**PERCEPTION OF THE FOUR FAMILIES OF TEACHING MODELS AND EMPLOYABILITY AMONG STUDENTS PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN KAMPALA DISTRICT UGANDA**

**BY**

**NAKAMANYA SOPHIE**

**2013/FEB/MEPM/M/1225**

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ART IN EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING OF NKUMBA UNIVERSITY**

**OCTOBER 2019**

# DECLARATION

I, Sophie Nakamanya, declare that this Dissertation is my original work. It has never been submitted for any award in any college, university or other institution of higher learning for any academic award at undergraduate or postgraduate levels. Any similarity is coincidental.

Signed ..……………………………….

Candidate: SOPHIE NAKAMANYA

Date…………………………………...

# APPROVAL

This Dissertation titled `Perception of the Four Families of Teaching Models Approach and Employability´ in selected Private Universities in Kampala District` has been done and accomplished under my supervision as University Lecturer, and is now ready for submission with my approval.

Signed………………………………… Date…………………………………

DR. MUSISI BADRU

# DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my beloved Mother, Husband, Siblings, Daughters - Emily, Erin and Eunice who have been the single most source for the accomplishment of this study even in face of serious financial constraints.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the Almighty God who has enabled me to live up to this minute of my academic life.

I also register my sincere gratitude to the authors of the educational information or date sources I read for my references while compiling this Dissertation because they availed me the basis for improving on my research work.

In a special way, I wish to thank all the Teachers, Lecturers and Professors who shaped my career.

In particular, I offer special thanks to Dr. Musisi Badru who supervised and helped me tirelessly in the process of writing this Dissertation.

Lastly, I wish to thank all my relatives, friends, classmates of Nkumba University, and all those who assisted me in various ways. I offer you gratitude for the support, patience and encouragement you availed me.

God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[DECLARATION ii](#_Toc22571982)

[APPROVAL iii](#_Toc22571983)

[DEDICATION iv](#_Toc22571984)

[ACKNOWLEDGEMENT v](#_Toc22571985)

[LIST OF TABLES ix](#_Toc22571986)

[LIST OF FIGURES x](#_Toc22571987)

[ACRYNOMS xi](#_Toc22571988)

[OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS xii](#_Toc22571989)

[ABSTRACT xiii](#_Toc22571992)

[CHAPTER ONE 1](#_Toc22571993)

[1.0 Overview 1](#_Toc22571994)

[1.1 Background of the study 1](#_Toc22571995)

[1.2 Statement of the problem 9](#_Toc22572000)

[1.3 Purpose of the study 9](#_Toc22572001)

[1.4 Objectives of the study 10](#_Toc22572002)

[1.5 Research questions 10](#_Toc22572003)

[1.6 Scope of the study 10](#_Toc22572004)

[1.6.1 Content scope 10](#_Toc22572005)

[1.6.2 Geographical scope 11](#_Toc22572006)

[1.6.3 Significance of the study 11](#_Toc22572007)

[CHAPTER TWO 12](#_Toc22572008)

[LITERATURE REVIEW 12](#_Toc22572009)

[2.0 Overview 12](#_Toc22572010)

[2.1 The nature of four families of teaching models used in private universities 12](#_Toc22572011)

[2.2 Perception of the four families of models of teaching used in university education 13](#_Toc22572012)

[2.3 Effect of the Four Families of Teaching Models on Employability 15](#_Toc22572013)

[CHAPTER THREE 19](#_Toc22572014)

[METHODOLOGY 19](#_Toc22572015)

[3.0 Overview 19](#_Toc22572016)

[3.1 Research design 19](#_Toc22572017)

[3.2 Study Population 19](#_Toc22572018)

[3.3 Sample size composition 20](#_Toc22572019)

[3.4 Sample size selection techniques 21](#_Toc22572020)

[3.5 Data collection methods 21](#_Toc22572021)

[3.5.1 Primary and Secondary data sources 21](#_Toc22572022)

[3.5.2 Interviewing 22](#_Toc22572023)

[3.5.3 Questionnaires 22](#_Toc22572024)

[3.6 Data Quality Control 22](#_Toc22572025)

[3.6.1 Validity 23](#_Toc22572026)

[3.6.2 Reliability (Dependability) of Research Instruments 24](#_Toc22572027)

[3.7 Documentary methods 24](#_Toc22572028)

[3.8 Analysis of data 24](#_Toc22572029)

[3.9 Quantitative data analysis 25](#_Toc22572030)

[3.9.1 Qualitative data analysis **Error! Bookmark not defined.**](#_Toc22572031)

[CHAPTER FOUR 27](#_Toc22572033)

[DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION 27](#_Toc22572034)

[4.1 Demographic information 27](#_Toc22572035)

[4.1.1 Sex / Gender of the respondents 27](#_Toc22572036)

[4.1.3 Educational level of the respondents 28](#_Toc22572037)

[4.1.5 Publications 30](#_Toc22572038)

[4.2 The nature of the four families of teaching models used by private universities 31](#_Toc22572039)

[4.3 Perception of the Four Families of Models of Teaching on employability 34](#_Toc22572040)

[4.3.2 Adequacy of the Four Families of Teaching Models used by private universities 35](#_Toc22572041)

[4.4 Analysis of the effect of the Four Families of models of Teaching on employability of students in private universities 36](#_Toc22572042)

[4.4 Qualitative data analysis 37](#_Toc22572043)

[4.4.1 Nature of the four families of Models of teaching 37](#_Toc22572044)

[4.4.2 The challenges faced in enhancing learning 37](#_Toc22572045)

[4.4.3 Measures to enhance the education standards 38](#_Toc22572046)

[CHAPTER FIVE 40](#_Toc22572047)

[DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 40](#_Toc22572048)

[5.1 The nature of the Four Families of Models of Teaching used in private universities in Uganda 40](#_Toc22572049)

[5.2 The perception of the importance and adequacy of the families of models of teaching 42](#_Toc22572050)

[5.3 The effect of the Four Families of Models of Teaching on employability of students in private universities in Uganda 44](#_Toc22572051)

[5.4 Conclusions 45](#_Toc22572052)

[5.5 Recommendations 45](#_Toc22572053)

[APPENDICES 55](#_Toc22572054)

[APPENDIX I 55](#_Toc22572055)

[RESEARCH MODELS OF TEACHING BY THEIR FAMILY AFFLIATION 55](#_Toc22572056)

[APPENDIX II 56](#_Toc22572057)

[THE SELF ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESPONDENTS 56](#_Toc22572058)

[APPENDIX III 63](#_Toc22572059)

[INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR KEY INFORMANTS QUESTIONNAIRE 63](#_Toc22572060)

[APPENDIX IV 64](#_Toc22572061)

[BUDGET ESTIMATES 64](#_Toc22572062)

[APPENDIX V 65](#_Toc22572063)

[RESEARCH TIME FRAMEWORK 65](#_Toc22572064)

# LIST OF TABLES

[Table 3.1: Showing the study population 20](#_Toc21750636)

[Table 3.2: Showing sample size selection 21](#_Toc21750637)

[Table 4.1: Sex / Gender of the respondents 27](#_Toc21751417)

[Table 4.2: Status of the respondents 28](#_Toc21751418)

[Table 4. 3:Educational level of the respondents 28](#_Toc21751419)

[Table 4. 4: Experience - Status of the Respondents at the university 29](#_Toc21751420)

[Table 4. 5: Publications – Level of education of teacher / lecturer respondents 30](#_Toc21751421)

[Table 4. 6:Nature of Behavior Modification Family models of teaching 31](#_Toc21751422)

[Table 4. 7: Nature of Information Processing Family models of teaching 32](#_Toc21751423)

[Table 4. 8: Social Interaction Family Models of teaching 32](#_Toc21751424)

[Table 4. 9 Nature of the Personal Family Models of teaching 33](#_Toc21751425)

[Table 4. 10 The importance of models of teaching by their family affliation 34](#_Toc21751426)

[Table 4. 11 Perception regarding the adequacy of the models of teaching by family affliations 35](#_Toc21751427)

[Table 4. 12 Analysis of the perceptions of models of teaching by family affliation effect on employability 36](#_Toc21751428)

# LIST OF FIGURES

[Figure 2 1 Conceptual framework 8](#_Toc21748655)

# ACRYNOMS

BMF - Behavior Modification Family

IPF - Information Processing Family

NCHE - National Council for Higher Education

PF - Personal Family

SIF - Social Interaction Family

# OPERATIONAL **DEFINITION** OF KEY TERMS

**Employability**

Employability has been defined as having a set of skills, knowledge, understanding and personal attributes that make a person more likely to choose and secure occupations in which they can be satisfied and successful (Dacre Pool, 2007). Employability can then be summed up as a collection of a series of abilities that graduate can obtain employment and succeed in their career (Tomlinson, 2012). These abilities enable graduate to meet the needs of employers and adapt to changes in the labor market, and it is a kind of comprehensive ability to improve the future career development (Thijssen, 2008).

