



THE IMPACT OF USING THE LECTURE METHOD ON TEACHING ENGLISH AT UNIVERSITY

Khalid Abdulbaki¹ⁱ, Muhamad Suhaimi¹,
Asmaa Alsaqqaf¹, Wafa Jawad²

¹Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Education Department, Malaysia

²HC of Technology, English Department, Muscat, Oman

Abstract:

This paper deals with the effectiveness of the lecture method of teaching at university in improving students' linguistic and academic skills. Research on English language teaching at universities and colleges in Oman reveal that a high rate of students who finish secondary schools and join higher education institutions could face difficulties in using the English language to meet their personal, social, academic, and career needs efficiently and appropriately. Lectures are popular among university academics for some reasons such as that they are economical in terms of planning, flexible as they can be applied to most content areas and also simple to implement in class. On the other hand, critics argue that lecturing is principally a one-way method of communication that does not involve significant students' participation. The objectives of this research study are to find out students' views and opinions of the use of the lecture method in teaching English as well as its strengths and weaknesses. The findings showed that although majority of respondents indicated that they had learned a lot from the lecture material, a number of respondents refer to the lack of motivation to participate during the lecture. Meanwhile, few indicated that there is an opportunity to interact during the lecture although the lecturer is the only authority as he dictates his points of view in class. The implications could be that some lecturers at university may find it the right time for them to accept the fact that actual participation of students in their learning is a significant practice to achieve the goals set by their educational institutions. It certainly does not affect the role of the lecturer as an educator and leader. On the contrary, it could create an active and enjoyable atmosphere for exchanging knowledge and improving skills.

Keywords: impact, lecture, method, teaching, university

ⁱ Correspondence: email khalidabdulbaqi@yahoo.co.uk

1. Introduction

Lecturers may be traced back to the Greeks of the fifth century BC. In medieval times lectures were the most popular form of teaching in universities. The term 'lecture' was derived from the Medieval Latin *lectare*, 'to read' aloud. Before the development of the printing press in the fifteenth century, books were expensive, and few students could afford them, so masters read from a text and then added commentaries, which came to be known as glosses (Atkins & Brown, 2002). However, the lecture remains unchanged until today.

Essentially, the lecture has been used down through the years as a means of transmitting cognitive or factual data from a teacher to a group of students. It presupposes that the teacher is the only expert with all the access at the teacher's disposal, and that the students need or want a large amount of this data in a short time. This method, thus, is one way channel of communication of information. The emphasis is mainly on the presentation of the topic and the explanation of the content to the students (Bligh, 2000; Hartman, 2007).

In education, the dominant teaching method in many universities, according to Welkener et al. (2010), is still lecturing and occasionally no teaching method other than lecturing is used at all. Lecturing, as Charlton (2006) claims, is probably the best teaching method in many circumstances and for many students especially for communicating conceptual knowledge, and where there is a significant knowledge gap between lecturer and audience.

Basically, lecturing can also be an efficient way of imparting information in a scheduled way without interruption, and with less planning than in most other teaching methods. However, from a learning-theory standpoint, it could be a very low form of instruction as far as amount of knowledge retention is concerned (Walkin, 2000).

In a lecture, however, students' attention appears to fall off fairly steadily after an initial rise, until the last five minutes when it briefly rises again which means that the middle of a talk is less well remembered than the beginning and end (Bligh, 2000). Lecturers' performance also declines over an hour. Lecturing could also be less effective than discussion, reading, individual work in class and so on. Lectures are claimed to be very widely disliked and felt to be inefficient by students (Gibbs, 1981).

A lecture is, therefore, a process in which information passes from the notes of the lecturer into the notes of the student without passing through the minds of either (Gilstrap & Martin, 1975). The amount of attention paid to teaching and learning is in inverse proportion to the perceived ability of the students (Bligh, 2000). Though lectures are much criticised as a teaching method, universities have not yet found practical alternative teaching methods for the large majority of their courses (Paul, 2015).

1.1 Statement of the problem

The main concern of teaching is providing knowledge to be absorbed and comprehended by students throughout a limited study period. It would be quite futile

if the volume of gain is not proportionate to the efforts exerted by lecturers in the classroom. Students, according to Merriam and Grace (2011), should be provided with sufficient and valuable information they need in order to achieve the study outcomes.

Understanding the aims and objectives of education and the needs of students, as Cascio (2015) argues, are of prime significance for an intact educational system. It is necessary, therefore, to find out the related factors that would have noticeable impacts on students' academic performance in different contexts at university level.

The primary objective of teaching at any level of education is, hence, to bring fundamental changes in the learner's knowledge (Tebabal & Kahssay, 2011). Thus, teaching is the essential of the two elements in the teaching-learning process as it is claimed that good teaching ultimately leads to good learning. The lecturers and the methods they use in teaching decide the volume and quality of knowledge that is communicated to the recipients (Ganyaupfu, 2013).

