

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

Mekbib Alemu¹

¹ Addis Ababa University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The first section after the abstract does not have a heading. It is maybe **Introduction**." In this part, many of the assertions about the research problem seem to be unsubstantiated individual perceptions. In several places, claims were made without properly citing the sources. So, the research issue does not appear to be well justified. This has serious implications for the rest of the study and the manuscript.

Even though the **literature review** is divided into sub-sections with different headings, the entire presentation is repetitive and unfocused. Reorganize, condense, and rewrite the literature review with specific focus. Besides, base the review in current literature instead of referring to decades-old facts as recent!

This assertion was presented again and again, but no evidence was presented as to the causal relationship between population growth and increase in class size in Nigerian higher education. The research problem is well stated, even though why the lecturers' perceptions are necessary in dealing with the situation is not well established. What research gap is to be addressed with the study of lecturers' perceptions of the effects of large class size?

Research Purpose, Research Question, and Hypotheses: In a journal article, all these three will not come together. The research purpose may be established and justified in the statement of the problem (or even in the introduction) part. Then, the purpose will be specified with either the research question(s) or the hypothesis. Furthermore, either of the two needs to be established, presented, and justified, instead of simply stating them. The major flaw in this manuscript is that no legitimate RQ (hypotheses) was presented based on existing research gap.

As could be observed from this manuscript, the structuring seems more like a thesis monograph instead of a journal article. Reconsider the structuring following the journal's guidelines or, in general, follow IMRAD formatting.

In the methodology part: Why southwest? Why all? How fair is 2538? Why was a questionnaire used? What was the reason for forcing respondents to agree or not, while they may have neutral positions? Was there no change in the construct validity of the instrument as a result of these changes? Shortening the 30-item instrument to a 17-item one definitely will have serious implications for the construct validity of the instrument! How is it affected?

The method part is not presented in a clear manner. No justification for why the target area was selected, what kind of sampling was used, and justification of the sampling method and the sample were presented. No connection between the research purpose (questions) and methodological decisions is presented and discussed. The data collection instrument is

a contracted form of Ayeni and Olowe (2016). However, the reduction of the 30-item instrument to a negatively biased, 17-item questionnaire was not well discussed and justified. Is it ethical to dismember one's validated tool in such a way? Furthermore, why is the analysis method like that?

Without a research problem, hypotheses were formulated and underwent hypothesis testing. As a result, the researcher bias was confirmed. Any statistical exercise is not data analysis. Besides, it would be good if standard ways of result presentation were learned from standard references.

In the discussion part, all the results stated as agreeing and disagreeing with the current study results are about the effect of class size but not about teachers' perceptions of it! Despite this incompatibility, the discussion was not about reflecting on findings from a theoretical (literature) point of view.

This is not a conclusion that shows contribution of new knowledge to the existing body of literature. The researcher knows this from the very beginning and decided to confirm it with data that was intentionally collected and poorly analysed.

The recommendations are by far incompatible with what is found in this "research"; not warranted by the findings of the current study. Just a wishful list of the researcher's perceptions.

Due to all the above issues in the manuscript and some more indicated in the manuscript with highlighting, it is difficult to recommend this article for publication.