### **Four families of teaching models**

(Bhavin H, 2013) a model of teaching can consist models of teaching that can also be utilized to design instructional material and guide instruction.The four Families of teaching models is an approach composed of models which serve as instructional methods and guides for designing educational activities, environments and experiences (Petrina, 2007). The teaching models that teachers can employ range from simple, direct procedures that get immediate results to complex strategies that students acquire gradually from patient and skillful instruction (Pateliya Y. P., 2013).

Joyce & Weil (2014) categorized the models of teaching in to four families. The four families, that is, information processing family, behavioral modification family, personal family and social interaction family, encompass a wide range of what teaching does mean (Joyce, 2008). The classification has been made in accordance with the theoretical basis and fundamental aim of the teaching model.

### **Private University**

A private university is defined as an institution licensed / authorized to offer degrees, diplomas and certificates and is owned by individuals with limited government interference (Tibarimbasa, 2010). Private universities belong to individuals or private organisations and, therefore, depend on private resources to run their affairs (Bigabwenkya, 2013). Today’s university can be public, private-for-profit or private-not-for-profit (Chisholm, 2009).

# ABSTRACT

The overall aim of this study was to analyse the Perception of the Four Families of Teaching Models and its effect on Employability. The four families of teaching models to some extent try to address the pertinent questions in teaching. What are the aims and objectives of the teaching? Which teaching models enable lecturers and learners meet these aims? How can these teaching models be organized? How can the extent to which these aims and objectives that have been met be evaluated?” The model used in delivering the university education has an influence on the student level of understanding of the subject matter, including the subsequent knowledge and skills developed from the university. In the current study, the researcher finds the four families of teaching models´ approach is quite relevant because it focuses on the expected employability outputs, that is, the intended outcomes which are crucial like, practical reason (modify behavior in response to information), sociality and participation, information processing abilities and selfhood of individual. University education through appropriate use of models of teaching is ideally expected to significantly increase chances of employability among students. Yet, if left unchecked, university education models of teaching can under-equip students in terms of employability capabilities. Hence, it was established in this study that these sub-variables jointly predict university education capability to foster employability among students in Uganda. Respondents indicated that they are satisfied with the models of teaching used. They commented that their unemployment causes are not largely due to ineffective teaching approaches at the fie private universities studied. This prevailing positive perception regarding the four families of teaching models can be seen as balanced, and thus facilitates adaptive, proactive career behaviour, which, in turn, influences general employability. This result is validated by the high mean scores on all their usage or application dimensions. Consequently, the study recommends that, in a bid to enhance university education capability among students, private universities should focus on improving teaching processes and learning processes, particularly on staff pedagogical skills, commitment and quality controls. These results are expected to add valuable insights to the field of teaching for employability practices, which, in turn, will inform graduates regarding their employability prospects.

#  CHAPTER ONE

**INTRODUCTION**

## **1.0 Overview**

The first chapter is the introduction, and it provides a background to the study, a statement of the research problem, objectives of the study, and research questions. The chapter also presents the scope of the study and the importance of the study. Then, this is followed by an explanation of the conceptual framework guiding this investigation.

## **Background of the study**

**1.1.1 Historical perspectives**

There is a significant body of work examining the skills required by employers and the ways in which those skills are taught to/developed by students (Hanson, 2010). Similarly, there is a body of work examining the possibility that educators, employers and students might differ in their views (Lowden, 2011). These have caused curricular debates on a stronger awareness of the results of study (“competences”, “learning outcomes”), on feedback of experiences for the improvement of teaching and learning (“quality assurance”), and on the links between study and subsequent employment (“employability”) indicate the need for improvements as well as successful changes (Teichler, 2009).

Years ago, many educators expected that research on teaching would result in a single model that was superior for all types of educational objectives (Bruce, 2014). Research on teaching and learning constantly has endeavoured to examine the extent to which different teaching methods enhance growth in student learning (Munyaradzi, 2013). Joyce and Weil (1972) were the first to select the models out of the large number of models putforth by psychologists, sociologists, system analysts, educators and psychiatrists. They discarded those models which were too vague to provide general models that could be communicated to concerned people working in the field of education (Van der Heijde, 2006).

Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil (1985) organized the alternative models of teaching in four families. The assumption was that students learn with different styles, at different speeds, different levels of prior knowledge and different environments when the subject matter is given by way of a variety of teaching models (Newcomb, 2007 ). They identified 23 models which are classified into four basic families based on the nature, distinctive characteristics and effects of the models (Joyce B. C., 2002). These four families are: 1. information Processing Models, 2. Personal Models, 3. Social Interaction Models and, 4. Behaviour Modification Models. Within the families, there are specific models which are designed to serve particular purposes (Maheshwari, 2013).

### **Behavior Modification Family models**

Behaviour Modification methods and philosophies deal with “inappropriate,” “abnormal,” or “undesirable” behaviours (Sharma A, 2018). The behavioural modification family acknowledges that people are self-correcting communication systems that modify behaviour in response to information about how successfully tasks are navigated (Joyce, 2004). For example, activity-based training can enhance university education by enabling instructors to engage learners in various out-of-classroom activities as a means of developing knowledge, skills and abilities that the learners need in order to carry out similar activities later in life and on their own (Gorski, 2004).

### **Information Processing Family Models**

The information processing models place emphasis on ways to enhance the human being’s natural drive to make sense of the world by organizing acquired knowledge, finding solutions to problems and developing concepts and language for conveying them (Joyce, 2004). Primary examples adopted in this area might be of cooperative, analytical, lecture, written /essay, practical work, activity-oriented teaching, designing and presenting a project (Wilson, 2016).

### **Social Interaction Family Models**

The social interaction family models aim to build learning communities and places emphasis on the significance of synergy in the learning communities. The social family models emphasize the social nature of the learners, their social behavior and how to enhance the learning process through social interactions (Beigzadeh A, 2016). The social context created within the classroom - the ways in which communication, teachers’ and students’ roles, and opportunities for collaboration are structured - all influence the learner’s understanding and construction of knowledge (Rousseau, 2000).

### **Personal Family Models**

(Horn, 1976) the Models of this family are intended to develop the unique personality of the learner. The personal family models use a set of personal career-related attributes that employers and researchers generally promote as an alternative to job security in an uncertain employment context as its basis (Coetzee M. , 2011). These models play more attention to the emotional life of the person and also focus on helping individual to develop the productive relationship with their environment (Joyce B. , 2008).

The classification above was made in accordance with the theoretical basis and fundamental aim of the teaching model (Joyce B. C., 2002). The four families of teaching models was proved to be capable of strengthening teaching even in well-resourced classrooms since teaching and learning materials are most beneficial when they are relevant to students’ lives (Westbrook J, 2013). The the four families of teaching models is proved to have greater power towards development of employability if applied at University level (Joyce, 2014).

 (Joyce B. , 2008) advocates that teachers must not only be knowledgeable about the content they teach, but must also know and be committed to making decisions that involve the use of a variety of instructional models, their accompanying strategies and techniques, and approaches suited for purposes and appropriate to meet the diverse learning needs of students. Teaching is not a one-dimensional operation, rather it uses models in combination designed on school’s curricula, units, and lessons (Bruce, 2014). The choice of teaching models is determined by the nature of the learning objective (Joyce B. C., 2002).

**1.1.2** **Theoretical perspectives**

The theoretical lens employed in this study is based on the major philosophical and psychological theories by Joyce and Weil regarding how humans learn. The most comprehensive review of teaching models is that of **Joyce and Weil (1980)**. All have a solid theoretical basis – that is, their creators provide us with a rationale that explains why we expect them to achieve the goals for which they were designed (Joyce, 2014). Each family as a sources of teaching models focuses on the attainment of a different set of outcomes or objectives and each is reflective of a distinctive existing educational philosophy. These theorists advocated that effective teaching is made up of a toolkit of ways to reach students and help them build their reservoir of knowledge, skills, and enduring values (Joyce, 2014).

(Pool L. D., 2007), noted that the design of the families of teaching models approach reflects an assertion that each component is absolutely essential and one missing element will considerably reduce a graduate’s employability. A degree of overlap between some of the components is acknowledged and this is reflected in the researcher`s conceptual framework. To fully understand the partnership between the four families of teaching models approach and its effect on employability, additional theories must be explored.