As for Oman, the English language is the main medium of instruction in most of higher education institutions. Research on English Language Teaching at universities and colleges, as Alami (2016) states, reveal that a high rate of students who finish secondary schools and join different public and private universities and colleges could face difficulties in using the English language to meet their personal, social, academic, and career needs efficiently and appropriately (Al-Issa, 2009b).

At the context of the present research, i.e. a university college in Oman, different methods are used in teaching English language and literature to the students in this institution (Emenyeonu, 2012). However, the researcher has not fallen upon any previous research that dealt with students' views and opinions of using the lecture method in English language and literature classes (Al-Mahrooqi & Denman, 2015). The views and opinions of students regarding the lecture method would indicate whether it could or not facilitate the process of learning which is the main objective of education (Galbraith, (2004).

However, as far as the context of this research study is concerned, the prime objectives to be achieved, is the obvious need for improving its students' language and literacy competence and linguistic skills, enhancing their cognitive abilities and developing their personal growth. Searching for literature related to these issues, it would be verified that there is some lack of academic research that would look deeply on these pedagogical matters (Alami, 2016; Al-Mahrooqi & Denman, 2015).

The students' views and opinions of the lecture method of teaching would have a great impact on the development of students' linguistic and communicative competence (Brumfit & Carter, 1986; McKay, 2001). These views on this method of teaching could also be of a crucial as it might be directly reflected on the learning outcomes of students (Fry et al., 2000; Savignon, 2007) Therefore, an academic research study would contribute to shedding light on these essential and significant issues pertinent to methods of teaching and learning.

The students' and lecturers' views of the method in teaching English might entail some considerable consequences in the constant search for achieving these goals through the use of the effective method (Silverthorn, 2006). As students are the recipient

of knowledge, their views and opinions are definitely significant since they immediately reflect the quality and effectiveness of teaching (Forrester-Jones, 2003; Kember & Wong, 2000).

Thus, the objective of learning is providing an encouraging and advantageous environment for students' learning, creating opportunities to develop language and linguistic skills, enhancing cognitive capabilities and enforcing personal growth (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The ultimate task to consider here, therefore, is to find out whether or not the lecture method is effective in teaching English to achieve these goals for the benefit of students (Hesson & Shad, 2007; Yoder & Hochevar, 2005).

1.2 Purpose of the study

The aim of the present research study is to find out whether the university college pedagogical goals and objectives of academic teaching and learning such as improving students' language and linguistic competence, enhancing their cognitive abilities and developing their personal growth are clearly achieved through the use of the lecture method. Furthermore, to find out the reasons which might lie behind the students' views and opinions.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The objectives of this research study were to find out students' views and opinions of the use of the lecture method in teaching English literature to achieve the goals set by the university college in Oman in terms of: a. General preferences, b. Improvement of language and linguistic skills, c. Cognitive enhancement, d. Personal growth and e. Management of learning

These objectives were as follows:

1. This research study aims at finding out the views of students of English in the university college of the use of the lecture method in teaching English to achieve the pedagogical goals.
2. This research study aims at finding out reasons that lie behind these views.

1.4 Research questions

In order to find out students' views of the use of the lecture method in teaching the English language and literature to achieve the goals and objectives set by the university college in terms of: a. General preferences, b. Improvement of language/linguistic skills, c. Cognitive enhancement, d. personal growth and e. Management of learning

The following research questions related to the study were to be considered:

1. What are the views of students of English in the university college of the use of the lecture method in teaching English to achieve the pedagogical goals?
2. What are the reasons that lie behind these views?

1.5 Significance of the study

This research study is considered significant because it deals with an important issue which could affect the students' learning of the English language and literature at

university. The quality of teaching provided to students is the prime concern of this institution. They need to reach a certain level of proficiency at the end of the academic term. The improvement includes achieving language mastery, heightening the level of thinking skills and strengthening their personal growth. These goals and objectives should be accomplished by the use of an effective method of teaching.

The ultimate findings, therefore, would contribute to the improvement of students' different language/linguistic skills, cognitive enhancement, and personal growth. Also, the findings would enable the institution to realise the specific needs of the students in order to adopt the teaching technique which is more appropriate and effective for imparting information and knowledge to different levels of learners.

1.6 Limitations of the study

The research study was carried out in only one educational institution in a particular country which might not reflect the views of students and lecturers of other institutions in other parts of the world. However, although the findings of this research would not be generalized globally, yet they could contribute to conducting similar research related to other disciplines.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The use of the lecture method in teaching

Lectures, though often criticised for their monolithic instruction style and which are associated with the lack of motivation on the side of the students leading to a very low learning success, they are still one of the most efficient educational methods known in higher education. In addition, lectures, as Carpenter (2006) claims, are very adaptive to time tables, other courses, different audiences and new cognitions, and they play a valuable part in the social life of the students.

