IJNRD.ORG ISSN : 2456-4184
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD) | IJNRD.ORG
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION AND THE PRACTICE OF ACTIVE LEARNING AT SALALE UNIVERSITY

[1]Yeshimebet Bogale, [2]Ayele Feyissa

[1] Assistant Professor of Documentary Linguistics and Culture, [2]Lecturer of Curriculum and Instruction
[1] Department of English Language and Literature, [2]Department of Curriculum and Instructional Studies
[1]Salale University, Fitche, Ethiopia

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to [1]Yeshimebet Bogale, Department of English Language and Literature, Salale University, Ethiopia, P.O.BoX 245

Abstract: *The purpose of this study was to describe instructors' perception and the practice of active learning at Salale University. To accomplish this purpose, the study employed a descriptive survey design and a concurrent nested approach. Probability sampling- stratified random sampling technique used to select instructors and students. Accordingly, from 445 instructors involved actively in teaching, 135 instructors (30%) were selected. These instructors were distributed to each department based on a ratio. From 1500 students (30 department x50 students on average), 450 students (30%) were selected. The data gathering instrument was a questionnaire. The questionnaire had both close-ended and open-ended questions and was administered to instructors and students. The data from the students' questionnaire were used to corroborate the data obtained from instructors' questionnaires on the practice of active learning. The analysis has been done quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis was done using descriptive statistics (percentage, mean, and grand mean) and inferential statistics: t-test by using SPSS version 26. The qualitative data were analyzed with interpretation. Based on the data, it has been found that teachers have a positive attitude towards active learning and they have practiced active learning sometimes which indicates that despite their positive attitude, their practice is somehow average. Regarding the challenges that hinder the practice of active learning, it has been found out that lack of skill of implementing active learning method, large class size/ No of students in a classroom/, lack of materials/ resources, low motivation of students to practice active learning and shortage of time to cover the portion are the major ones. Finally, based on the findings recommendations have been forwarded.*

Key Words: *Active Learning, Instructors' Perception, Practice, Implementation*

INTRODUCTION

Education is an instrument that has been helping mankind to cope with the changing world. The present world is becoming increasingly complex and rapidly changing, thus urging education to change. As an instrument of change, education itself has been changing in its aims, contents, and methods of acquiring it. Therefore, the aim of education today is to create active and competent citizens who are flexible and creative, who can solve problems, make decisions, think critically, communicate ideas effectively and work efficiently within teams and groups. To attain this aim, the active learning method has been suggested as a better means of acquiring education by scholars of the field. The available literature on the evolution of education has shown that two broad teaching and learning methods have dominated the education systems. These are teacher-centered/ traditional method/ and learner-centered/active learning method. The teacher-centered method is rooted in positivist philosophy which outlined that knowledge is a fixed truth, which can be transmitted to students through a process of teaching. The learner-centered method on the other hand i**s** emanated from constructivist philosophy which stresses that knowledge is individual and socially constructed (Tadese and Daniel, 2016; Taye, 2013; Escandon, 2004 cited in Ambissa, 2009).

Over the past several years, the active learning method has received considerable attention from educators, curriculum experts, and policymakers who have perceived it as an alternative to the traditional teaching method (Michael, 2004). This intern urges the paradigm shift from the teacher-centered method to the learner-centered method. This shift has been the major educational phenomenon in the world since the 1950s. It is argued that the paradigm shift is attributed to three major factors- cognitive and psychological, political, and economical. Cognitive and psychological factors are the primary reasons to adopt this method. The term cognitive refers to the mental processes, such as remembering or solving problems, while psychological encompasses cognition but also includes the study of emotions, motivation, and interpersonal relationships.

The political factors are associated with the development of democracy and civic responsibility. The way teachers teach and their relation with their students contribute to students' political socialization and engagement in democratic processes. The economic factor is related to the global economic demand, which forced countries to diversify their economies and to be competent in the global economy. This entails equipping the youth with new sets of skills and knowledge (Mowafaq, and et.al, 2016).

The adaption of the active learning method in the Ethiopian education system seems a recent phenomenon that is linked with the new Education and Training Policy issued in 1994 (FDRE,1994). The policy made it clear that the chief goal of the education and training policy is creating citizens with an all-around knowledge capable of playing a conscious and active role in the economic, social, and political life of the country at various levels. To attain this goal, the education policy introduces the active learning method (Ministry of Education, 2008). Among the educational institutions responsible to accomplish the above goal of education, universities have the largest share (Aschalew, 2012).