Vygotsky’s (1973) theory of learning tackles what makes knowledge by highlighting aspects that have a major impact on the way we teach and on ways students learn. It emphasizes the improvement of the existing classroom teaching methods or models so as to facilitate learning through interaction with others, internalizing knowledge, and acquisition of first hand personal experience as students build a satisfactory and coherent picture of the world. (Bennett, 1999) proposed a model of course provision in higher education which included five elements: (1) disciplinary content knowledge; (2) disciplinary skills; (3) workplace awareness; (4) workplace experience; and (5) generic skills. This model goes some way towards including all the necessary elements to ensure a graduate achieves an optimum level of employability, but is still missing some vital elements.

The USEM account of employability (Yorke, 2004) is probably the most well known and respected model in this field. USEM is an acronym for four inter-related components of employability: (1) Understanding; (2) Skills; (3) Efficacy beliefs; and (4) Metacognition. The USEM model forms part of a large body of research-based scholarly work on employability. A major goal of formal education should be to equip students with the intellectual tools, efficacy beliefs, and intrinsic interests to educate themselves throughout their lifetime (Bandura, 1995).

However, it is not suggested that these four families of teaching models are the only areas of overlap, as this occurs at various points. It is therefore further noted that the application of theory brings together complex theoretical perspectives and how they relate to the real world. The educational facilities, methods of assessment and quality of teachers will challenge students and employers to raise issues of theory and how it relates to the real world (Ntim, 2015). In this modern environment, theoretical foundations are essential for students to make informed judgments. All views of the above theorists are significant to this study because they highlight the need for a mix of models of teaching in order to foster employability.

**1.1.3 Contextual perspectives**

Likewise, every country invests in university education to develop and empower its citizens with the high-level capacity needed to practically work and transform their surrounding environmental resources into productive employment after graduation (Nabayego, 2014). The genesis of university education in Uganda is traced to the inception of Makerere University in 1922 (Lejeun, 2005); and was modelled on the British system (Bigabwenkya, 2013). At the time of independence (1969), the jobs graduates could do were in public administration, teaching, health work, and other jobs in revered companies and organizations (Kasenene, 2003). Most of the students graduated having acquired little or no knowledge and skills required to enable them to practically engage in productive and entrepreneurial activities based on their surrounding environments. Such type of graduates continued to be produced until the Uganda Government realized that university education so detached students from the realities of Uganda that it could not enable most learners to develop hands-on knowledge and skills required to participate productively in the societal development process (Kamuhangire, 2011).

(Bigabwenkya, 2013), Makerere University remained the only university in Uganda until 1989 when other universities opened and since then more than 30 universities have emerged in a period of about two decades. The history of education indicates that the country has posed, on average every twenty-five years to re-examine its education system (Kasozi, 2003). Consequently, the government instituted the Education Policy Review Commission (EPRC) to review Uganda’s education policy, including the university education policy (Nabayego, 2014). The Commission reiterated that adopting this recommendation would enable Uganda’s education generally and university education in particular, to develop practical and hands-on knowledge and skills needed by students to become productively employed after graduation (Commission E. P., 1989). Government of Uganda adopted the recommendation and started to redesign the national curricula and syllabi with intent to promote this kind of education (Bitamazire, 2005).

Since then, university education has expanded in all aspects such as student and staff numbers, nature of programmes and teaching and learning resources (Bigabwenkya, 2013). The commercialization of the universities from around 1992 in Uganda was actually a necessary evil which prompted majority of students to join private universities and tertiary institutions (Hyuha, 2017). Studies reveal that the percentage of candidates eligible for university education in Uganda has been increasing by 12 percent each year between 1994 to 1999 (Kasozi A. , 2006). Although at its inception liberalization of university education was resisted by students and the general public in Uganda (Sekamwa, 1997) as shown in the Makerere University strikes of 1989 and 1990, by 1992 it had become an official government policy to privatize education (Government White Paper 1992).

According to (Okwakol, 2009), in Uganda, university education institutions are charged with formation of human capital through teaching, building knowledge base through research and knowledge development, and dissemination and use of knowledge by interacting with the knowledge users. The major aims of education include to make the next generation original thinkers and workers who can contribute to what is known for both their personal and community good (Kasozi, 2003). Conclusively, although quality is an issue that cannot be avoided in education, the efforts and initiatives institutions invest into ascertain quality turns out to be of paramount importance (Bunoti, 2011).

(Bigabwenkya, 2013), private universities, like public universities in Uganda design their own curriculum content using their technical teams. This autonomy creates room for weaknesses in the university education processes regarding what is taught, how it is taught and what the students learn. The NCHE from 2002 to 2014, noted that most of our graduates were short of what was expected of them (Hyuha, 2017). In effect, the capabilities developed are basically at the discretion of the technical teams at the university (Bigabwenkya, 2013). However, The higher education capability levels among students and consequently new graduates (2001-2010) have apparently been declining or stagnant, especially in terms of practical reason, sociality and participation, learning dispositions, and science and technology in spite of a rapid increase in enrolment at university level (Bigabwenkya, 2013).

Kasozi (2006) agrees that the majority of some 1800 programmes offered at higher institutions of learning are theoretical and irrelevant to the job market. As much as the universities are churning out products, which implies internal efficiency, such products cannot be consumed by society (external inefficiency) (Nabayego, 2014). Current criticisms of our higher education, including private universities indicate that the system needs massive improvements (Hyuha, 2017).

The Government of Uganda re-affirmed its commitment to improving the quality of higher education. In that respect two policy instruments have been introduced to transform the country’s higher education system: i) The education strategic investment plan 1998 – 2003, and ii) The education sector strategic plan 2009 – 2015, with the aims of modernizing, diversifying and making Uganda’s education more competitive, attractive, service oriented and relevant to society and to Uganda’s development goals in specifically (Bunoti, 2011). It is this contention that inspired the researcher to focus his study on the perception of the four families of teaching models and its effect on employability of students among selected private universities in Uganda.

1.1.4 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework is a guiding investigative research (Maicibi, 2007). The conceptual framework in this research work is a representation of the research topic, emphasizing the linkage of the four families of teaching models as core factors in fostering employability. The figure below shows the Independent variable Four Families of Teaching Models; and the Dependent Variable Employability.

**Independent Variable Dependent Variable**

**Perception of the Four Families of Teaching Models Employability**

**Intervening Variables**

* Educational Facilities
* Methods of Assessment
* Quality of Teachers

**Fig.1 Conceptual framework**

For the purpose of this research, the independent variable – the Perception of the Four Families of Teaching Models will be used by the researcher to describe how they foster Employability among private university students in Uganda. While the dependent variable – Employability was chosen for this study in order to make a conclusion about the current treatment related to employability challenges. It is expected that the dependent variable relies on the four families of teaching models as they encompass employability key factors. The intervening variables that link a cause and effect which were identified as suitable for this study included educational resources like school facilities, methods of assessment and quality of teachers. These resources are among the means through which organizational activities, service and satisfactory ends are attainable (Afework, 2014). For the achievement of organizational objectives, resources play the crucial roles.

Therefore, in order to analyse the relationship between the variables, the researcher focused on the independent variable Perception of the Four Families of Teaching Models. These were clearly examined basing on the objectives of the study. The dependent variable mainly focused on employability as an outcome of application of the four families of teaching models. It is equally apparent that, in order to be successful in any university education, the student must complete rigorous employability development, often through several models of teaching related to the employment lifetime.

## **1.2 Statement of the problem**

The new graduates in Uganda have low labour productivity due to, among other things, deficiencies in knowledge, skills and attitudes (Asiimwe, 2011). This is partly attributed to the entry of “private” providers as a response to the increasing demand for higher education that has caused decline in the quality of graduates (Basheka B.C., 2009). Figures for graduate unemployment has alarmingly continued to rise at over 80 percent (Fagil, 2012). The Uganda Bureau of Statistics indicated that worldwide, Uganda is the leading country with the youngest population of 78% below the age of 30 years. Of the students who graduated in 2011, only 33% were able to find employment in the formal sector. Moreover, a large number of graduated students especially bachelor holders do not feel ready enough to work in their related fields (Yash Pal, 2009 ). Therefore, teaching in the absence of learning is just talking and what students learn today affects their lives in the long term (Doyle.T., 2008). The above state motivated the researcher to find out the effect of the four families of models on employability among students in private universities.