Nevertheless, the lecture method of teaching is one way channel of communication of information (Charlton, 2006). Students' involvement in this teaching method is mainly to listen, jot down some notes during the lecture, combine the information and organize it (Marmah, 2014; Nicholls, 2002).

Generally speaking, lectures would be used efficiently and effectively if proper means of teaching are found to make them more active, attractive and interesting tools for students in order to decrease their shortcomings such as inducing passivity, limited retention of information, constraining higher order thinking, as well as for lecturers to be able to closely monitor students' learning from lectures (Fry et al, 2009).

2.2 Pedagogical aspects of lecture

A lecture is a straightforward means of communicating knowledge to students. Lecturers would have a great control over what is delivered in the classroom since they are the prime source of information. Huxham (2005) maintains that students who are auditory learners find that lectures appeal to their learning style more than to other students'.

Lecturing, as Bligh (2001) postulates, is still the teaching method that dominates in many universities around the world. Its proportion to all other methods may reach two to one, and sometimes it could be the only method used. Probably, most college teachers lecture even those who embrace a modern view of participatory learning still turn to the lecture from time to time. Moreover, research, according to Golding (2001), has consistently shown that in many places traditional lecture methods, in which lecturers talk and students listen, are the dominant feature of many college and university classrooms.

However, a lecture is just one choice in a lecturer's variety of methods. As with all the other choices, it may only be used when they are most appropriate. The lecture method, as Hart et al (2002) assert, continues to play a prominent role in the teaching of most disciplines at universities. This is despite persistent and widespread criticism of the lecture as a common teaching method.

As with other teaching methods in use, the lecture method gets a mixed view among different scholars. Although most of students have been inspired by brilliant lecturers, many learners have been bored, confused and even annoyed by inexperienced lecturers (Cannon & Newble, 2002). On the other hand, Charlton (2006) contends that there seems to be ample evidence that lectures are probably the best practicable teaching method in many circumstances and for many students. However, it is not generally understood why lectures are useful, and the lack of a convincing rationale for lectures has been a major factor in under-estimating their importance.

In agreement with this claim, Ramsden (2003) states that a lecture is mostly easier to be carried out than other methods of teaching. Therefore, the lecture might be the most familiar and acceptable by many lecturers as it could typically be the method they have grown up with through the span of their life. In addition, the lecture method might be commonly used in teaching as many divergent subjects as human mind could imagine.

A good lecture always offers a point of view and an avenue of entry into a field of study, In addition, a lecturer may focus students' attention to help them identify and remember central points of the lecture. The lecture method, therefore, emphasizes the role of the lecturer in communicating knowledge to students (Davis, 2009). The latter's role, thus, is mainly to take notes during the lecture and repeat whatever they have learnt on the exam papers. Students are often passive learners who could most of the time depend on the lecturer in their learning (Brookfield, 1995).

Nevertheless, Lectures are effective educational tools, as Wood et al (2007) argue, if they are skillfully delivered by competent lecturers, with clear and enthusiastic voice, good eye contact, and appropriate gestures. They could be good mainly for auditory learners and those who are aware of different modes of presentation. Lecturers may consider some ways to assist students to make the connections between different representations, especially students whose first language is not English.

Energetic and enthusiastic lecturers, therefore, could offer efficient ways to explain important details to large groups of diverse learners far from one-way monologues that serve as flowing information from a teacher to students. Good

lectures, in view of Fisher and Frey (2008), could ground students in an interesting topic and include activities to motivate their critical thinking about that particular topic.

Despite increasing choice of alternatives, the great majority of students, as Charlton (2006) claims, continue to enroll in attendance-based and residential universities where lectures are a primary mode of instruction. Therefore, since lectures are still a popular teaching means at many universities to encourage higher levels of thinking among students, Donald (2002) suggests that lectures may be shaped to encourage them to acquire the needed skills to build on their own existing understanding.

In brief, Fry et al (2009) state that students say that lecturers need to take advantage of their attentive audience in as many ways as possible by soliciting responses and reactions from the students, by providing aids for note-taking and comprehension, and by daring to model learning in action, not learning as passive acquisition.

2.3. Criticism of lecturing

The lecture method involves the lecturer taking the lead in delivering knowledge with minimum or no participation of the students. This is problematic as the students take on a passive role, which can hinder their learning process (Fry et al, 2009). Students need to be alert learners, to keep their minds active and be able to integrate different information. The lecturer could make sure to attract the attention of students through asking questions and encouraging their participation.

The traditional teaching paradigm, thus, places the main responsibility for student learning upon the lecturer's shoulders. That is to say, the lecturer may present almost the same information, lectures to and tests all students regardless of the individual differences among them (Shopov & Pencheva, 2001). Limited or no concern is given to the personal or psychological needs of the individuals.