Salale University is one of the public Universities in Ethiopia. After being a campus of Addis Ababa University for years, it was established as a University in 2009 E.C. The University currently has five Colleges that reside on two campuses. The College of Agriculture and Natural Resource, College of Business and Economics, College of Health Science, College of Natural Science, and College of Social Sciences and Humanities. Except for the college of Health Science, which is found in Abebech Gobena Campus, the remaining four colleges are located in the main campus. Generally, the University encompasses 30 different departments, with 445 academic staff. This study was conducted at Salale University to get firsthand information about the perception of instructors towards active learning and their practice.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Education and Training Policy highly encourages a paradigm shift from the teacher-centered to the student-centered method. The student-centered method leads to effective teaching-learning and promotes the development of student's critical thinking and engages them in the teaching-learning process actively and effectively. Therefore, teachers at all levels of education are expected to implement active learning methods to help learners to learn actively.

Despite the policy's desire and paradigm shift, research findings attested that the implementation of the active learning method in Ethiopian schools is very low (Smith, 2004; Wendemagegnehu, 2006). The situation is even worth it at the university level (Ministry of Education, 2008; Aschalew, 2012). Salale University, the focus of this study, cannot be different. Based on the observation of the researcher, predominantly, Salale University, as one of the fourth generation Universities; has a large number of novice instructors even do not have taken pedagogical and other training that promote the use of Active Learning. As a result, the researcher believed that some gap exists while the novice teachers are teaching in a situation that demanded relevant experience. Besides, the study is the first of its kind in this University. Thus, this research is designed to describe the perception of instructors and their practice of active learning through the following basic research questions:

- ✓ How do instructors perceive active learning at Salale University?
- ✓ To what extent is the perception of instructors affects their practice of active learning?
- ✓ What is the status of the practice of active learning at Salale University?
- ✓ What are the challenges that hinder the implementation of active learning at Salale University?

RESEARCH DESIGN

The major purpose of this research is to describe instructors' perception and practice of active learning at Salale University. To achieve this purpose, a descriptive survey design was implemented. The study also followed a concurrent nested approach in which the quantitative and qualitative data were gathered concurrently. According to Gay, (1992) descriptive survey was conducted to answer the question concerning the current status of the subject of the study. Thus, this design helps to look at the current situations at Salale University.

SOURCE OF DATA

The primary sources were consulted to obtain information about the subject under study. The primary sources for this study were instructors and students of Salale University. Furthermore, the necessary documents were also be used as secondary sources of data.

SAMPLE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

In this research, the probability sampling technique- stratified random sampling was used to select instructors. The researchers selected 135 (30% of 445= 135) instructors who are actively engaged in the teaching and learning process as a sample size. Those 135 sample instructors were selected from 30 departments based on their ratio. For the students' questionnaire, students were selected from the first and second years. It was

assumed that there are 50 students in each class on average. Then, in 30 departments there were 1500 students. Among these 450 (30% of 1500) students were selected.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The prime data collection instrument in this study was a questionnaire with both close and open-ended questions. Two questionnaires were designed- one for instructors and the other for students. The instructors' questionnaire has three parts the general information, perception, and practice part but the students' questionnaire has two parts the general information and the practice part, which is the copy of the instructor's questionnaire practice part. The questionnaires were administered to 135 instructors and 450 students.

Data from the instructors and students were collected with informed consent. Each participant was told that the information obtained would be kept confidential. Then the questionnaires were distributed.

METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The quantitative data collected following the nature of basic questions and the purpose of the study through questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS version 23(descriptive statistics -percentage, mean and grand mean and inferential statistics – independent T-test) followed by interpretation and the qualitative data were analyzed qualitatively.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

This section deals with the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data collected through the two questionnaires. It consists of two parts. The first part is concerned with the description of the background of the respondents; the second part is concerned with the analysis of the main data about the practice and perception of Active Learning Methods.

BACKGROUND OF THE RESPONDENTS

In this study, a total of 585 participants participated. Of these, 450 were second and third-year students from 32 departments; 135 were instructors of all the five colleges that are found in the university. The questionnaires were administered to 450 students and 135 instructors. All the students and 112 instructors have returned the questionnaire and this represents **100%** and **82.7%** response rate respectively.

