis (1995) indicates that, some teachers prefer the lecture method since it gives them control over the class thus covering up for their knowledge.

Despite the fact that most faculty and students do have preference for the lecture method, many educators believe that the traditional lecture approach to teaching is ineffective compared to active learning methods (Marbach-Ad, Seal, & Sokolove, 2001; Jungst, Licklider, & Wiersema, 2003). They were of the view that for meaningful learning to occur, students must actively engage with the to-be-learned subject-matter through such activities as discussion, hands-on activities, and problem solving. Cognitive theory has suggested that only active processing of information, and not just passive reception of that information, leads to learning. Hammen and Kelland (1994) gave further evidence indicating that very little learning occurs in lectures when they showed a weak correlation between lecture attendance and course grades in medical school courses. According to proponents of the use of active learning methods, one main weakness of the lecture method is that it allows students to be passive recipients of information that has been "prepared" by the professor (Hansen & Stephens, 2000, p. 42). Thus, students become dependent on the professor to tell them what they need to know and can avoid taking responsibility for their own learning (Machemer & Crawford, 2007). Further, students accustomed to being passive have a "low tolerance for challenge" (Hansen & Stephens, 2000, p. 46). Finally, according to active learning activists, learning as a result of lectures is relatively superficial and transient (Phipps, Phipps, Kask, & Higgins, 2001; Moust, Van Berkel, & Schmidt, 2005). Furthermore, Heward (2003); Martin (1996); McIntosh (1996) and Norris (1994) lamented that, this strategy is unhelpful for students who are poor in note-taking skills and disadvantaged students (handicapped students). It is a mistake to assume all college students are competent note-takers.

The recommendation to use active methods is made even though research is mixed as to the effectiveness of these methods. Some research suggests that, compared to the lecture method, methods that promote active learning increase student achievement (O' Sullivan & Copper, 2003; Christianson & Fisher, 1999), student participation (McClanahan & McClanahan, 2002), and retention of concepts over time (Berry, 2008). Other research indicates that the lecture method is superior (Struyven, Dochy, & Janssen's, 2008), or at least comparable (Van Dijk, Van Den Berg, & Van Keulen, 2001), based on several assessments, including student learning. It may be that the lecture method is effective for teachers who lecture well, and active methods are effective for teachers who are adept at developing meaningful in-class activities.

Tomlinson (2000) showed skepticism on the usefulness of the lecturing teaching strategy. The researcher agrees that lecturing minimizes feedback from students, assumes an unrealistic level of students' understanding and comprehension, and often disengages students from the learning process. Consequently, causing information learnt to be quickly forgotten.

Norris (1994) argued that, the lecture strategy could cause students to miss the important points of the content as he might consider that everything the lecturer says is important. It may happen sometimes

lecturers go off-track from their primary objectives for the class session. In addition, lecture-teaching strategy may lead to passive learning since students have no chance to give their contributions

On how to make the lecture more effective, Martin (1996) McIntosh (1996) recommended that lecturers fit the lectures to the audience, focus on the main points of the topics and organize the points for clarity. Also, lecturers should select appropriate examples or illustrations, present more than one side of an issue and be sensitive to other perspectives, repeat points when necessary, be aware of the audience by noticing their feedback and be enthusiastic. Woodson (2003) proposed guided notes as an appropriate measure that can boost lecture-teaching strategy. This meant that, lecturer or instructor prepare beforehand guide notes, to be distributed to students soon after the lecture.

Heward (2003) in support of Woodson (2003) argued that the lecture teaching strategy can be improved and become the most appropriate teaching strategy by using the guided notes. This is an instructor-prepared handout that provides background information and standard cues with specific spaces where students can write key facts, concepts, and/or relationships during the lecture. The findings indicated that lectures paired with guide notes are a powerful teaching strategy and it accommodates all students within their diversities. He insisted that guide notes guides both lecturer and students in prioritizing and focusing to the key points within the lecture and in increasing students' curiosity and learning engagement within the lecture.