## **1.3 Purpose of the study**

The present study was to investigate the extent to which the four families of teaching models used in student’s employability are combined to take recognition of employability of students in private universities teaching context. The study will contribute to an understanding of the current status of these inter-linked concepts so as to achieve the specific employability aspects. The specific application of this investigation in the university population will aid in a greater understanding for both University Institutions and employers in the Ugandan labour market. This additional knowledge may prove useful in achieving a more coherent picture of effective teaching models for employability in Uganda. Finally, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all populations, but the information may be useful in university teaching as well as employers. The research questions were formulated as stipulated in the following section.

## **1.4 Objectives of the study**

i) To identify the nature of four families of teaching models used to enhance employability among students of private universities in Uganda.

ii) To establish the perception of the four families of teaching models used to enhance employability among students of private universities in Uganda.

iii) To analyse the effect of the four families of teaching models used to enhance employability among students of private universities in Uganda.

**1.5 Research questions**

1. What models of teaching by their family source are used by private universities in Uganda to develop employability?
2. What is the perception of the four families of teaching models used by private universities in Uganda to develop the employability?
3. What is the contribution of the four families of teaching used by private universities in Uganda on employability of students?

## **1.6 Scope of the study**

### **1.6.1 Content scope**

This study examined the current institutional moves reflecting the importance of models of teaching towards employability. The research was limited to only the current students at the selected private universities in Kampala district. The study mainly focused on the Four Families of Teaching Models developed by **Joyce and Weil (1980).** The Four Families of Teaching Models was applied by the researcher as the Independent variable for this study . These four families of teaching models are: 1. information Processing Models, 2. Personal Models, 3. Social Interaction Models and, 4. Behaviour Modification Models. The twenty (20) models identified for this research were selected from the identified 23 models identified by Joyce and Weil. The classification has been made on basis of the way they approach the education goals and means (Pateliya Y. P., 2013). **(See Appendix I for Research Models of teaching by their family affliation).**

### **1.6.2 Geographical scope**

The study was carried out in Kampala District, covering five (5) private universities within this geographical location. The selection of these private universities was based on the fact that most of the universities in Uganda either have the main campus in Kampala district and or a branch outside Kampala district.

## **1.6.3 Significance of the study**

The findings shall make a theoretical contribution to the body of knowledge related to education practices with a particular emphasis on models of teaching which would foster employability among university students. The findings of the study will also raise awareness among the educational managers at all levels of the different factors needed to influence achievement of the university education goals. Furthermore, the findings of the study will guide the policy makers, curricula developers and implementers to understand how to develop a whole person. Above all, the study will contribute to the award of a Master’s Arts Degree in Educational Management and Planning to the candidate.

**Summary**

This chapter provided an introduction to the study at hand, giving an overview of the literature, research problem, and importance and benefits of the study. Specific research questions and objectives were highlighted, including the methodology to be used in conducting the research. The layout of the study was provided so as to guide the reader. The following chapter provides a detailed literature review of the constructs relevant to this study.

# CHAPTER TWO

# LITERATURE REVIEW

# 2.0 Overview

This chapter explores the existing literature written about the perception of the four families of teaching models and its effect on of university students in relation the research topic. This chapter takes an in-depth look at the available literature that relates to perception of the four families of models of teaching. Available skills, models, and important influential factors will also be taken into consideration. Furthermore, a summary of the most pertinent studies relating to models of teaching is presented to build a global view of what constitutes an employable graduate. Finally, the interaction and influence of four families of teaching models employability of students are discussed, allowing the researcher to draw meaningful conclusions from the data obtained in the study.

# 2.1 The nature of four families of teaching models used in private universities

Gorski (2004) found out that in European educational institutions, particularly in university education institutions, students had been made to study academics in the morning and to socialize and work in the afternoon hours, all in cooperation and collaboration with members of the surrounding communities. Studies from developed states however project a different scenario. For example, in German classes are said to take the form of lectures, seminars, practical exercises, work placements and study trips (Symington, 2012). Therefore, all course descriptions and curriculum need to demonstrate “a union of theory and practice that ultimately constitutes the values and competencies of professionals” (Bates, 2008). This balance increases the possibility of meeting what should be the main purpose of aspiring for university education, namely the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitude that depict learning dispositions, practical reason, sociality and participation, and an understanding of science and technology (Terzi, 2004).

Many African universities import the knowledge they deliver to students and by so doing impart foreign theoretical conceptions (Okolie, 2003). It is also noted that the destiny of South Africa is currently being shaped in the lecture room, where teaching and learning techniques are outdated and theoretical knowledge is still disseminated through the technique of talk and chalk, yet education has a number of important aims (Nicolaides, 2012). Furthermore, use of foreign theoretical models for resolving local problems is one of the major bottlenecks to African development (Kasozi, 2003). In a different context, (Sambo, 2006) study of Nigerian universities provides evidence curriculum and pedagogy do not satisfy both the labour market requirements and the expectations of the direct university education recipients, namely the students.

(Nabayego, 2014) added that the university education introduced in Uganda exposes students to largely classroom-based learning activities. Uganda’s education system is breeding a generation of young people that are merely regurgitating theoretical knowledge to excel in exams in a world that requires practical hands -on skills and the result is that companies have to rely on expatriates (Nakandha, 2011 )***.*** Such an approach disempowers many Ugandan graduates in various ways, notwithstanding the fact that it only enables some of the graduates to perform an array of white-collar jobs in the public sector, especially after Uganda’s political independence up to date (Kasozi, 2003). Traditional approaches based on conventional classroom-based teaching and learning will not be capable of meeting the escalating demand for higher education in the knowledge society (Taylor, 2004).  This is when students’ instruction must change into a method in which their needs are considered and as a result of the mentioned method active behavior change occurs in them (Dooge, 2007).

The models of teaching briefly reviewed here have been selected from many other possibilities. It may be noted that all the models are not mutually exclusive (Joyce, 2014). We find that characteristics of one model apparent in some other models. Further, we find that information processing models, besides focusing on the development of intellectual skills and the acquisition of content, are also concerned with the development of social relations. Besides, some interaction models emphasize also personal development of the individual (Bhavin H, 2013).

## **2.2 Perception of the four families of models of teaching used in university education**

Until today, questions about the effectiveness of teaching methods on student learning have consistently raised considerable interest in the thematic field of educational research (Hightower, 2011). The role of education is to ensure that while academic staff do teach, what is taught should also be intelligible to students emanating from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and that they rapidly become familiar with the expected standards (Nicolaides, 2012)*.* It is argued that involving students in the evaluation of teaching is an essential tool in implementing, institutionalising, and enhancing the newly introduced standards in teaching and learning (Al-Hinai, 2011). Attention to this task in university education is considered as a major one, so in their instruction, educators must pay attention to learners and learning approach in order to attain new teaching approaches (Nahidi, 2016).

Various models by their families pull students into particular types of content (knowledge, values, skills) and increase their competence to grow in the personal, social, and academic domains (Joyce B., 2014). For example, demonstrations or projects are effective for meeting some goals but ineffective for meeting others. The implication here is that there is no single best way or teaching strategy that can be employed in all situations since the number of teaching goals is large and diverse in nature (Joyce B. , 2008). This is true for countries such as Britain, China, Germany, Italy, France, America, Portugal and, more recently, South Africa. Governments and employers alike are seemingly realising the importance of the combined knowledge, skills, and endeavours of individuals in building a sustainable competitive advantage (Brown, 2004).

A large number emphasize concepts and information derived from the academic disciplines (Muralikrishnan T. S., 2009). The social family strives to develop positive and cooperative learning environments with intellectual and social advantages (Joyce, Four Families of Teaching Models, 2004). These interactions normally occur face-to-face but are not limited to this type of interaction with the assistance of online tools and technologies (Bhavin H, 2013). Employers emphasize that learning from the social network is one of the most important factors affecting graduate employability acquisition (Kempster, 2010).

When students work together in groups they learn to use leadership as well as problem solving skills; engage with one another, they “build [their] own insight into what’s being discussed. Someone else’s understanding complements [theirs], and together [they] start to weave an informed interpretation observed (Connor, 2010). They also learn to work together as a team to produce a desired outcome. This is where the lecturer needs to be alert and encourage and motivate student participation. Students are more willing to express their ideas and they experience deeper learning as they are able to test out new concepts (Warren, 2003); thereby soon develop a sense of ownership for their work and contributions. The personal family of teaching models provides the essential part of the teaching repertoire that directly addresses the students’ needs for self-esteem and self-understanding and how to build support and respect among students (Joyce, 2014).