Table 1: Background Information of Instructors

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	18	17.3
	Female	86	82.7
	Total	104	100.0
Age	<=29	53	51.0
	30-39	48	46.2
	40-49	3	2.9
	Total	104	100.0
Experience Of instructors	<1 year	8	7.7
	1-5 years	75	72.1
	6-10 years	14	13.5
	> 10 years	7	6.7

	Total	104	100.0
Educational Level	BA/BSC/BED	10	9.6
	MA/MSC	89	85.6
	PhD	5	4.8
	Total	104	100.0
HDP Completed	No	53	51.0
	Yes	51	49.0
	Total	104	100

Table 1 above summarizes the background information of instructors (n=112) who completed the questionnaire. As shown in the table, 17.3 % of the instructors who filled and returned the questionnaire were males and the rest 82 % were females. Regarding the educational background of instructors, 89 (85.6%) instructors are second-degree holders, 10(9.6%) are first-degree holders and the remaining 5 (4.8%) are PhD holders.
Table 1 further shows that 51.0 % of the instructors opined that their age is less than or equal to 29 years. Overall, 46.2% percent of the instructors are between the age of 30 and 39; however, the remaining 2.9% of the instructors are between the ages of 40-49. Concerning the experience, 72.1% of the instructors have the experience that lies between 1 to five years. Moreover; 51% of the instructors have not taken HDP training whereas only 49% of the instructors have completed HDP training.

INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS ACTIVE LEARNING

In analyzing the perceptions of instructors on active learning, items related to assumptions, advantages, and their views about active learning were presented in table 2 below.

Table 2: Frequency Distribution and Mean Values of Data Collected on Perceptions of Instructor

No.	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	Mean
1	Active Learning method promotes meaningful learning	-	3.1.%	1.0%	15.7%	71.3%	100%	4.71
2	The time allocated for the course is not enough for activity-based learning	1.0%	7.1%	7.1%	43.5%	33.3%	100%	4.12
3	Active Learning method encourage students to take responsibility for their life	1.0%	-	4.0%	38.0%	57.0%	100%	4.5%
4	Active Learning method encourages me to interact with my students	-	2.0%	3.0%	33.0%	62.0%	100%	4.55
5	Active Learning method accommodates individual difference	-	4.0%	10.1%	52.5%	33.3%	100%	4.15
6	Active Learning method promotes democratic practice	1.0%	3.1%	9.4%	58.3%	28.1%	100%	4.09
7	Using Active Learning method in class creates collaborative and supportive environment	-	1.0%	6.0%	47.0%	46.0%	100%	4.38
8	It takes a long time to prepare activity-based learning lesson	1.0%	11.1%	16.2%	49.5%	22.2%	100%	3.81
9	Active Learning method enhances students' academic achievement	-	2.0%	8.0%	41.0%	49.0%	100%	4.37
10	I consider students' knowledge in my class	-	1.0%	11.1%	49.5%	38.4%	100%	4.25
11	I am in favor of applying Active Learning Strategies in my courses.	1.0%	4.0%	9.1%	48.5%	37.4%	100%	4.17

12	I have found my courses are easier to teach with Active Learning Strategies	**3.0%**	**4.0%**	**17.0%**	**46.0%**	**30.0%**	**100%**	**3.96**
13	Applying Active Learning Strategies will be more interesting and relaxing than using traditional methods	**1.0%**	**6.0%**	**4.0%**	**4.0%**	**49.0%**	**100%**	**4.30**
14	Active Learning method motivates me to teach better	-	**3.1%**	**8.2%**	**45.4%**	**43.3%**	**100%**	**4.29**
15	Active Learning method improves students' communication with their instructors.	-	**1.0%**	**4.0%**	**37.0%**	**58.0%**	**100.1%**	**4.52**
16	Active Learning method enhances students' motivation	-	**2.0%**	**8.0%**	**44.0%**	**46.0%**	**100%**	**4.34**
17	Active Learning method helps students express their opinions	-	-	**6.1%**	**48.5%**	**45.%**	**100%**	**4.3.9**
18	Active Learning method can give students a sense of participation	**1.0%**	**1.0%**	**5.1%**	**37.4%**	**56.6%**	**100%**	**4.45**
	Grand Mean							**4.297**