Cashin (1990) recommends that lectures should be presented in way that fits its audience, focusing on the topic, pinpoints the specific areas of concentration and precisely organization with clear examples. The researcher adds that sensitive issues, stressing on the key points and getting feedback from the audiences are of overriding importance for effective and efficient teaching through the lecture strategy.

5. Advantages/ strengths of the lecture method

The lecture is a widely accepted instructional method (Moore 2009). It is good for teaching specific facts and basic skills (Killen 2007), factual material are presented in a direct, logical manner (Killen 2007:128); It is good for introduction of new subject or topic to learners. It is used to present new material not yet available in print or books (Killen 2007:128). It is regarded as an efficient method to transmit content to a large group of learners. Lectures can also present large amounts of information to large groups (Freiberg and Driscoll 2000). It is the best method to use when the facts or problems are conflicting or confusing in nature; when there is shortage of time, the lecture method is the best to use (Freiberg and Driscoll 2000 and Moore 2009). When the best way to understand a topic is through oral presentation, the lecture method is the best. Lectures explain, clarify and organize difficult concepts. Lectures challenge beliefs and habits of learning; Lecture breeds enthusiasm and motivation for further study; the lecturer has full control of whatever is happening in the lecture. The lecture presents little risk to students who are not very creative and innovative. The lectures appeal to those learners who learn by listening (Killen 2007:127).

6. Disadvantages/ weaknesses of the lecture method

The lecture may not be effective for higher order thinking skills, depending on the knowledge base and skill of the teacher (Moore 2009). The lecture method can stifle learners' creativity (Killen 2007). Learners are often passive (Freiberg and Driscoll 2000). Learning is very difficult to judge. There is little check of learner understanding (Killen 2007). Pure lecture fails to give feedback to both the teacher and the learners. Lectures cannot keep student attention for a long time or for the whole lesson. Information tends to be forgotten quickly if taught through the lecture method. Lectures assume that all learners have the same learning styles (Killen 2007). Lectures cannot teach motor skills, influence attitudes and values, teach application, analysis, synthesis or evaluation (Jarvis 2006). In its purest form, it is a passive method of learning. It lacks learner participation. Encourages learner passiveness, if used badly, the lecture method can give poor results, the lecture method of instruction needs thorough preparation and planning on the part of the teacher. The teacher works harder than the learners. He learns more than the learners (Killen 2007).

The present study was designed to determine the perceptions students have about the lecture method. As long as lecturers continue to be told to abandon the lecture method, it will be important to determine how students views about this change. If lecturers are aware of students perceptions of the lecture method, they may be in a better position to address students' difficulties with the transition to active learning.

7. Objectives of the research

The main objective of the study is to investigate students perception of the lecture method among undergraduate students of the College of Technology Education, Kumasi-Ghana. Specifically, the study aims at finding answers to the following questions.

1. What are the perceptions of undergraduate students about the lecture method of teaching?
2. Is there any difference in the perception of male and female students about the lecture method?
3. Is there any difference in the perception among students concerning the lecture method in terms of their admission status (full time, part time)?
4. Do older students (25 years and above) like the lecture method more than younger students (below 25 years)?
5. Is there any difference in students' perception of the lecture method with regard to their levels?
6. What do students think can be done by lecturers to make the lecture more effective?

8. Structure of the study

The paper is presented as follows. The first part presents the introduction and a selective review of the literature relevant to the study. The second section focuses on the methodology and data gathering procedures for the study. The third section is on the analysis of the questionnaire, findings and discussions as they relate to the research questions. The last section deals with the conclusion of the present study. The sample was chosen from undergraduate students in the five departments (Accounting, Management, Vocational technical and Information Technology) of the University of Education, Winneba – Kumasi campus which is also known as College of Technology Education, (COLTEK). One hundred and ninety-seven second and third year undergraduate from the five departments of the University of Education, Winneba-Kumasi campus (COLTEK) were targeted for the study using a self administered questionnaire.