(Smith M. K., 2008) noted that opening up avenues for students to practically engage in different life philosophies and ways of life such as debating clubs or leadership systems like school councils and youth forums; assisting with the development of an inclusive education (this may be through activities that encourage students to accept others, and to make practical sense of their schools’ internal and surrounding environments); developing practical programs whose activities link schools (such as university educational institutions) with local communities and homes (this can be achieved by developing the activity programs inviting respectable people and parents to talk to students and encourage their competency development in matters of discipline, hard work, morals, social competence and empathy); working with community groups to design and run programs using school resources; and working with school staff to develop new social and educational opportunities. To note of all the above observations is that they covered the use of activity-based informal training in university education institutions of American, Asian and European countries (Nabayego, 2014).

**2.3 Effect of the Four Families of Teaching Models on Employability**

According to Symington (2012), the debate around what constitutes employability is not limited to its definition or scope, but also relates to those influential factors like how we teach, that are perhaps not as well defined in current knowledge. In the 21st century, people seem to be regarded as competency traders, meaning that employability depends on the knowledge, transferable skills, experience, and unique characteristics that are brought to the table (Symington, 2012).

According to (Knight, 2002), it is apparent that we cannot consider graduate learning and their subsequent employability in isolation. There is a general consensus that becoming employable is an important goal for graduates (Brown, 2005); (Saunders, 2010) and so it could be said that it is incumbent upon universities to assist students to become ‘work-ready’ or ‘career-ready’ (Raybould, 2005). Employability and good learning have a lot in common, and should not be seen as oppositional (Yorke M. K., 2003). Hence it is understood that Employability is nothing but individual's capacity to understanding and acquiring personal attributes (knowledge, skills and abilities) to gain employment, satisfying employer as well as sustain there (Bhola, 2013). Embedding employability into the core of University education is considered a key priority of Government, universities and colleges and employers observed (Yorke M. K., 2003).

(Mason, 2003) recommended that students need to be equipped with an understanding of the world of work; and that graduates require complimentary discipline specific skills and personal/transferable skills (Wickramasinghe, 2010). In the same vein, students too set high expectations of universities equipping them with the necessary skills, experiences and attributes to ease their transition to graduation and beyond into a graduate job (Moore, 2013). Understanding what influences their perceptions of our teaching, and their preferred teaching approaches, on the other hand, can give us valuable insight in designing good and relevant teaching models for the teachers (Joyce B. , 2008). Mmany young people face difficulties in finding a job because of the mismatch between their education or training and labour market requirements (ILO, 2012). To this end, “students develop those generic skills or abilities on which their teachers place a high value, but show little change in those areas which are not valued by staff” (Toohey, 1999).

According to (Burnett, 2012), globally, youth unemployment in 2012 was about 75 million, or a rate of 12.7 percent, varying from 28% in the Middle East to 13.5% in South Asia. The major skill gaps in Africa are cognitive (especially numeracy, critical thinking), non-cognitive (especially communication, leadership and decision-making) and technical which also depends on the industry (Burnett, 2012). The higher education institutions in Rwanda are challenged to adjust their program structures, curricula, teaching and learning methods to adapt to a new range of demands, such as quality, to increase the employability of graduates (Mbabazi, 2013). Many analysts suggest that the curriculum in institutions of higher learning requires significant updating to match the needs and demands of employers (Oluyomi, 2012). But nobody dares to assess the extent to which changes in those directions have taken place (Teichler U. , 2011).

While some of the public and private universities in Kenya offer core science (environmental geosciences and geology) and engineering programmes (mechanical, chemical and process, civil and industrial), there is no tailored curriculum or coursework focused on meeting the demands of such an industry (African Development Bank, 2014). Some scholars argue that higher education, including university education, yields no or few “social benefits” beyond what the individual student gets from higher education and that higher education may instead promote “social unrest and political instability” (Friedman, 1980). This argument implies that the public benefits of higher education are not widely recognised (Bigabwenkya, 2013). The high and growing rate of graduate unemployment in Uganda implies, however, that most of the university education graduates are not practical enough to turn their local environmental resources into gainful work and effective contribution to national development; it shows a glaring conflict between the internal and external efficiency in university education in Uganda (Nabayego, 2014). In fact, available evidence shows that most university graduates are unable to write proper, comprehensible lecture notes and job application letters in English - due to their very low literacy competence levels - in addition to under-performance at work places for those employed (Hyuha, 2017).

Until 1987, higher education in Uganda was entirely a public venture. But because of the numbers of students who qualify for higher education, the public sector could not meet the demand; public private partnerships (PPPs) were introduced in the 1990s with a hope of improving the provision of services, quality and accessibility of higher education. Despite the existence of PPPs in the Higher Education sector, the quality and accessibility of higher education has continued to fall short of the stakeholders’ expectations in many sub-Saharan countries including Uganda (Kasenene, 2010).

 (Bunoti, 2011) students think the content and teaching approach are too theoretical, resulting in training job seekers and not job makers. There is an increasing number of students which is unmatched by facilities, which has impacted adversely on the quality

of higher education (Kasozi, 2005). As the demand for higher education increases, it presents educational entrepreneurs and managers with a challenge of

making investment decisions by which they can attain desired educational goals of the potential customers (Kayongo, 2010).

Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature that has thus far shaped the understanding of models of teaching used in university education. Given the scope of the study, those sources deemed most relevant to the four families of models of teaching approach and its effect on employability were utilised in order to identify the skills that are needed for students employability at university level; those desired by employers, and those that are lacking according to employers. From the literature, it is evident that universities do not embrace the fact that one size does not fit all including the case of university education teaching in Uganda, thereby calling for the need to address it through further research. Chapter 3 provides insight into the specific research methodology used to conduct the research.

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODOLOGY

# 3.0 Overview

This chapter introduces the study design, study population, sampling strategy, sample size, data collection methods and analysis.

## **3.1 Research design**

The current research design carried an explanation of how the study is organized in order to obtain the data and other facts required so as to make meaningful analysis and conclusion from this study. As mentioned previously, different stakeholders have different views on these issues; thus, it is important to take into account various stakeholders, such as the students, teachers and administrators, in this study.

The researcher used students as focus of this study because they are well positioned as change agents of the future in the policy and public debates on higher education in Uganda. Their voices have not been included to a large extent in research on higher education in Uganda; thus, they were included as key stakeholders in the present study. Furthermore, it was presumed that teachers or lecturers and administrators are significant actors in the students’ life and would, thus, provide important views about students’ teaching. The teachers and administrators from different programs and areas of work were included to increase variation in the results and promote the generalisability potential of the study through the maximisation of variation and context similarity (Larsson, 2009).

## **3.2 Study Population**

Saunders & Thornhill (2012), defined study population as the full set of cases from which a sample is taken. In the current study, the researcher examined in depth some features of private universities education and the cases selected were five (5) private universities, namely Agakhan University, Muteesa University, Ndejje Univeristy, Uganda Christian University, Victoria Makerere University. The researcher therefore selected the five (5) cases, that is, the five (5) private universities because of their importance in illustrating private university education in Uganda.

The current study used responses of 200 respondents comprising of individual students, lecturers, and relevant administrators as representative sources of data on the five (5) private universities in Kampala district under study. These stakeholders in the five (5) universities were of paramount importance because they helped the researcher to explore the actions or perceptions of individual respondents towards the four families of teaching models. In addition, these multiple sources of evidence revealed how and what private university education contributes to employability among students. In effect, the multiple sources strengthened the dependability, credibility and confirmability of the study findings.

The researcher’s determining factor for selection of participants is on the understanding that they have maximum exposure and knowledge about how courses are being taught at the university. Kampala District was chosen because atleast most of the universities in Uganda either have the main campus or branch located in Kampala district. It was expected that these selected participants shall be representative of the views and attitudes of other groups of people to whom the research would wish to apply the research.

Table 3.1: Showing the study population

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of participants**  | **Participants per University** | **Total** |
| Administrators | 1 | 5 |
| Teachers / lecturers | 5 | 25 |
| Students | 34 | 170 |
| **Total** | **40** | **200** |

## **3.3 Sample size composition**

The respondents within the sample are referred to as the "units of analysis." Each member of the population had an equal chance of selection for participation in this study. The sample of 150 respondents comprising of administrators (5), teachers / lecturers (24) and students (131) was used as a representation of the population. The researchers allotted a time slot during which an explanation was given of the purpose and method for completion of the survey. To eliminate generalizations and timeliness of the study, the study population was trimmed and determined using the Krejcie & Morgan’s (1970) table as cited by Amin (2005).

### **3.4 Sample size selection techniques**

The researcher used both cluster sampling and purposive techniques. This study used cluster sampling because cluster sampling helps resolve the problems of lack of a good sampling frame for a dispersed population, and when the cost of reaching a sampled element is high.