Item 1, says "active learning method promotes meaningful learning" It was widely supported by instructors. As can be seen in table 2 above, the mean value of their responses (4.71) ranges from agrees to strongly agree. Hence, all the instructors strongly agreed on the idea that the active learning method promotes meaningful learning. On the other hand item, 2 of the same table says "The time allocated for the course is not enough for activity-based learning." For this item, 76,8% of instructors agreed. The mean value for their response was (4.12) which ranges between strongly disagree and strongly agree. Therefore the instructors reflected their agreement. Items 3 and 4 were agreed with mean values (4.50 and 4.55 respectively). This implies that instructors assumed an active learning method that is not only encouraged students to take responsibility for their life but also encouraged instructors themselves to interact with their students. The mean value of Items 5 and 6 were 4.15 and 4.09 which means instructors agreed that the active learning method accommodates individual differences and promotes the democratic practice. For item 7 instructors showed their strong agreement that using the active learning method in the classroom creates a collaborative and supportive environment, with a mean value (4.38). For item 8 which says "It takes a long time to prepare activity-based learning lesson" instructors agreed with mean value (3.81). For items 9 and 17 instructors reflected their agreement with mean value (4.37 and 4.39 respectively) this means that they support the idea that the active learning method enhances students' academic achievement, motivation and helps them to express their opinion freely. Item 10 in which instructors were asked whether they consider students' knowledge or not, a considerable number of them agreed that they considered students' knowledge in their classes. Their response ranged between disagreeing and strongly agreeing with a mean value (4.25). Items 11 and 12 got the agreement of the majority of instructors whose responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree with the mean value of (4.17 and 3.96) each. This indicates that most of the instructors were not only in favor of applying active learning strategies in their courses but also they found their courses easier to teach with active learning strategies. 89% of the instructors replied that the Active learning method is more relaxing and entertaining than the traditional method with a mean value of 4.30. In the same way items 14, 15, 16, and 18, got the consent of the majority of the instructors, whose responses ranged between disagreeing and strongly agreed with a mean value of 4.29, 4.52, 4.34, 4.39, and 4.45 respectively.

This implies that the majority of the instructors supported the assumptions that using active learning method made instructors more relaxed and motivated and that it would improve students' communication with their instructors helps them to express their opinions, and give them a sense of participation.

The general analysis of all the items indicated that the majority of instructors seem to have positive attitudes towards active learning. The grand mean value (4.297) of all the responses tends to support the values for agreeing. Various research findings proved that there is a strong tie between " perception towards active learning and their effort in implementing it (Sguazzin and Grann, 2008 cited in Aschalew, 2012). In line with these ideas,

eighteen statements for the instructors were included in the questionnaires to assess their perception of active learning.

Hence, it appeared that almost all of the instructors showed their agreement with the assumption of active learning raised in the questionnaires. The level of their agreement with the assumptions of active learning showed us that the instructors have perceived active learning positively.

THE PRACTICE OF ACTIVE LEARNING

To examine the status of the practice of active learning method twenty active learning strategies have been included in the questionnaire and the frequency distribution of the use of these strategies by respondents has been presented hereunder.

Table 3: Frequency Distribution and Mean Values on the practice of active learning methods