The lecture method, therefore, is claimed to be teacher-centred where the lecturer occupies most of the lecture time talking to students who may be listening passively (Bligh, 2000; Cook, 2001). There could be some reluctant participation on the part of the students in their learning as they heavily depend on the lecturer for listening to and understanding the relevant material. The consequences in the long run, thus, may not be in the best interests of the learners.

Moreover, Brown & Race (2002) enquires whether this reliance on lecturing is effective for universities to achieve the educational objectives they look for. He also asks if the dependence on lecture method exploits lecturers' time and energy efficiently as well as those of the students. Finally, he asks whether this method gives students deep and advantageous educational experience. The overwhelming evidence, as Davis (2009) claims, indicates that the answer to these questions is negative.

Research had shown that most of these lectures continue for nearly fifty minutes at a time, although the human attention span seems to be considerably less than that, i.e. almost fifteen to twenty minutes at the beginning of a lecture (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Meanwhile, Benjamin (2002) claims that as the lecture begins, most students are paying

close attention but for most students that attention lasts for about 10 minutes. Even with material that may seem interestingly agreeable to the lecturer, it is often a challenge to maintain the active interest of an often distracted audience for such a long period (McKeachie & Svinicki, 2006).

The lecture strength is that it is a way to deliver information to a large number of people at a time, yet the drawback in the lecture is that it produces limited deep knowledge comparing to other used teaching methods (Heppner, 2007; Marmah, 2014). Meanwhile, Daniel (1999) contends that a lecture is not the ideal platform for a complex scholarly argument or a massive accumulation of data. The goal of any lecture is to illuminate a topic, not to baffle students with its nuances or to overload them with so much unnecessary knowledge.

Furthermore, lecturing, as Bligh (2000) claims, could not be as effective as other methods of teaching at university in promoting independent thought or developing student's thinking skills. He adds that a lecturer may dominate the bulk of the lecture time talking to students who have almost nothing to do except listening passively.

Generally speaking, lecture-based instruction imposes an obvious gulf or barrier between the lecturer and student that less experienced lecturer use to maintain control of their classroom. Omatseye (2007) claims that very little verbal and academic exchange may occur between the lecturer and the students during a lecture time.

Therefore, Blumberg (2008) contends that students' actual participation in a lecture could create an encouraging atmosphere for academic learning.

3. Method

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study employed quantitative data collecting techniques to collect data. The research starts with a survey that aims at looking in depth into the students' views on the lecture method in teaching English literature at university. The quantitative data collection technique involves conducting and administering a questionnaire.

The research is, thus, designed in a way that would allow the researcher to gather, through the coordination with the English Department in the university college, as much data as possible which would assist in answering the research questions. The result would facilitate the development of a framework which could be applied in language and literature classes when the lecture method is used.

3.2 Participants

A sample is a set of respondents selected from a larger population for the purpose of a survey. The study sample in this research comprised ninety nine students in the third and final years who study English language and literature in the Department of English language and literature in a university college.

For the present research study, judgment sampling is used as it is appropriate in this context. It involves the choice of subjects who are most advantageously placed or in the best position to provide the information required (Saunders et al., 2012).

3.3 Data collection

The study uses a students' questionnaire designed according to Likert scale of five levels. The aim is to investigate students' perceptions of the value and importance of lecturing, active learning and interactive activities they undertake during lectures. The questionnaire (see Appendix) contained forty questions and was designed so that students could complete it in about 20 minutes. It is divided into four categories:

a. General preferences, b. Improvement of language/linguistic skills, c. Cognitive enhancement, d. Personal growth and e. Management of learning.

3.4 Data analysis

Data collected would be analysed using SPSS version 20 to get the mean and standard deviation. Prior to analyzing the quantitative data, testing the reliability of instruments is needed. Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was done on the data obtained from the pilot test. It is a coefficient of internal consistency which is commonly used as an estimate of the reliability of a psychometric test for a sample of examinees. In this study, the computed range of the pilot testing participated by the randomly selected thirty students in the third and fourth years of the university college is 0.830 which could be interpreted as having reliability in the instrument (Cronbach, 2004). As for the internal consistency of each category, the computed reliability analysis test is shown as follows:

Table 3.1: Reliability of constructs on the lecture method

Category	Lecture
a. General preferences	0.982
b. Improvement of language/linguistic skills	0.776
c. Cognitive enhancement	0.971
d. Personal growth	0.720
e. Management of learning	0.984

Table 3.1 shows that the students' responses for the lecture method showed the value of more than 0.60. All the values are higher than the acceptable lower limit of 0.6 according to Nunnally (1978).

4. Results and Findings

Students were asked forty questions to gather information on their perceptions of the lecture method. The majority of respondents indicated that the method had been of value to them. Likewise, majority of respondents indicated that they had learned a lot from the lecture method material as interesting. However, majority of respondents indicated a preference for interaction during the lecture.