Purposive sampling is a non-random sampling technique in which the “researcher uses a wide range of methods to locate all possible cases of a highly specific and difficult-to-reach population” or specialised population. The researcher therefore found purposive sampling to be appropriate for selecting cases of five (5) private universities from a list of 34 private universities because these five are located in Kampala district in Uganda.

**Table 3.2: Showing sample size selection**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category of participants per selected university** | **Total Population** | **Selected sample** | **Sampling Technique** |
| Administrators | 5 | 5 | Purposive |
| Teachers / lecturers | 25 | 24 | Purposive  |
| Students | 170 | 131 | Cluster |
| **Total** | **200** | **150** |  |

## **3.5 Data collection methods**

The researcher collected from current students, lecturers and administrators who were located through the snowballing method. The researcher collected data using both quantitative and qualitative methods. This mixed method approach was used because of its advantages. The mixing of methods in this study was to cater for the different advantages that each method brought to the study. To this end, the quantitative methods were embedded in a quantitative design, and the qualitative data were used just to support the quantitative findings. Data was collected using the following data collection methods

### **3.5.1 Primary and Secondary data sources**

This study used both primary and secondary data sources. Primary sources, as already indicated elsewhere, were the respondents, namely the students, teachers / lecturers, and administrators. The students accounts and opinions were collected. The lecturers’ experiences, ideas and interpretations were studied. Finally, the respondents perceptions and opinions were analysed. In essence, it was a study of perception as it delved into feelings, views and opinions. The secondary sources were published journals, books, articles and other materials were read in order to bring out the cardinal issues on the Perceptions of the four families of teaching models towards employability among students in selected private universities in Uganda. This data was access from physical, Google, Wikipedia and other general education and educational and research relating to models of teaching by their family sources.

### **3.5.2 Interviewing**

Interviewing was basically of two (2) types, involving the structured and unstructured. The current study selected 150 respondents from five (5) private universities in Uganda; of whom only ten (10) were targeted for interview using an interview guide. Incidentally, the respondents were persons with university education, who easily appreciated the value of the research interviews. Meanwhile, a total of 129 participants / respondents the questionnaires. A semi-structured interview guide was used because, as Cohen and Manion (1998) reveal, semi-structured interviews are more flexible than the structured ones since they allow the interviewer to ask the participants/respondents major questions and provide opportunity for probing deeply. Interviews have a high response rate; they allow for probing and clarification, and in a face-to-face interview, the interviewer can observe the respondent while asking questions (Babbie 2006).

### **3.5.3 Questionnaires**

In this study, a questionnaire was used because it was generally considered to be a tool that was free ofthe researcher’s biassince the answers represented the respondents’ own opinions. The study had 150 questionnaires administered in five (5) private universities within Kampala District. The last section of the questionnaire was open-ended with unstructured interview format which provided the qualitative part of data. Questionnaires, in this study centred on asking a range of questions focusing on models of teaching methods used to foster employability. The questionnaire had the first part on bio-data, the three questions with different Likert Scales.

## **3.6 Data Quality Control**

The data quality control was assured through reliability and validity, as well due consideration to ethical issues.

### **3.6.1 Validity**

 The validity of an instrument implies the extent to which a research instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. It is the extent to which an empirical measure clearly reflects the true meaning of the concept under consideration in the study (Babbie 2006). The current study used face and content validity to check the instruments. Face validity is the extent to which particular measures may or may not resonate with our common understanding and our personal “mental images” with regard to a particular concept or issue. The researcher focused on the extent to which the content of both the questionnaire and the interview schedule corresponded to the content of the concepts in the Four Families Models of Teaching Model and its effect on employability.

Meanwhile, under the Four Families Models of Teaching approach, an examination of 20 models within the model was done by selecting them from the 23 identified models of teaching by Joyce and Weil (1980) which were classified into four major families. Hence, to establish content validity, this study specified the domain of the content for analysis as Four Families of Models of Teaching, where each family was represented using four specific models of teaching. But it should also be noted that the specific models of teaching can as well be used as general models of teaching depending on the intended educational goals.

The indicators of the Four families of teaching models were Behavior Modification Family, Information Processing Family, Social Interaction Family and Personal Family for teaching. Then within each family models suitable for the family were developed. The indicators for Employability were the four families of teaching models because the encompass the expected outcomes for employability, that is, attitudes / behaviour, cognitive skills, social skills and individual skills. Efforts were made by the researcher to ensure that the instruments 150 were comprehensive and that they could be used to collect only data relevant to the study. To ascertain this objective, University Supervisor at Nkumba University who reviewed the instruments and advised the researcher on how the instruments could further be improved upon. Improvements were made to them and the final version was produced and used in this study.

### **3.6.2 Reliability (Dependability) of Research Instruments**

In this study, the researcher tested the consistency of the documents using internal reliability. The instruments were pre-tested on students of Ndejje University, whose business is related to the private university education system. To further enhance the reliability and dependability of data, the researcher used simple terms in the questionnaire, interview schedule and face to face guide. The use of multiple methods of collecting data allowed the generation of data from different accounts.

**3.6.3 Ethical consideration**

In carrying out the empirical studies, I used the general guidelines of research ethics put forward by the American Psychological Association-APA (2010) as a benchmark. I adhered to the principles of integrity and respect for rights and dignity; the ethical standard of informed consent to research and informed consent for recording voices were emphasised throughout. Supportive documents were obtained. I utilised recommendation

letters, one from my university and one from my employer. The letters clearly indicated my position as a researcher, the purpose of the data as purely for my Masters research project, and a request for cooperation in facilitating the data collection.

During every interview, I briefed the prospective participants about the aim of the research, the possible benefits of the research, and the planned schedule for data collection. I clearly informed the participants that they were free to request clarification at any moment and would receive answers. I further clarified that their true names as individuals and also universities were not necessary in handling the data, with the aim of promoting privacy and

confidentiality.

### **3.7 Documentary methods**

The researcher used various documents in order to uncover the latent messages that are hidden in the text, staff lists and school facilities, course outlines in order to interpret the educational approaches used by universities.

## **3.8 Analysis of data**

The researcher analyzed data using both qualitative and quantitative techniques because each category (qualitative and quantitative) required a specific approach that was technically acceptable and relevant to generate credible results. The analysis of raw data obtained from respondents involved editing, coding, presentation and interpretation and electronic computer software in order for data to be ready for analysis. The data collected on questionnaires was transferred to an electronic file in order to process and analyze it using the computer software - Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher used the descriptive statistics obtained by use of computer software to explain the Independent Variable effect on employability in private universities students in Kampala District.

### **3.9 Quantitative data analysis**

Quantitative analysis was a major part of the analytics in this study and, therefore, qualitative data simply supplemented the quantitative data. The researcher carefully scrutinized the raw data to ensure consistency, accuracy and completeness of the questionnaires. Quantitative data were collected from 129 respondents and analysed through descriptive. The descriptive statistics involved means, frequencies and percentages. Meanwhile, regression analysis was used because the study took interest in determining predictions among the variables. In regression analysis, the researcher aimed at analysing the degree of predictability between the four families of teaching models. The study used simple regression when generally dealing with models of teaching within the four families of teaching models approach. In this study, it was therefore possible to test the contribution of private university education to employability among students in public universities in Uganda.

The researcher presented qualitative data mainly in the form of written transcripts, that is, in form of words or text that were derived from the respondents / participants. The eventual analysis provided an explanatory presentation on the contribution of the four families of teaching models towards employability among students in private universities. The analysis done by the researcher went through three concurrent activities, as advocated in literature, namely: *data reduction* which involved selecting, summarising, focusing, simplifying, and abstracting the data from transcripts; data display which involved organising and compressing information, which facilitated conclusion drawing and action; and conclusion drawing and verification which involved establishing meanings from regularities, patterns, explanations, causal flows and propositions.

## **Summary**

Chapter three has described the different stages in the mixed method approach as used in this study. The rationale behind each decision at every stage of the methodology has been indicated as well as how the perception about the four families of teaching models was established through the collection, analysis, presentation and interpretation of data. In essence, this chapter has explained how the study was carried out, right from the design stage, through data collection and data, processing up to the final stage of analysis and presentation of findings. In so doing, the chapter has established a background against which the study and its results can be judged by the readers. In general, the researcher attempted to be rigorous to ensure that the final output meets acceptable scientific and academic standards. The following chapter (Chapter Four) presents the study findings, analyses and interpretation.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**4.0 Overview**

Chapter three explained how the study was carried out through the stages of design, data collection, processing and analysis. This chapter four presents the results of the study and discussion of the findings. The results are presented and analyzed thematically based on study objectives and the findings are presented in the tabular form, percentages and occasional quotations of respondents´ views. Details of respondents´ biographic characteristics such as sex / gender, age, level of education, position held in the university, length of service and the results are presented below.