No.		groups	Never (1)		Rarely(2)		Sometimes (3)		Frequently (4)		Always (5)		Total		Mean
			f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1	Gapped Lecture	T	6	66.1	8	8.2	29	29.6	32	32.7	23	23.5	98	100	3.59
		S	101	23.2	45	10.3	93	21.4	81	18.6	115	26.4	435	100	3.15
2	Problem Solving	T	3	3.0	10	19.9	32	31.7	37	36.6	19	18.8	101	100	3.58
		S	36	8.4	50	11.7	89	20.8	93	21.7	160	37.4	428	100	3.68
3	Role Playing	T	7	6.9	24	23.8	28	27.7	28	27.7	14	13.9	101	100	3.18
		S	47	11.1	48	11.3	105	24.8	93	22.0	130	30.7	423	100	3.50
4	Discussion	T	3	2.9	5	4.8	32	30.8	25	24.0	39	37.5	104	100	3.88
		S	32	7.4	39	9.0	94	21.8	101	23.4	165	38.3	431	100	3.76
5	Brainstorming	T	5	5.0	13	12.9	21	20.8	36	35.6	26	25.7	101	100	3.64
		S	35	8.3	50	11.9	94	22.4	98	23.3	143	34.0	420	100	3.63
6	Peer Teaching	T	9	9.1	13	13.1	40	40.4	26	26.3	11	11.1	99	100	3.17
		S	30	7.2	52	12.5	87	20.9	107	25.7	141	33.8	417	100	3.66
7	Cooperative learning	T	8	8.0	13	13.1	29	29.0	31	31.0	19	19.0	100	100	3.40
		S	36	8.6	36	8.6	92	22.0	102	24.3	153	36.5	419	100	3.72
8	Educational visits/field trip	T	44	43.1	18	17.6	25	24.5	9	8.8	6	5.9	102	100	2.17
		S	164	37.7	41	9.4	72	16.6	71	16.3	87	20.0	435	100	2.71
9	Group work	T	5	5.0	6	5.9	23	21.3	45	44.6	22	21.8	101	100	3.72
		S	52	12.1	40	9.3	112	24.6	88	20.5	138	32.1	430	100	3.51
10	Inquiry	T	8	8.2	16	16.3	37	37.8	24	24.5	13	13.3	98	100	3.18
		S	49	11.8	57	13.7	112	26.9	95	22.8	103	24.8	416	100	3.35
11	Case study	T	10	9.8	16	15.7	43	42.2	20	19.6	13	12.7	102	100	3.10
		S	53	12.3	44	10.2	109	25.3	106	24.6	119	27.6	431	100	3.45
12	Question and Answer	T	2	1.9	3	2.9	18	17.5	37	35.9	43	41.7	103	100	4.13
		S	38	8.7	37	8.4	71	16.2	111	25.3	182	41.5	439	100	3.82
13	Demonstration	T	7	6.9	9	8.8	39	39.2	31	30.4	16	15.7	102	100	3.39
		S	63	14.9	56	13.2	97	22.9	96	22.7	112	26.2	423	100	3.32
14	Story telling	T	15	14.7	29	28.4	28	27.5	16	15.7	14	13.7	102	100	2.85
		S	73	17.4	61	14.6	82	19.6	81	19.3	122	29.1	419	100	3.28
15	Independent homework/ assignment	T	5	4.8	5	4.8	25	24.0	41	39.4	28	26.9	104	100	3.79
		S	41	9.6	28	6.5	77	17.9	94	21.9	189	44.1	429	100	3.84
16	Debate	T	20	19.8	24	23.8	33	32.7	21	20.8	3	3.04	101	100	2.63
		S	126	29.2	61	14.1	87	20.1	75	17.4	83	19.2	432	100	2.83
17	Discovery method	T	15	15.5	26	26.8	34	35.1	20	20.6	2	2.1	97	100	2.67
		S	70	16.5	53	12.5	101	23.8	90	21.2	111	26.1	425	100	3.28
18	Recitation	T	19	19.0	19	19.0	36	36.0	22	22.0	4	4.0	100	100	2.73
		S	76	18.0	69	16.3	89	21.0	94	22.2	95	22.5	423	100	3.15
19	Project work	T	11	10.8	12	11.8	45	44.1	23	22.5	11	10.8	102	100	3.11
		S	119	27.1	63	14.4	68	15.5	77	17.5	112	25.5	439	100	3.00
20	Dramatization	T	33	34.0	25	25.8	25	25.8	11	11.3	3	3.1	97	100	2.24
		S	117	26.6	68	15.5	88	20	87	19.8	80	18.2	440	100	2.88
Grand Mean for		T													3.21

Teachers			
Grand Mean for Students	**S**		**3.38**

From the analysis of the data, it was found out that three themes –teaching techniques employed frequently, sometimes and always were emerged. Firstly both teachers and students agreed with mean values put under the

Independent Samples Test

bracket that the following seven teaching techniques were employed frequently-Discussion(3.88,3.76), Problem-solving (3.58,3.68), Brainstorming(3.64,3.63), Cooperative learning(3.4,3.72), Group work/assignment(3.72,3.51), Question and answer(4.13,3.82) and Independent homework(3.79,3.84). Secondly both teachers and students agreed on the following seven teaching techniques to be used sometimes with their corresponding mean values- Inquiry(3.18,3.35),Demonstration(3.39,3.32), Storytelling(2.85,3.28), Debate(2.63,2.85), Discovery(2.67,3.28) Recitation(2.73,3.15), Project work (3.11,3.06). Thirdly teachers and students showed different views on the following six teaching techniques.

Gapped Lecture, the majority of the instructors responded that this strategy is employed frequently in their classroom with a mean value of 3.59. However, students' response shows a 3.15 mean value which is close to sometimes. Further analysis was made to check if there is a significant difference between the mean scores, accordingly, Independent Sample T-Test was tested at 0.05 significance level and the results were summed as (*P=0.02)* as it is indicated in table 4 below. The finding indicated that *the p-value is* less than 0.05 significance level. this implies that there were significant differences between the mean scores of teachers and students.

