Review of: "Teaching Method Preference by College Teachers in India"

Thanikachalam Vedhathiri[1]

1 National Institute of Technical Teachers Training and Research (NITTTR)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author has taken up research work on “Instructional System Technology (IST)”.

The basic questions are:

1. How many of the respondents have undergone a course on Instructional Design and Delivery?

2. Where is the need to combine heterogeneous faculty members from Humanities, Science, Engineering, Social Science, and Others in this research?

3. The instructional design for these branches need not be the same method.

4. IST for UG and PG will vary based on the topics.

5. The author has not focused on any one of the instructional design models.

6. There is a need to incorporate the concepts of ADDIE, Dick and Carey, ASSURE, Backward Design, Kemp Design Model, The Kirkpatrick Model, Gerlach-Ely Model, TRACK, Situational Learning Theory, Anchored Instructional Model, Cognitive Apprenticeship, Events Instruction, Robert Gagne's Taxonomy of Learning, Bloom's Taxonomy, Flipped Classroom, Social Learning Theory of Albert Bandura, Andragogy Theory of Malcolm Knowles, Jean Piaget's Theory and Stages of Cognitive Development, etc.

7. The present research does not provide any new model in IST.

8. The author has to revise his paper based on the advances in IST and suggest improvements.

9. Engineering programs are based on “Analysis-Design- Develop Prototype-Test-Improve- Plan Manufacturing- Market-Maintain-and Innovate further”

10. What are instructional objects for the courses in various branches?

11. It appears that there is no mention of outcome-based instructional design, problem solving abilities and critical analysis in this paper.

12. Every faculty member in higher education should undergo an orientation course on IST, planning an instructional design to suit his/her learners.