

# Review of: "Implications of Large Class Size on Effective Teaching and Learning in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions: Lecturers' Perception"

Kindu Ayechew Ayenalem<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gondar University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Implications of Large Class Size on Effective Teaching and Learning in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions: Lecturers' Perception

Olubunmi Kayode Ayanwoye<sup>1</sup>

I would like to thank the author for his thorough effort in a very current research topic, not only in the study setting but also in other areas with a similar context. As the author tried to show, large class size is a typical problem in many developing countries, particularly in Africa. Hence, examining the instructors' perceptions to understand the implications of large class size in the practice of the teaching-learning process is very important and timely. In this regard, the paper provides important insights about the topic in question. However, despite its qualities, I feel that the paper has some faults that I indicated below in my comment. I organized my comments and concerns as presented below.

## 1. Title, Abstract, and Introduction

- A. **Title:** The title is clearly stated. It is informative. However, there is some confusion when one looks at the purpose of the study. It aims to investigate the impact of large class size. The author mostly used the term "impact" throughout the paper. However, I do not think that the study is an 'impact' type of study. It simply examines teachers' perceptions about larger class size in the teaching-learning process. So, advise the author if alignment is created between the title and the remaining sections of the paper.
- B. **Abstract:** The abstract section comprises most of the required components. However, it needs some reconsideration due to the following weak points:
- I think an abstract is a brief and short reflection of the whole paper. As a result, it is usually organized in a paragraph. However, the abstract of this study is prepared in three separate paragraphs, which is mostly uncommon. I suggest to the author that the abstract be presented in one condensed paragraph only.
  - The abstract section also has some problems related to missed words (e.g. non-experimental descriptive survey....design is missed), inappropriate conjunction (lecturers' perceptions were unaffected by differences in gender, qualifications, institutions, or years of experience, the conjunction 'or' is wrongly used. 'and' is instead appropriate because teachers do not show a perception difference across all the variables).
  - Conclusion of the study is not included in the abstract.
  - I think the study is conducted in a tertiary education setting. However, including the abstract section, and throughout the paper, different terminologies were used by the author (e.g., postsecondary institutions, academic institutions, tertiary institutions, higher schools, universities, colleges to refer to the study setting). I think that creates a bit of confusion. Thus, it is better if the author provides a clear definition for tertiary education in the Nigerian context and uses that term consistently in the paper.
- A. **Introduction:** Right after the list of keywords and before the review of literature section, there is a discussion of some issues without a clear title. I thought this is an introduction section. Am I right? If that is so, I can say that the introduction section is more or less prepared in a good way. However, there are some problems that need improvement.

i. This section does not provide a **strong/convincing** rationale/objective of the study. It simply says large classes are given in Nigerian tertiary institutions, so this study looked at lecturers' perceptions of the effects of large class sizes on efficient teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions with the goal of supplying manageable explanations. What makes the study urgent over other problems? Where is the gap that initiates this study? Is the aim of the study to find workable solutions or examine the teachers' perceptions regarding large class size? If the aim was the former one, had the researcher obtained those workable solutions other than his recommendations? (**See** the abstract section that says In order to find workable solutions to the issue, the study investigated the impact of large class sizes on teaching and learning at Nigerian academic institutions (which academic institution?). **See** also the statement of the problem section, which says "In order to find workable alternatives, this study looked at lecturers' perceptions of the impacts of large class sizes on in Nigerian postsecondary institutions. Look again at your purpose of the study section: This study aspired to understand how lecturers view the impact of large class sizes on efficient teaching and learning. The study specifically investigated the gender, qualification, institution, and year of experience discrepancies in this perception) (the author interchangeably uses terms like: successful teaching and learning, effective teaching and learning (mostly used), and efficient teaching and learning. Do those three terms such as successful, effective, and effecting connote similar meanings in your study? If not, why do you use them in such a way?). Why is the statement of the problem section separated from the introduction section and presented below the review of literature section? Generally, I recommend that if the introduction section comprises both the statement of the problem and that of research objectives/questions/hypotheses, the author provides some more and strong justifications/rationales for the study. Making this change reduces unnecessary duplication of the same idea in different places. It will also give coherence to the paper.