9. Methods

Design

This investigation was conducted using a survey approach. Broadly speaking, surveys are designed to look closely at an existing situation without trying to manipulate the variables which characterize the situation (Cohen, Manion, & K. Morrison, 2011). Researchers must be aware of potential relationships between variables in order to carry out a proper investigation (Andres, 2012). Given that the aim of this investigation was to determine students' perceptions about the lecture method and what students feel lectures can do to make the lecture more effective, the survey method was an appropriate approach. Due to limitations of time, only a small-scale survey was conducted, and the data was collected through questionnaire from a small group of 197 from the College of Technology Education, Kumasi where the researcher is a lecturer.

Participants

To answer the research questions, 197 undergraduates' students from the College of Technology Education, Kumasi were randomly selected. The participants consist of 97 males and 100 females, 89 level 200 and 108 level 300 students. 112 of the respondents were full time students and 85 were part time students. The mean age of the respondents was 27.07 with the standard deviation of 6.16. The biographical data of the respondents is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Biographical data of respondents

| | N Frequency | % Percentage |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 97 | 49.2 |
| Female | 100 | 50.8 |
| Age | | |
| Below 25 | 89 | 45.2 |
| 25 and over | 108 | 54.8 |
| Level | | |
| 200 | 89 | 45.2 |
| 300 | 108 | 54.8 |
| Status | | |
| Full time | 112 | 56.9 |
| Part time | 85 | 43.1 |

Materials

The main material used for the study was the questionnaire. A four points Likert-type scale questionnaire, ranging from strongly agree (4) to strongly disagree (1) were constructed to elicit participants' responses to their perceptions towards the lecture method.

The questionnaire consists of two parts, Part I and Part II. Part I included respondents biographical data: gender, age, level and admission status. Part II is made up of 15 items. 14 of the items were constructed based on the Likert-type scale. The students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the item. The last item was an open-ended one which requires respondents to give their views on how they think the lecture method could be improved to enhance better teaching. The questionnaire was pilot tested yielding Cronbach alpha of 0.73

Table 2. Description of the questionnaire

1. I learned a lot through the lecture method
2. I remember much of what I learned through the lecture method
3. The lecture is the best method for teaching
4. I relied on the lecturer to learn what I need to know
5. The lecture makes me avoid responsibility for my own learning
6. The lecture makes learning relatively superficial
7. I have low tolerance for challenge because of the lecture method
8. I have to figure out what was important to write during the lecture
9. The lecture requires that I work very hard for good grades
10. The lecture increases students participation
11. Lecturers who use the lecture method know the subject matter very well
12. The lecture prepares me very well for tests
13. Lectures are excellent for transmitting large amount of information
14. The lecture is appropriate for presenting materials that are too complex for students to understand
15. Suggest any two things lecturers can do to make the lecture more effective

Data analysis

The collected questionnaires were scrutinized to identify error and then coded. In order to ensure ease of scoring and analyses, the following rules were used in coding the items, Strongly disagree-1, disagree-2, agree-3 and strongly agree-4. All the responses were inputted into the computer for computer analysis using SPSS version 16

Results of the study

The purpose of the study was to determine undergraduate students of the College of Technology Education, Kumasi in Ghana perceptions about the lecture method. The following results were found.

Table 3. Statistical scores on students' attitudes towards the lecture method

| Attitude | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | p |
|----------|-----|-------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Positive | 112 | 35.27 | 4.03 | | |
| Negative | 85 | 36.34 | 3.85 | | |
| Total | 197 | 35.73 | 3.97 | 1.882 | 0.61 |

P > 0.05

Table 3 indicates the statistical score of students' perception in general towards the lecture method. The result showed that there is no statistical significance difference among students with regards to their

perception about the lecture method. It could be said that undergraduate students in the university have similar perception about the lecture method.

Table 4. Statistical scores on male and female students' attitudes towards the lecture method

| Gender | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | p |
|--------|-----|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Male | 97 | 36.14 | 3.63 | | |
| Female | 100 | 35.31 | 4.31 | | |
| Total | 197 | 35.73 | 3.97 | 1.459 | 0.146 |

$P > 0.05$

Table 4 shows the statistical scores of male and female students' perception towards the lecture method. The t independent test analyses showed that there is no significant difference between perception of male and female undergraduate students ($t=1.459$, $df=195$, $p=0.146$) with regards to the lecture method of teaching. This implies that perception of males and females students towards the lecture method is similar.