Table 4: Independent Sample t-test analysis

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Active Learning Gap Lectured	Equal variances assumed	29.566	.000	-3.086	534	.002	-.487	.158	-.796	-.177
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.867	209.955	.000	-.487	.126	-.735	-.238
Active Learning Problem Solving	Equal variances assumed	15.238	.000	.474	527	.635	.066	.139	-.208	.340
	Equal variances not assumed			.549	184.297	.584	.066	.120	-.171	.303
Active Learning Role Ply	Equal variances assumed	6.244	.013	2.278	524	.023	.324	.142	.045	.604
	Equal variances not assumed			2.485	174.521	.014	.324	.130	.067	.581
Active Learning Discussion	Equal variances assumed	4.062	.044	-.846	533	.398	-.114	.135	-.379	.151
	Equal variances not assumed			-.903	170.030	.368	-.114	.126	-.363	.135
Active Learning	Equal variances assumed	4.269	.039	-.203	520	.839	-.028	.139	-.302	.245
	Equal variances not assumed			-.218	168.354	.828	-.028	.130	-.285	.228
Active Learning Peer Teaching	Equal variances assumed	9.349	.002	3.039	515	.002	.414	.136	.146	.682
	Equal variances not assumed			3.362	171.518	.001	.414	.123	.171	.658
Active Learning Cooperative Learning	Equal variances assumed	.377	.539	2.069	518	.039	.290	.140	.015	.566
	Equal variances not assumed			2.117	156.215	.036	.290	.137	.019	.561
Active Learning Educational Visit/ Field T	Equal variances assumed	31.133	.000	3.473	535	.001	.578	.166	.251	.904
	Equal variances not assumed			4.135	194.444	.000	.578	.140	.302	.853
Active Learning Group Work	Equal variances assumed	15.645	.000	-1.260	529	.208	-.181	.144	-.464	.101
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.424	177.068	.156	-.181	.127	-.433	.070
Active Learning Inquiry	Equal variances assumed	8.534	.004	1.241	512	.215	.177	.143	-.104	.458
	Equal variances not assumed			1.364	165.006	.175	.177	.130	-.080	.435
Active Learning Case Study	Equal variances assumed	16.205	.000	2.548	530	.011	.361	.142	.083	.639
	Equal variances not assumed			2.858	174.942	.005	.361	.126	.112	.610
Active Learning Question and Answer	Equal variances assumed	15.371	.000	-2.951	539	.003	-.401	.136	-.668	-.134
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.530	194.887	.001	-.401	.114	-.625	-.177
Active Learning Demonstration	Equal variances assumed	14.634	.000	-.882	523	.378	-.129	.147	-.418	.159
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.015	186.582	.312	-.129	.128	-.381	.122
Active Learning Story Telling	Equal variances assumed	11.018	.001	2.797	519	.005	.438	.157	.131	.746
	Equal variances not assumed			3.073	174.535	.002	.438	.143	.157	.720
Active Learning Independent Homework	Equal variances assumed	11.583	.001	.540	531	.590	.075	.138	-.197	.346
	Equal variances not assumed			.619	190.069	.537	.075	.120	-.163	.312
Active Learning Debate	Equal variances assumed	23.190	.000	2.003	532	.046	.314	.157	.006	.621
	Equal variances not assumed			2.438	203.260	.016	.314	.129	.060	.567
Active Learning Discovery Method	Equal variances assumed	21.185	.000	3.834	522	.000	.573	.149	.279	.867
	Equal variances not assumed			4.648	194.018	.000	.573	.123	.330	.816
Active Learning Recitation	Equal variances assumed	15.546	.000	3.501	523	.001	.521	.149	.229	.814
	Equal variances not assumed			4.131	194.764	.000	.521	.126	.273	.770
Active Learning Project Work	Equal variances assumed	48.306	.000	-.418	540	.676	-.068	.162	-.387	.251
	Equal variances not assumed			-.515	208.869	.607	-.068	.132	-.328	.192
Active Learning Dramatization	Equal variances assumed	19.662	.000	4.367	534	.000	.688	.157	.378	.997
	Equal variances not assumed			5.346	183.269	.000	.688	.129	.434	.941

Role-play, the mean of instructors' response was 3.18 indicating that the instructors implemented this type of active learning sometimes; nonetheless, the students' mean 3.50 reflected that it is implemented frequently. As it is indicated in the above table 4, to determine whether the two means were significantly different an independent t-test was conducted and thus it was found out that the p-value was less than 0.05, (*P=0.023)* which indicated that there was a difference between the two means.