4.1 Analysis of Students' questionnaire

The views of students of the lecture method are shown in the following table:

Table 4: Views of students on the Lecture Method

Categories	Lecture	
	Mean	Rank
a. General preferences	3.06	I
e. Management of learning	2.88	II
d. Personal growth	2.88	II
c. Cognitive enhancement	2.88	II
b. Improvement of language/linguistic skills	2.87	III

In Table 4.1 the views of students for the lecture method, reveals that the category 'General preferences' has a neutral mean of 3.06 and comes in rank 1 while the category 'Improvement of language/linguistic skills' has also a neutral mean of 2.87 to be in the last place in ranking

According to statistics, a result is considered significant because it has been predicted as unlikely to have occurred by chance alone (Sirkin, 2005). *P*-values are often coupled to a significance or alpha (α) level, which is also set ahead of time, usually at 0.05 (5%). Thus, if a *p*-value was found to be less than 0.05, then the result would be considered statistically significant (Schlotzhauer, 2007).

Table 4.2: Students' responses to lecture method with reference to General Preferences

Item No.	A. General Preferences	Mean	S.D
1.	I benefit from lecturing.	2.98	1.28
2.	I feel bored during the lecture.	3.02	1.12
3.	I am attentive through the whole lecture.	2.77	1.10
4.	I like to listen to the lecturer and the students.	3.48	0.99
5.	Concentrating on the text is useful.	3.22	1.08
6.	I like to have lecturing more often.	2.85	1.12
7.	I like lecturing as well as discussion during the same lecture.	3.91	0.81
8.	The lecture method should be applied to all subjects.	2.81	1.05
9.	I intend to apply the lecture method in my future teaching career.	2.64	1.01

Table 4.2 shows students' responses to lecture method regarding general preferences. Students have high mean in item 7 as they agree that they 'like to have lecturing and discussion in the same lecture' (Mean= 3.80, SD= 0.81) and in item 4 that they 'like to listen to the lecturer and the students' (Mean= 3.48, SD= 0.99). Students, have neutral mean value in item 5 as they believe that 'it is useful to concentrate on the text (Mean=3.22, SD=1.08) and in item 2 they 'feel exited during the lecture (Mean =23.2, SD=1.12).

Students also have neutral mean in regard to lecturing as it is shown in item 1 with respect to 'benefits gained by students from lecturing (Mean= 2.98, SD= 1.28), in item 3 where students are also neutral in being 'attentive through the whole lecture' (Mean= 2.85, SD= 1.10), in item 8 the lecture method 'should be applied to other subjects

too' (Mean=2.81, SD=1.05), in item 6 where they express their inclination to have lecturing more often (Mean= 2.77, SD= 1.12), and in item 9 as students refer to their intention to apply the lecture method in teaching career in future (mean=2.64, SD=1.01). It is noticed that students have the tendency to enjoy the benefits of lecturing and discussion during the same lecture period. Nonetheless, they are neutral regarding the application of the lecture method to all subjects and their intention to apply the lecture method in their future teaching career.

Table 4.3: Students' responses to lecture method with reference to Linguistic Skills

Item No	B. Language and Linguistic Skills	Mean	S.D
10.	In lecturing, I am able to listen to others' opinions and take notes.	2.70	1.08
11.	I am able to ask and answer questions during the lecture.	2.49	1.02
12.	I am able to make an oral summary of the topic of lecture.	2.63	1.02
13.	I am able to give short talk on the topic of the lecture.	2.61	0.92
14.	I am able to express my ideas which can be understood by others.	2.70	0.99
15.	I feel my fluency develops by the lecture method.	2.74	1.14
16.	My pronunciation improves by the lecture method.	2.93	1.24
17.	My command of the English grammar improves through lecturing.	3.46	1.17
18.	My vocabulary increases by lecturing.	3.58	1.09

The above table shows the statistically computed data on students' responses with regard to the lecture method used in teaching literature in terms of improvement of language/linguistic skills. The high mean is shown in item 18 where students agree that they 'obtain more vocabulary in the lecture (Mean=3.58, SD=1.09) and they identify relatively less in item 17 with the 'improvement of their command of English grammar' (Mean= 3.46, SD= 1.17).

Meanwhile, neutral mean is realised in item 16 in relation to 'improvement in students' pronunciation during lecture' (Mean= 2.93, SD=1.24), in item 15 'improvement in student fluency' (Mean= 2.74, SD= 1.14), in item 10 as they have the 'ability to listen to others opinions and take notes' (Mean= 2.70, SD=1.08) and in item 14 regarding their 'ability to express ideas' (Mean = 2.70, SD= 0.99).

Students in item 12 are also neutral towards ability to 'make oral summary of the topic of discussion' (Mean= 2.63, SD=1.02) and in item 11 as they refer to their ability to 'ask and answer questions' (Mean= 2.61, SD= 1.02). In item 13, however, students disagree regarding their ability to 'give short talks during lecturing' (Mean= 2.49, SD= 0.92).