Table 5. Statistical scores on students' perception towards the lecture method based on their ages

| Age | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | p |
|--------------|-----|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Under 25 | 90 | 36.65 | 3.25 | | |
| 25 and above | 107 | 34.95 | 4.38 | | |
| Total | 197 | 35.80 | 3.81 | 3.045 | 0.003 |

$P < 0.05$

Using the t-test for independent samples, a significant difference was found between students based on their ages ($t=3.045$, $df=195$, $p=0.003$). It could be inferred that students who are below 25 years are more incline to the lecture method ($N=90$, $M=36.65$) than students who are 25 and above years ($N=107$, $M=34.95$). This indicates that students who are below 25 years have more positive attitude ($M=36.65$) towards the lecture method than students who are 25 and above years ($M=34.95$).

Table 6. Statistical scores on students' perception towards the lecture method based on their levels

| levels | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | p |
|--------|-----|-------|--------------------|-------|------|
| 200 | 94 | 36.4 | 3.44 | | |
| 300 | 103 | 35.1 | 4.36 | | |
| Total | 197 | 35.76 | 3.90 | 2.213 | 0.28 |

$P > 0.05$

Table 6 shows the statistical scores of the students' perceptions towards the lecture method based on their levels. The t-independent test analysis shows that there is no statistically significant difference in perceptions of students based on their levels (level 200 or 300). This means that the perception of students about the lecture method based on their levels is similar.

Table 7. Statistical scores on students' perception towards the lecture method based on their status

| levels | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | p |
|-----------|-----|-------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Full-time | 112 | 36.34 | 3.74 | | |
| Part-time | 85 | 34.93 | 4.18 | | |
| Total | 197 | 35.76 | 3.90 | 2.489 | 0.014 |

$P < 0.05$

Table 7 shows the statistical scores of the students' perceptions towards the lecture method based on their status. The t-independent test revealed statistical significant difference between full-time students and part-time students towards the lecture method ($t=2.489$, $df=195$, $p=0.014$). The test indicates that full-time students ($M=36.34$) like the lecture method more than part-time students ($M=34.93$).

On the open-ended item requesting students to indicate what they think could be done to make the lecture more effective, majority of the respondents gave the following answers. Learners should be given the opportunity to ask questions, the lecturer should not be the only one who should talk during the lecture, lecturers should give students areas to be learnt for students to read ahead, lecturers should create a conducive atmosphere for learning, they should avoid derogatory remarks, they should give immediate feedback, they should speak loudly and boldly, lectures should not last long and should intersperse the lectures with jokes to let students stay alert.

Discussion

This study was designed to investigate under-graduate students' perceptions about the lecture as a method of teaching in tertiary institutions. A four point Likert-type scale was used to gather data for the study. The result of the study indicated that there is no statistical significance difference among students with regards to their perception about the lecture method. The study also showed that there is no statistical significance difference among students in terms of gender and level. However, the study revealed statistical significant difference between full-time students and part-time students (status) and on the ages of the students. Under-graduate students in this study do not totally share with education experts negative views of the lecture method

The findings on research question one and two which shows that students (males & females) have similar perceptions about the lecture method confirms that of Leeds, Stull, and Westbrook (1998) who reported students preference for the lecture method in introductory economics, management and accounting and believed that they learned more through lectures. The findings are line with that of Qualters (2001) who suggests that students do not favour active learning methods. Casado (2000) also came out with similar findings when he examined students perceptions across six teaching methods and realized that students most preferred the lecture method. Baldwin (1993) found that students who were taught introductory financial accounting using the lecture performed better than those taught using active learning methods. Most of the students rated lecture method as the best teaching method. Reasons included; teacher provides all knowledge related to topic, it is time saving method; students listen lecture attentively and take notes. Nolan (1974) found that students preferred lecture methods as they are felt compelled to write their own notes.