Peer teaching: instructors' responded that it was used sometimes, whereas teachers responded that it was implemented frequently with a mean value of 3.17 and 3.66 respectively. The result of the independent sample t-test, (*P=0.002) in* the same table above *indicated* that the p-value was less than 0.05, which reveals that there was a difference between the two means.

The educational visit was another active learning method responded differently by teachers and students. Teachers responded that educational visit was employed rarely with a mean value of 2.17. Conversely, students responded that this active learning technique was used sometimes with a mean value of 2.71. Furthermore, an

independent sample t-test was also conducted to check whether there was a significant difference between the two means. As a result, the same table above shows, it was identified that the P-value,(P=0.001) is less than 0.05, which indicates a significant difference between the two means.

For the Case Study, teachers said that it was used sometimes with a mean value of 3.10, but the students' mean value (3.45) falls within the range of frequencies. The P-value, (P=0.011), in table 4, which is less than 0.05 reveals that the two means are significantly different.

For the last active learning technique –dramatization- teachers responded that it was used rarely with a mean value of 2.24. Nevertheless, students responded that it was employed sometimes with a mean value of 2.88. A further analysis was also made to check whether there is a significant difference between the two men. Accordingly, on the same table above, the P-value (P=0.00) is less than 0.05, which showed that there is a significant difference between the two means.

Generally, an analysis of the sub-scale was made using the grand mean of the student's response is 3.38 which is almost equal to the grand mean of the instructor's response (3.21). This indicates different active learning techniques including the lecture method were employed sometimes.

CHALLENGES THAT HINDERS THE PRACTICE OF ACTIVE LEARNING

Teachers were asked to mention the challenges that hinder the implementation of active learning methods in their classrooms. Based on this question, this research found out that large class size, lack of time, low motivation of students, and lack of resources, are the most common challenges that hinder the implementation of active learning. This finding supported the finding of Alemu, (2010) and Aschalew (2012). Lack of skills to implement active learning was another challenge identified by this research.

FINDINGS ON INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION OF ACTIVE LEARNING

The data from the analysis of instructors' questioner revealed that the majority of instructors showed their agreement with the assumptions of active learning that were raised in the questionnaires. Generally, it was found out that the majority of the instructors have a good understanding of active learning with an overall grand mean of **4.297**.

FINDINGS ON THE PRACTICE OF ACTIVE LEARNING METHODS

Based on the analysis of the data, there was some practice of active learning strategies during the teaching-learning process.

- ✓ Based on the findings from the teachers and students survey, it is confirmed that there were Practices of different active learning strategies which have been employed sometimes. For instance, Inquiry, Demonstration, Storytelling, Debate, Discovery, Recitation and Project Work
- ✓ Additionally, the study revealed that Problem Solving, Discussion, Brainstorming, Cooperative Learning, Group Work, Question and answer, Independent homework/assignment, were the most frequently employed technique.
- ✓ On the other hand, this study identified that there have been methods that the instructors' and students' responses mismatch. These methods are Gapped Lecture, Role Play, Peer Teaching, Educational Visits/ Field trip, Case Study, and Dramatization.

In general, when we look at the sub-scale of the study, the classroom practices of active learning methods have been implemented sometimes. This is indicated by the grand mean of 3.21 for instructors and 3.38 for students'.

FINDINGS ON CHALLENGES THAT HINDER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVE LEARNING

Based on the open-ended questions, the following points were mentioned as factors that affect the implementation of active learning methods. The study revealed that various factors contributed to the average level of implementation of active learning methodologies. Shortage of time and a large amount of content that needs to be covered during a semester were the most factors that have been hindering the implementation of active learning strategies. The tendency to use the traditional lecture method was also another very serious factor that has been affecting the implementation of active learning negatively. Other factors which have been seriously affecting the implementation of active learning strategies are listed below:

- Lack of skill of implementing active learning method
- Large class size/ No of students in a classroom/
- Lack of materials/ resources
- The low motivation of students to practice active learning
- Shortage of time to cover the portion

CONCLUSION

The general objective of this study was to describe the perception of instructors and their practice of active learning, to examine the extent to which the perception of instructors guided the practice of active learning in the classrooms, and to explore the status of the implementation of active learning and to indicate the challenges that hinder the use of active learning method. To this end, relevant data were collected; analyzed, and interpreted, based on this the following conclusion has been drawn.