Although students' vocabulary increases and their command of English grammar is enhanced by lecturing, other activities required for improvement of linguistic skills such as students' pronunciation would need to be met. Students also doubt their ability to express thoughts as limited opportunities may be given to students in the class to participate and contribute to their learning (Daniel, 1999; Fisher & Frey, 2008).

Table 4.4: Students' responses to lecture method with reference to Cognitive Enhancement

Item No	C. Cognitive Enhancement	Mean	S.D
19.	In lecturing, I am able to identify ideas in the topic of the lecture.	3.04	1.12
20.	I am able to analyze detailed information while listening to a lecture.	2.61	0.99
21.	I am able to extract detailed opinions while listening to a lecture.	2.47	0.87
22.	I am able to compare my ideas with others' ideas in a lecture.	2.54	0.99
23.	I broaden my general knowledge through a lecture.	3.77	1.03
24.	I am able to distinguish between different opinions in a lecture.	2.88	1.10

Table 4.4 reveals students' responses to lecture method with reference to cognitive enhancement. High mean is related to students' agreement in item 23 that lecturing 'widens general knowledge' (Mean= 3.77, SD=1.03), and in item 19 as they have ability to 'identify ideas in topic of lecture' (Mean=3.04, SD=1.12).

Neutral value is recognised in item 24 where students are able to 'distinguish between different opinions in a lecture' (Mean=2.88, SD=1.10) and in item 20 as they refer to their 'ability to analyse information in the lecture' (Mean= 2.61, SD= 0.99). Students, however, show their disagreement in item 22 in reference to their ability to 'compare their ideas with others' (Mean= 2.54, SD= 0.99) and in item 21 where students have less confidence in their ability to extract detailed opinions (Mean= 2.47, SD= 0.87). As it is gathered from above, students benefit from lecturing through widening the scope of their general knowledge. Nevertheless, they lack the opportunity to compare their ideas with others' or confidence in ability to extract detailed opinions during the lecture.

Table 4.5: Students' responses to lecture method with reference to Personal Growth

Item No	D. Personal Growth	Mean	S.D
25	I am able to state my points of view without hesitation during the lecture.	3.20	1.13
26	I want to present my opinion during lecturing but afraid to do so.	3.24	1.23
27	I prefer others to state their opinions during the lecture.	2.89	1.23
28	I expect the lecturer to ask for my opinion during the lecture.	3.20	1.13
29	My self-confidence increases through lecturing.	2.74	1.14
30	I am motivated to participate actively in future lectures.	2.70	1.08

The above table discusses students' responses to lecture method with reference to personal growth. The students' views of the lecture is noticed in their neutral mean value in item 27 for 'others to express opinions' (Mean= 3.24, SD= 1.23), the ability in item 25 to 'state viewpoints without hesitation' (Mean= 3.20, SD= 1.13), and in item 28 where students 'expecting the lecturer to ask their opinions' (Mean= 3.20, SD=1.13).

Neutral means are also found in item 26 with the fear among students to 'express their opinions' (Mean= 2.89, SD= 1.23), in item 29 as 'self -confidence increases through lecturing (Mean=2.74, SD=1.14) and in item 30 as students' believe that they are 'motivated to participate actively in future lectures' (Mean=2.70, SD=1.08).

Students are not sure whether to voice their opinions in a lecture, leave this task to be carried out by others or wait for the lecturer to ask them. They are not sure either

of the increase in their self-confidence or whether they are motivated to participate actively in future lectures.

Table 4.6: Students' responses to lecture method with reference to Management of Learning

Item No	E. Management of Learning	Mean	S.D
31	The lecturer may raise topics for the lecture along with students.	2.96	1.12
32	The lecturer may notify us in advance of the topic of the lecture.	3.60	1.05
33	The lecturer may help us form our sentences during the lecture.	3.00	1.09
34	The lecturer may correct our pronunciation immediately.	3.10	1.13
35	The lecturer usually gives us opportunities to talk in the lecture.	1.98	1.25
36	Few students only talk all the time.	2.88	1.10
37	The lecturer dictates points of view during lecture.	3.80	1.42
38	The lecturing topics are relevant to our preferred choices.	3.10	0.99
39	Only the lecturer should talk during the lecture	2.76	1.22
40	As a student, I should be free whether or not to participate in the lecture.	3.25	1.10

Table 4.6 discusses students' responses to the lecture method with reference to management of learning. The students high mean is related to their agreement to item 40 in regard to 'participating during the lecture should be free' (Mean= 3.91, SD= 1.10) and in item 32 as students assume that the lecturer may 'notify them in advance of the topic of the lecture' (Mean=3.60, SD=1.05).