## **4.1 Demographic information**

### **4.1.1 Sex / Gender of the respondents**

Table 4.1: Sex / Gender of the respondents

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sex / Gender** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| Female | 64 | 49.6 |
| Male | 65 | 50.4 |
| **Total** | **129** | **100** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

According to table 4.1, concerning sex / gender of the respondents, the result reveal that the respondents were equally distributed in terms of either gender male or female with each scoring an approximately 50%. This is a strong indicator that in the education sector, the gender balance that has for long been advocated in Uganda has been largely achieved; and also that both female and male showed interest in the study equally.

**4.1.2** **Status of the respondents**

**Table 4.2**: **Status of the respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Status** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Administrator | 11 | 8.7 |
| Teacher/Lecturer | 15 | 11.8 |
| Student | 103 | 79.5 |
| **Total** | **129** | **100** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

From table 4.2 above, an attempt was made to identify the role the respondents were engaged in whether being a student, a teacher or an administrator at the selected private universities. The results indicate that majority of the respondents were students forming 103 (79%), teachers represented 15 (11.8%) and administrators represented 11 (8.5%). This is an acceptable result in this study and education setup whereby the students are generally the majority. The reults further imply that all key university players were represented in the study and data collected was obtained from reliable sources.

### **4.1.3 Educational level of the respondents**

**Table 4. 3**:**Educational level of the respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Educational level** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Secondary | 1 | .8 |
| Diploma | 6 | 4.8 |
| Bachelors | 110 | 84.8 |
| Masters | 12 | 9.5 |
| **Total** | **129** | **100** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

From table 4.3 above, the results indicate that majority of respondents were at the bachelors’ level and this category formed 110 (85%) of the respondents. There were 12 (9%) of the respondents who possessed a master’s degree, 6 (4.6%) had an ordinary diploma while it was only less than one (1%) that had a secondary level of education. This implies that all respondents had either been exposed to or got involved in the delivery of university education to students and had knowledge about the different models of teaching continuum at the university.

However, the results further reveal given the study was conducted in universities, NCHE requirement was that each university should have at least 60% of its academic staff with PhDs. As a matter of fact, all the universities are 'bottom-heavy', with a seriously inadequate number of senior staff, particularly at the professorial levels (Hyuha, 2017).

**4.1.4 Experience - Status of the Respondents at the university**

**Table 4. 4**: **Experience - Status of the Respondents at the university**

| **Experience** | **Status** | **Total** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrator** | **Teacher / Lecturer** | **Student** |
| 2-3 years | 5 | 4 | 99 | 108 |  |
| 4-5 years | 5 | 9 | 3 | 17 |  |
| 6-7 years | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
| **Total** | **11** | **14** | **102** | **127** |  |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

Of the 129 (100%) respondents, 108 (85.7%) respondents had stayed in the university setting for a period between 2-3 years; 17 (13%) respondents for a period between 4-5 years; and 2 (1.5%) respondents for a period between 6-7 years. However, the period that respondents had so far stayed at the Universities reveals that atleast, there has been physical contact and observation of facts or events as they happened. This implies that they were knowledgeable and had been exposed to various models of teaching during the process of teaching and learning at the selected private universities.

On the contrary, results further depict that there is severe lack of retention administrators and lecturers who would be senior academicians capable of shaping teaching practices to match with the current educational trends. This has a significantly adverse impact on the quality of teaching and graduates. lectures. Prevalence of part-time staff also indicated the shortage of academics. However, the study did not focus on testing work status as a factor in explaining the four families of models of teaching effect on employability.

### **4.1.5 Publications**

**Table 4. 5**: **Publications – Level of education of teacher / lecturer respondents**

|

|  | **Publications**  | **Total Publications** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of education** | **Total Respondents** | **Contributions of Community Policies on the Improvement of the Relationship Between Policies and the Community** | **Effects of Secular Education on Performance of Catholic Founded Schools** | **Urbanization and its Effects on Wetlands** |
| Administrator | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Teacher / Lecturer | 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Student | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **126** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **3** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015*** |

Of the 12 (100%) teacher / lecturer respondents, only 3 (25%) indicated having written publications in regard to knowledge generation and dissemination although they appeared to be research dissertations because they were written by teaching staff who hold Master’s Degree, since no PhD holders were present in this study.

As noted that unfortunately, over 90% of what is taught in our universities, colleges and schools is imported knowledge (Kasozi, 2005). This implies that many of our universities do not know their major role as knowledge producers resulting into lack of locally produced and relevant knowledge to impart to our students. Therefore, employers will definitely find some of the university graduates unable to perform simple intellectual and practical tasks because over reliance on theoretical imported teaching learning content. However, the results can still be attributed to the fact since the total number of teachers/lecturers in this study was few, the results are a reflection of the same.

# 4.2 The nature of the four families of teaching models used by private universities

The researcher used this objective to investigate the four families of teaching models, particularly those developed for this study. 1= Yes indicating that the model of teaching was present, 2=No, 3= Blank Entry. The summary of finding is in the table 4.6 below.

**Table 4. 6**: **Nature of Behavior Modification Family models**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model of teaching** |  **Yes=1****No=2** |  **Frequency** |  **Percent** |
| Heuristic | 1 | 114 | 88.4 |
| 2 | 15 | 11.6 |
| Role-Playing | 1 | 114 | 88.4 |
| 2 | 14 | 10.9 |
| Analytical | 1 | 38 | 29.5 |
| 2 | 60 | 46.5 |
| 3 | 31 | 24 |
| Laboratory | 1 | 119 | 92.2 |
| 2 | 10 | 7.8 |
| Case Study | 1 | 123 | 95.3 |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

**Table 4. 7**: **Nature of Information Processing Family models**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model of teaching** | **Yes=1****No=2** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Inductive | 1 | 83 | 62.4 |
| 2 | 46 | 35.7 |
| Deductive | 1 | 73 | 56.6 |
| Synthetic | 1 | 82 | 63.6 |
| 2 | 46 | 35.7 |
| Verbal/Oral | 1 | 121 | 93.8 |
| Written Method | 1 | 125 | 94 |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

**Table 4. 8**: **Social Interaction Family Models**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Model of teaching** | **Yes=1****No=2** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Discussions/debate | 1 | 129 | 100 |
| Cooperative teaching | 1 | 126 | 97.7 |
| Collaborative | 1 | 123 | 95.3 |
| Problem Based Learning | 1 | 96 | 74.4 |
| 2 | 32 | 24.8 |
| Demonstration | 1 | 115 | 89.1 |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

**Table 4. 9 Nature of the Personal Family Models**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model of teaching** | **Yes=1****No=2** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Brainstorming | 1 | 122 | 94.6 |
| Practical methods |   | 116 | 89.9 |
| 2 | 13 | 10.1 |
| Activity-oriented | 1 | 119 | 92.2 |
| 2 | 10 | 7.8 |
| Designing project | 1 | 106 | 82.2 |
| 2 | 23 | 17.8 |
| E-learning | 1 | 82 | 63.6 |
| 2 | 46 | 35.7 |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

From Tables 4.2.1 to 4.2.4 above, the results show that majority of respondents had witnessed various models being implemented. However, a substantial number of respondents indicated that Problem solving, and demonstration, that fall under the Social Interaction Families (SIF) were missing. Under the Behavioral Modification Families, a substantial number of respondents indicated that heuristic, role playing, laboratory training were missing in their learning.

Furthermore, a substantial percentage of respondents indicated that, inductive, deductive and synthetic pedagogies, that fall under the category of Information Processing Family were missing in their learning. Finally, the result show that there was a substantial number of respondents that had not experienced Designing project, E-learning, Activity oriented and Practical methods, all that fall under Personal Family being implemented.

## **4.3 Perception of the Four Families of Models of Teaching on employability**

**4.3.1 Importance of the Four Families of Models of teaching used by private universities**

The researcher used this objective investigate whether learners considered the models of teaching employed as being important to them. The respondents rated their answers as 1=Not important, 2=Somewhat important,3=Neutral, 4= Important, 5= Very important. The summary of the results is shown in table 4.3 below.

