Perception of the four families of teaching models and employability among students in private universities in Kampala District

Nakamanya Sophie

Keywords: *four families of teaching models, employability*

Introduction

The overall aim of this study was to analyse the contribution of the Four Families of Teaching Models on Employability of students in Private Universities in Kampala.

Objectives

The study focused on the following objectives:

1. to identify the nature of four families of teaching models used to enhance employability among students of private universities in Kampala;

2. to establish the perception of the four families of teaching models used to enhance employability among students of private universities in Kampala, and

3. to analyse the effect of the four families of teaching models used to enhance employability among students of private universities in Kampala.

Methodology

A sample of 129 respondents provided data for this study through quantitative and qualitative means. The questionnaire, for both structured and unstructured interviews, was administered to each respondent. Qualitative data were analysed using SPSS software, which generated descriptive statistics consisting of means, frequencies and percentages. The qualitative data were analysed using written scripts, that is, in form of words or text that were derived from the respondents.

Key findings

The results of the study revealed that the majority of respondents had witnessed various models being implemented at their universities and their provision was fairly adequate given their scores which ranked towards a mean of 2 (Fairly Adequate). However, regarding their perception of the four families of teaching models, the Information Processing Family (IPF - Mean=3.58, SD=0.982) and the Personal Family (PF - Mean=4.04, SD=0.931) were ranked as being important. However, the results further reveal a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 3 in the rating for each of the four families of teaching models which suggested that there were learners who either attained the highest level of satisfaction while some gained the lowest level. The majority of respondents were not sure whether the Social Interaction Family (SIF - Mean =3.37, SD=0.945) and the Behavior Modification Family (BMF - mean=3.07, SD=0.893) were of importance to them given their response that tended towards 3, which was: "Not Sure". Some respondents felt that either of the models of teaching were "Not Important" at all or was "Very Important" given the minimum score of 1 and a maximum score of 5. The results showed that the majority of the responses were tending towards a mean of 4

which was: "Disagree", that adopting any or a mix of the said four families of teaching models contributed much towards their employability.

Key recommendations

There was a need for lecturers/teachers to first take a teaching psychology course which would put them in a position to predict the needs of students and expected outcomes on the side of employers. Westbrook (2013) emphasised the need to try different models of teaching as a mixture or based on the one that yields the best results.

Lecturers and administrators at universities should engage in continuous research to learn more about various models of teaching and their outcomes. Similar views have also been shared by various scholars like, Wilson (2016), Bhavin (2013) and Nabayego (2014) who have in the past conducted studies in different contexts. The scholars have agreed that no one particular category group of moels of teaching fits all situations and it is thus upon the teachers/lecturers to pick the best that suits the condition and aim at hand.

Key references

Bhavin H, P. (2013). Social Interaction Model. *International Journal for Research in Education*, 2(5).

Nabayego, C. (2014). How University Education in Uganda Can Be Improved To Prepare Economically Productive Graduates. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), 62-70.

Petrina, S. (2007). Teaching or Instructional Methods. Advanced Teaching Methods for the Technology Classroom. London: Idea Group, Inc.