Neutral means are noticed in item 37 that the lecturer 'dictates his points of view during the lecture' (Mean= 3.25, SD= 1.42), in item 38 the lecture topics are 'relevant to students' preferred choices' (Mean=3.10, SD=0.99), in item 34 the lecturer may 'correct their pronunciation immediately' (Mean=3.10, SD=1.13), in item 33 the lecturer 'helps students form sentences' (Mean= 3.00, SD= 1.09).

However, in item 31 the lecturer 'raises topics for the lecture along with students has the mean of (Mean=2.96 SD= 1.12), in item 35 the lecturer 'gives students opportunities to talk in the lecture' (Mean=2.88, SD=1.25), in item 39 'only the lecturer should talk during the lecture' (Mean= 2.76, SD= 1.22. On the other hand, students in item 36 disagree that 'few students only talk all the time' (Mean=1.98, SD=1.10). Students believe that they are free to participate in the lecture and that the lecturer notifies them about the topic prior to the coming lecture. Nonetheless, students are uncertain that the lecturer dictates his points of view and the lecture topics are relevant to students' preferred choices.

5. Discussion

5.1 Students' views on using the lecture method

Students were asked to respond to a questionnaire to gather information on their perceptions of the lecture method. Majority of respondents indicated that the method had been of value to them (Charlton, 2006). Likewise, majority of respondents indicated that they had learned a lot from the lecture material as it is interesting. However, majority of them refer to the lack of motivation to participate during the lecture.

Meanwhile, few indicated that there is no opportunity to interact during the lecture since the lecturer is the only authority as he dictates his points of view in the class (Fry et al, 2009).

The research work showed that students have neutral cumulative mean of 2.97 regarding the use of the lecture method in teaching English in terms of the five categories included in the questionnaires of this research. Students' perceptions on the lecture method revealed that students' opinions on the lecture method ranged from a mean of 1.98 Management of learning to a mean of 3.91 for General preferences.

5.2 Analysis of students' views

The analysis of students' views and opinions of the lecture method, Table 4.1, the category 'General preferences' is highest in ranking while improvement of language skills is the lowest. As for table 4.2, it showed that the item with the highest mean among the five categories is from General preferences, 'I like lecturing as well as discussion during the same lecture.' with agree mean value. Meanwhile, the lowest is from Table 4.6 Management of learning, 'The lecturer usually gives us opportunities to talk in the lecture' with disagree mean.

The details of each of the five categories revealed that for General preferences, Table 4.2, the item with the highest mean is 'I like lecturing as well as discussion during the same lecture.' while for the lowest is 'I am attentive through the whole lecture.'

For Language and Linguistic Skills, Table 4.3, the highest is 'My vocabulary increases by lecturing' while the lowest is 'I am able to ask and answer questions during the lecture'.

For Cognitive Enhancement, Table 4.4, the highest is 'I broaden my general knowledge through lecturing.' while the lowest is 'I am able to extract detailed opinions while listening to a lecture.'

For Personal Growth, Table 4.5, the highest is 'I want to present my opinion during the lecture but afraid to do so.' while the lowest is 'I am motivated to participate actively in future lectures'.

As for Management of Learning, Table 4.6, the item with the highest mean is 'The lecturer dictates points of view during lecture' while the lowest is 'The lecturer usually gives us opportunities to talk in the lecture'.

6. Implications for teaching and learning

The implications for teaching and learning would be rather noticeable. For students, active participation in the college class improves student's learning of course content and development of problem solving. Participation in the class would also develop students' oral communication and critical thinking.

Furthermore, lecturers of English at university may find it the right time for them to accept the fact that actual participation of students in their learning is an urgent and significant issue to achieve the goals set by their educational institutions. It certainly does not affect the role of the lecturer as an educator and leader. On the contrary, it

could create an active and enjoyable atmosphere for exchanging knowledge and improving skills.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion, it would not be unusual to state the simple fact that good teaching would lead to better learning. It has been reaffirmed that lecturing could be an essential means for communicating knowledge at university. Yet, learners may need more participation in class to consolidate their learning. The method of teaching preferred by students could have a great impact on the outcomes that would be eventually achieved by them at the end of a course. Lecturers, therefore, may bear a huge ethical responsibility towards themselves and their students.

References

1. Alami, M. (2016). Causes of Poor Academic Performance among Omani Students. *International Journal of Social Science Research*. 4(1)
2. Al-Issa, A. (2009b). Omani ELT school curriculum: Policy & practice. Paper presented in the Oman Annual International ELT Conference, *The Language Centre, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat*.
3. Al-Mahrooqi, R. & Denman, C. (2015). *Issues in English education in the Arab world*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
4. Atkins, M. and Brown, G., (2002). *Effective teaching in higher education*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
5. Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
6. Blich, D. A. (2000). *What's the use of lectures?* (1st Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
7. Blumberg, P. (2008). *Developing learner-centered teachers: A practical guide for faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
8. Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey.
9. Brookfield, S.D. (1996). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press. pp.1-49.
10. Brown, S & Race, P. (2002). *Lecturing: A practical guide*. London: Routledge.
11. Brumfit, C & Carter, R. (Eds.). (1986). *Literature & language teaching*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press
12. Cannon, R. & Newble, D. (2002). *A handbook for teachers in universities and colleges: A guide to improving teaching methods*. London: Kogan Page Ltd
13. Carpenter, J. M. (2006). Effective teaching methods for large classes. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences Education*, 24(2),13-23.