The result however is inconsistent with that of adult learning which is based on learner involvement, participation, interaction and facilitation (Fry, Medsker & Bonner, 1996). The result also is inconsistent with that of Naylor (1996) which emphasizes that adult learning should be student-centered rather than teacher

centered. A study conducted by McClanahan and McClanahan (2000) involving two classes of students indicated that in one class the majority (64%) preferred active learning methods, but the other class only 43% favoured the active learning methods. The result is also not in line with the commonly held view that females like the more participatory methods of teaching and learning.

With regards to the admission status of respondents the result indicated that full-time students preferred the lecture method to other methods. This result runs counter to the findings of Fry et.al (1996) who found out that most professional part-time students like the lecture method of teaching. Jarvis (1995) also found out that most part-time students' preference for the lecture method overwhelms that of full-time students.

Conclusion

The research has confirmed the widely held view that the lecture method will continue to be the dominant method of teaching in tertiary institutions. The research has also shown that students continue to like the lecture since they believe that they pay fees in order to be taught and not for them to go and look for information on their own. In view of students preference for the lecture it is necessary for lecturers to look out for ways and means of making the lecture more interesting and for the involvement of the students. It should be necessary for lecturers to prepare adequately and give students advance reading assignment. Lectures should also not be for a long time in order for students not to lost focus of the lesson

REFERNCES

- Bates, AW and Poole,G (2003) *Effective Teaching with Technology in Higher Education: Foundations for Success*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Bligh, D.A. (2000). *What's the use of lectures*, San Francisco. C.A. Lossey Bass
- Casado, M. (2000). Teaching methods in higher education: A student perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 12, 65-70.
- Christianson, R. & Fisher, K. (1999). Comparison of student learning about diffusion and osmosis in constructivist and traditional classrooms. *International Journal of Science Education*, 21, 687-698
- Cohen, P. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multi section validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 281-309
- Felder, R. M. & Brent, R. (1996). Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction. *College Teaching*, 44, 43-47.
- Freiberg, H.J. & Driscoll, A. (2000). *Universities teaching strategies*. 3rd Edition. London: Allyn & Bacon
- Hansen, E. J. & Stephens, J. A. (2000). The ethics of learner-centered education: Dynamics that impede progress. *Change*, 32, 40-47.
- Jungst, S., Licklider, B. & Wiersema, J. (2003). Providing support for faculty who wish to shift to a

- learning-centered paradigm in their higher education classrooms. *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3, 69-81
- Killer, R. (2007). *Teaching strategies for quality teaching and learning*. RSA: Shuman Printers
- Marbach-Ad, G., Seal, O. & Sokolove, P. (2001). Student attitudes and recommendations on active learning. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 30, 434-438.
- McKeachie, W. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1218-1225.
- Moust, J. H. C., Van Berkel, H. J. M., & Schmidt, H. G. (2005). Signs of erosion: Reflections on three decades of problem-based learning at Maastricht University. *Higher Education*, 50, 665-683.
- O'Sullivan, D. & Copper, C. (2003). Evaluating active learning: A new initiative for a general chemistry curriculum. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 32, 448-452.
- Phipps, M., Phipps, C., Kask, S. & Higgins, S. (2001). University students' perceptions of cooperative Learning. Implications for administrators and instructors. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 24, 14-21.
- Qualters, D. M. (2001). Do students want to be active? *Journal of Scholarship of Learning and Teaching*, 2, 51-60.
- Ramsdeen, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*. (2nd ed.), London, Routledge Falmer.
- Valanayagam, E.G. (1994). *Teaching technology for college teachers*. New Delhi. Sterling Publishers.
- Struyven, K., Dochy, F. & Janssens, S. (2008). Students' likes and dislikes regarding student-activating and lecture-based educational settings: Consequences for students' perceptions of the learning environment, student learning and performance. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 23, 295-317.
- Van Dijk, L., Van Den Berg, G., & Van Keulen, H. (2001). Interactive lectures in engineering education. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 26, 15-28.