Accordingly, the analysis of the data indicated that almost all of the participants of the study perceived active learning positively with the grand mean value of (4.297). However, the extent of their perception has not guided their practice. Moreover, it was indicated that the instructors assured that when they use active learning, the students learn better and develop the ability to express their feelings confidently; they believe that active learning plays an important role in developing self-confidence. The analysis of the data disclosed that the extent of the practices of active learning in the university was found to be average. The instructors' and students' responses confirmed the practice of active learning with a grand mean of 3.21, and 3.38 respectively which leads to the conclusion that the practice of active learning is “Sometimes”. The challenges that have hampered the implementation of active learning by instructors in the university were discovered. Accordingly, large class size/a large number of students in a class/; a lack of materials/ recourses/, shortage of time, students' lack of motivation, instructors’ lack of skills in implementing active learning, were found to be the major ones.

RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the significances of this study was to provide a recommendation based on the findings of the study. Thus the following recommendations are forwarded:

- ✓ Since the implementation of active learning is found to be average, the university should devise a certain mechanism to encourage both the instructors and students to use active learning in their teaching and learning process.
- ✓ Students’ attitude has been mentioned as a challenge of implementing active learning in the classroom. To minimize this problem, the university should prepare different awareness creation workshops, training, seminars, and courses to bring an attitudinal change for students of the university.
- ✓ The university has to provide continuous training to capacitate instructors' skill of using active learning in their classrooms always.
- ✓ The university should provide necessary resources/ materials to enhance and promote the implementation of active learning which resulted in bringing quality of education.

- ✓ Students' low motivation has also been found out that the other challenge for the implementation of active learning. To avoid this problem instructors' should take the responsibility of encouraging and inspiring their students to use active learning in their teaching and learning process.
- ✓ It has been found out that there is an incompatibility of time given and the course contents need to be covered. Thus the Ministry of Science and Higher Education should make the time and the course harmonious.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to acknowledge those institutions and individuals that contributed to the successful accomplishment of this study. Therefore first we would like to appreciate Salale University for sponsoring this study. Our heartfelt thanks also go to Salale University instructors and students for permitting us by providing with available data.

REFERENCES

[1] Alemu, B.M. 2010. Active Learning Approaches in Mathematics Education at Universities in Oromiya, Ethiopia.

[2] Aschalew ,T. 2012. Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Active Learning at Haramaya University, Eastern Ethiopia: The Case of Faculty of Education. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*. http://dx.doi.org/10.4314%2F star.v1i4.98828.

[3] Escandon,A.2004. Education/Learning Resistance in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Case Study.Working Paper No.5 in Ambissa kenea.2009. Students' Reaction to active Learning Method in Addis Ababa University, *The Ethiopian Journal of Education* Vol.XXIX, No 1.

[4] Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia.1994. *New Education and Training Policy*, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

[5] Gay L. R .1992. Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application 4th ed. New York: Macmillan international.

[6] Michael Prince.2004. Does Active Learning Work? *A Review of the Research Journal of Engr.Education*, 93(3) pp.223-231.

[7] Mowafaq Momani and et.al.2016. The Impact of Implementing Active Learning Strategies. In Teaching English From the Perspective of Tabuk Educational Region Intermediate School Teachers, *Asian Journal of Educational Research* Vol. 4, No. 1, available at Multidisciplinary Journals www.multidisciplinaryjournals.com

[8] Ministry of Education.(2008). Review of the Ethiopian Education Training Policy and its implementation: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

[9] Smith Daniel. (2004).Universities, Paradigms, and Ontological Choices. *The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education.*

[10] Squazzin, T. and Grann, M.V. (2008). Education Reform and Innovations in Namibia. Okahandja: Namibia.in Aschalew Teshome(2012) Teachers‟ Perceptions and Practices of Active Learning in Haramaya University, Eastern Ethiopia: The Case of Faculty of Education. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*. available at http://dx.doi.org/10.4314%2F star.v1i4.98828. Study Com http://study.com/academy/lesson/

[11] Tadesse A. and Daniel T. (2016). An Assessment of the Practice and its Determinant Factors of Active Learning Methodologies by Teachers of teacher Education Colleges of Begemider and Gondar : North and South Gondar Zones of Ethiopia. *British Journal of Education* Vol.4, No.1, pp.32-50, available at www.eajournals.org

[12] Taye Alemayehu (2013) An Assessment of the Practices of the Implementation of Active Learning in Combined Arms Academy, MA Thesis submitted to Addis Ababa University.

[13] Wendmagegnehu Tuji. (2006). Upper Primary Students' Engagement in Active Learning: the Case in Butajira Town primary Schools. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*. Vol. xxvI. No 1.