1. **Objective/Questions/hypothesis:** Orderly, I suggest that if **Questions/hypothesis** were presented under the introduction section. When I come to their quality and clarity, I have a concern particularly about the clarity of the hypotheses. They all lack clarity. All need clarification.**H01:** There is no significant gender difference in lecturers' perception of the implications of large class sizes on effective teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

My suggestion: **H01:** There

is no significant difference in lecturers' perception of the implications of large class sizes on effective teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions based on gender, or

**H01:** There is no significant difference between male and female lecturers' perception of the implications of large class sizes on effective teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions. These two are a bit clearer than yours.

**H02:** There is no significant qualification difference in lecturers' perception of the implications of large class sizes on effective teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

You are not looking at the qualification difference. You rather need to see the perception difference among different levels of qualification. Thus, please restate all four hypotheses in a clear manner.

**H03:** There is no significant institutional difference in lecturers' perception of the implications of large class sizes on effective teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

**H04:** There is no significant year of experience difference in lecturers' perception of the implications of large class sizes on effective teaching and learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

**4. Review literature:** I appreciate the author for the review literature section in this study. However, I have three comments on it.

The placement of the review literature section (which is located after the introduction, but before the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, and hypothesis) in my view is inappropriate.

Although the author tried to organize the review literature under four subtopics such as Large Class, Challenges of Teaching Large Classes as Perceived by Lecturers, Lecturers' Perception of the Impact of Large Classes on Teaching Effectiveness, and Lecturers' Coping Mechanisms for Overcoming Challenges of Teaching Large Classes, I do not observe unique ideas relevant to the given topic. Rather, I observed many repetitions and duplications of ideas. So, I suggest either the elimination of those subtopics or the organization of refined or topic-relevant review literature. What I mean is, many of the subdivided sections of the review literature are more or less similar. They need to be either merged or carefully delineated to avoid idea duplication.

As a third comment, the author in his review literature stated that he used a continuous improvement theory/paradigm to guide the study. My questions and concerns are: Is that paradigm/theory used as the theoretical framework of the study? If so, who/where is the source of the theory/paradigm? Nothing has been said in the paper. Next, how is that theory or paradigm relevant to this study? In what way? Thus, the review literature section should be revised in a way that provides answers to the above questions/comments.

**5. Methodology/Materials and Methods:** The method section is generally sound. However, more clarity is needed on the sampling technique. I am not convinced by the purposive sampling technique. Participants' voluntariness and the use of purposive sampling are two different things. Further, I do not see the ethical considerations taken by the researcher in the methods section.

**6. Findings/Data Analysis:** Generally, the data analysis/findings section is well-written. However, the eight tables used to test the four hypotheses can be reduced to at least four tables if not one.

Variables	Category	N	M	SD	t	df	p-value
Gender							
Educational level							
Age							
Teaching experience							

Thus, please consider merging at least two tables about one hypothesis.

**7. Interpretation/Discussion:** The authors provide somewhat good discussion of the findings. However, it is only limited to comparing the research findings with previous studies. I think the discussion goes further than that. It should at least show and discuss the implications of the findings. Comparing the findings with previous works and locating it in the current literature is by itself good, but what do those consistent or inconsistent findings imply? What do they indicate at least with respect to the guiding theory/paradigm that the author introduces us to in his review of the literature section?

**8. Conclusions and recommendations:** I feel the conclusion is not based on the findings. It is overly stated. The recommendations are somewhat good, but they need to be presented with the conclusion under the title "Conclusion and Implication of the Study". Then the practical, policy, and further research implications should be discussed in paragraph form instead of as a list of recommendations.

**9. References:** See the journal's referencing style.

**10. Compliance with Ethical Standards:** I do not see any ethical consideration section in the paper.

**11. Writing/language issues:** The paper will be much improved if the author rereads the paper to consider and correct some typological errors (missed words/letters, coherence of paragraphs, and duplication of ideas, and inconsistent use of some significant terms like postsecondary to mean tertiary, efficient and successful to mean effective, etc.)

**12. Overall comment to the authors:** Dear author, I would like to thank you again for your valuable research work. Your paper has many good qualities. However, I only indicated the flaws that will be helpful for your improvement measures. If you find my comments, questions, and concerns valuable for the improvement of your paper, please consider them; if not, leave them out.

**Thank you once again and good luck!**