15. Cascio, C. (2015). Factors of poor student performance. Retrieved October 16, 2015, from <http://classroom.synonym.com/factors-poor-student-performance-12636.html>
16. Charlton, B. (2006). Lectures are an effective teaching method because they exploit human evolved 'human nature' to improve learning-*Medical Hypotheses*, 67,261-5.
17. Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching (3rd Edition)*. New York: OUP Inc.
18. Daniel, E. (1999). *Lecture-discussion method*. Retrieved January 30, 2016, from <http://www.ils.unc.edu/daniel/214/lecture.html>
19. Davis, B., G. (2009). *Tools for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
20. Donald, J. G. (2002). *Learning to think: Disciplinary perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
21. Emenyeonu, O. (2012). Student-Centered Learning in Oman: Challenges and Pitfalls. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 2(5), 243-254.
22. Fisher, D. & Frey N. (2008). *Better learning through structured teaching*. Alexandria, USA: ASCD.
23. Forrester-Jones, R. (2003). Students' perceptions of teaching: The research is alive and well. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(1), 59-69.
24. Fry, H., Ketteridge, S. & Marshall, S. (2009). *A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: enhancing academic learning*. London: Routledge Falmer.
25. Galbraith, M. W. (Ed.). (2004b). *Adult learning methods: A guide to effective instruction* (3 Ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger.
26. Ganyaupfu, E. M. (2013). Teaching methods and students' academic performance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*. 2(9), 29-35.
27. Gibbs, G. (1981). Twenty terrible reasons for lecturing. SCED Occasional Paper No. 8, Birmingham.
28. Gilstrap, R. L., & Martin, Wi. R. (1975). *Current strategies for teachers: A resource for personalizing instruction*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.
29. Hart, S., Dixon, A., Drummond, M.J. & McIntyre, D. (2004). *Learning without Limits*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
30. Heppner, F. (2007). *Teaching the large college class: A guidebook for instructors with multitudes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
31. Hesson, M. & Shad, K. (2007). A student-centered learning model. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 628-636.
32. Kember, D., & Wong, A. (2000). Implications for evaluation from a study of students' perceptions of good and poor teaching. *Higher Education*, 40(1), 69-97
33. Marmah, A. A. (2014). Students' perception about the lecture as a method of teaching in tertiary institutions. *International Journal of Education and Research*, (2)6.
34. McKeachie, W. J., & Svinicki, M. (2006). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

35. Marmah, A. A. (2014). Students' perception about the lecture as a method of teaching in tertiary institutions. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(6), 601-612.
36. McKay, S. (1986). Literature in the ESL classroom. In C. Brumfit and R. Carter (Eds.), *Literature and Language Teaching*, (191-198). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
37. Merriam, S. B., & Grace A. P. (Eds.). (2011). *The Jossey-Bass reader on contemporary issues in adult education*. San Francisco
38. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
39. Omatseye, B. (2007). The discussion teaching method: An interactive strategy in Tertiary learning. *Education*, 128(1), 87-94.
40. Paul, A. M. (2015). [Are college lectures unfair?](#) Sunday Review. New York Times. Retrieved 20 October 2016.
41. Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
42. Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
43. Savignon, S. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 207-220.
44. Silverthorn D. U. (2006). Teaching and learning in the interactive classroom. *Adv Physiol Educ*, 30(4), 135-140.
45. Shopov, T. & Pencheva, M. (2001). *Whole language, whole person: A handbook of language teaching methodology*. Sofia: Passagem Editores.
46. Tebabal, A. & Kahssay, G. (2011). The effects of student-centered approach in improving students' graphical interpretation skills and conceptual understanding of kinematical motion. *Latin-American Journal of Physics Education*, 5(2), 374-381.
47. Walkin, L. (2000). *Teaching and learning in further adult education*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thomas Publishers Ltd.
48. Welkener, M. M., Kalish, A. and Bandeen, H. M. (2010). *Teaching and learning in the college classroom*. Boston, MA: Pearson Learning Solutions.
49. Wood, L.N., Sadhbh, J., Petocz, P and Rodd, M. (2007). 'Learning in lectures: multiple representations'. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*. 38(97), 907 – 915.
50. Yoder, J. & Hochevar, C. (2005). Encouraging active learning can improve students' performance on examinations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 32(2), 91-95.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).