**Table 4. 10 Importance of the Four Families of Models of Teaching**

|  |
| --- |
| **1=Not important, 2=Strongly Important, 3=Not Important,****4=Important, 5=Very Important** |
|   | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **BMF** | **129** | **1** | **5** | **3.07** | **.893** |
| **IPF** | **129** | **1** | **5** | **3.58** | **.982** |
| **SIF** | **129** | **1** | **5** | **3.37** | **0.945** |
| **PF** | **129** | **1** | **5** | **4.04** | **.931** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

The results indicate that in general, both the Information Processing Family (IPF - Mean=3.58, SD=0.982) and Personal Family (PF - Mean=4.04, SD=0.931) were ranked as being important to the learner given their scores that tended towards a mean of 4 which is “Important”.

Majority of respondents were not quite sure whether Social Interaction Family (SIF - Mean =3.37, SD=0.945) and Behavior Modification Family (BMF - mean=3.07, SD=0.893) were of importance to them given their response that tended towards 3 which is Not Sure. This is an indicator that the trainers have to critically analyse the purpose of models of teaching being employed in order to improve the perception of students. They also have to explain to students the intended outcomes of the model of teaching in order to involve students` participation in the teaching-learning process.

Further examination of the results, however indicate that there were some respondents who actually 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. This suggests that, the learners are diverse and no model of teaching can offer a one-size-fits-all solution. As such the teachers / lecturer should make a more attempts to constantly assess the individual needs and try to tailor the delivery of their lectures in the most appropriate pedagogy.

## **4.3.2 Adequacy of the Four Families of Teaching Models used by private universities**

This objective aimed at assessing the response of the students in gauging the adequacy of the models of teaching by their family affliations employed by their universities. In this respect a score of 1= Adequate, 2= Fairly Adequate, and 3=Inadequate. The summary of the finding is as shown in table 4.4 below.

**Table 4. 11 Perception regarding the adequacy of the models of teaching by family affliations**

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of level of adequacy** |
|  Family | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| **BMF** | **127** | **1** | **3** | **1.64** | **.659** |
| **IPF** | **127** | **1** | **3** | **1.75** | **.704** |
| **SIF** | **127** | **1** | **3** | **1.46** | **.574** |
| **PF** | **127** | **1** | **3** | **1.62** | **.687** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

The results indicate that in general, the learners felt that all models of the four families of teaching models employed were fairly adequate given their scores which ranked towards a mean of 2 (Fairly Adequate). A critical assessment of individual models of teaching indicate that it is only “discussion and debate” that was adequate (Mean=1.2, SD=0.4). This shows that the trainers still need to devise means to improve on adequacy of the model of teaching chosen as majority of learners rated them averagely. 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 suggests that there are learners who either attain the highest level of satisfaction while some gain the lowest level. This equally suggests that it is possible to make a follow up from the learners on what aspects needs to be improved in order to adequately meet the needs of all learners given the individual differences.

## **4.4 Analysis of the effect of the Four Families of models of Teaching on employability of students in private universities**

In this objective, the researcher made an attempt to assess whether the learners believed that the pedagogy used in their particular university ably gave them the skills they require in the job. A score of 1=Strongly Agree, 2 =Agree, 3= Not Sure, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree. The summary of the results is as shown in table 4.4 below.

**Table 4. 12** **Analysis of the effect of Four Families of Models of Teaching on employability of students in private universities**

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary - 1=Strongly AgreeA, 5=Strongly Disagree** |
| **Family** | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
| **SIF** | **129** | **2** | **5** | **3.92** | **.648** |
| **BMF** | **129** | **2** | **5** | **3.83** | **.755** |
| **IPF** | **129** | **2** | **5** | **3.70** | **.787** |
| **PF** | **129** | **2** | **5** | **3.95** | **.761** |

***Source: Primary Date 2015***

The results show that majority of the responses were tending towards a mean of 4 which is “Disagree”. This means that the respondents were not contented that adopting any or a mix of the said four families of teaching models contributed much towards their employability. This suggests that other factors not related to the model of teaching explained what the respondents felt that was important to employability.

In general Personal Family was indicated as one that had the worst perceived in explaining employability PF (Mean=3.95, SD= 0.761) and this was followed by Social Interaction Model SIF(Mean= 3.92, SD=0.68). Ideally, it can be concluded that the learners do not feel adopting any of the families of teaching models actually gave them an edge towards employability. This adds on to the mixture of debates surrounding Ugandan job markets that has in the past questioned whether universities are actually producing ready students. A case in point is when the President suggested that graduates need to be retrained. Further, questionable employment practices like favouritism and corruption in the job market, that are common in the Ugandan popular media may have informed the learners’ perception that it may not matter about what qualification one has as long as they have other backers.

# 4.4 Qualitative data analysis

In this section, interviews with key informats from the selected five universities was conducted. The respondents were selected based in the period they had spent on each university and been in core positions that included teaching and administration. A total of five participant participated in the study. They were also required to shed more light on the models of teaching by their family sources employed in the universities and their evaluation as well of their appropriateness. They were also requested to identify the challenges related to teaching and also the possible means to do it. The results that were largely shared are as follows

### **4.4.1 Nature of the four families of Models of teaching**

In respect to the models of teaching by their family sources employed by the researcher, the respondents indicated that the different families are vital and are employed in different situations depending on the course being taught. Majority of the respondents believed that the universities were moving in the right direction when they deliberately tailor the models of teaching to fit into the course they teach.

In support of the above one of the respondent narrated; “*the use of the appropriate model of teaching makes the university more professional*… *this is because a university is supposed to diversify their practices that produce students who are all round in order to face life.* The respondent was thus attesting that the families of teaching models approach can greatly contribute to production of a wider range of employability skills.

Another one posed .*.‘’.. teaching styles can either make or break the student…………….choice of an appropriate pedagogy is thus vital..”*

### **4.4.2 The challenges faced in enhancing learning**

The respondents identified financial constraints as the main hindrance affecting delivery of learning as it should. Almost all the respondents indicated that the universities are faced with financial limitations that makes it difficult to offer the best that they can. This explains why for some courses where practical or field work ought to be the best learning methods may not have been properly achieved.

In responding to the question, one respondent had this to say…*’…..Financial constraints related to low fee payment rates by students and high demands make universities operate with small budget. This limits delivery. Students at times pay fees late a situation that limits the early purchase of utilities….. also as a result of this, the lectures are lowly paid which leads to low motivation and morale*…..””

Another respondent noted…’’ yeah, the government and the Ministry of Education does not offer support to private institutions. The institutiuons rely on students fees and also donors… domors are not many…… . *This limits how far a university can go to provide quality eductation*…..”

### **4.4.3 Measures to enhance the education standards**

In this section, the respondents were requested to provide measures that they thought would be appropriate in enhancing the the education standards in their university. In response, the respondents felt that the universities need financial assistance is one of the major means of improving education standards. In this, the universities would be able to meet all the necessary expenses like buying the learning equipments, facilities and even motivating the lecturers.

In support of the above view one of the respondents indicated that’’….. *financial support is needed to improve on the infrastructure and motivate teachers…..”* Another respondent indicated that….” *The universities should explore other sources of funding rather than just relying on the contribution of students*…. “

Further, the respondents pointed out that the structure the University education in Uganda as it is needs to be changed. This would entail making the education more practical and case study oriented. As such, the respondent felt, the students wound be provided with an opportunity to better experiment and gain more of practical experience.

In response, one of the respondent observed..” *yeah… we need an overhaul,,, what we offer here is different from what is offered abroad…. That is why you see some organisations turn to students who studied from abroad………………”*

In another response a respondent indicated, *…” we need to learn how to fast adopt into a new environment….. when it demands a change , we change… It is true that National Higher Council of Education requires that syllabi are updated in every five years… But now I fell we need a complete overahaul……*

In conclusion, there are statistically significant relationships between the four families of teaching models approach and its effect on employability. Furthermore, it was statistically determined from the narrations, that much effort is required to help improve the way the teaching is done among private universities. However, some internal challenges like inadequate funds are putting a limitation to the achievement of the most desirable standards. Recommendations regarding these findings will be discussed in Chapter 5.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**5.0 Overview**

Statistical analysis of the data gathered by means of a self-administered questionnaire was reported in Chapter 4, and the final chapter will draw conclusions regarding the achievement of the research objectives, implications of the findings, and will discuss limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research. This section discusses conclusions and achievement of the research objectives as they relate to the literature review and the empirical study respectively.

**5.1 The nature of the Four Families of Models of Teaching used in private universities in Uganda**

The researcher found out that the results indicated all the 20 models of teaching under the four families of teaching models were equally distributed among the four families, that is, Behavior Modification, Information Processing, Social interaction and Personal families were well represented. There are different possible reasons that can be advanced to explain the findings as elaborated hereafter.

In Ugandan context, no known university requires their lecturers / teachers to first take a teaching psychology course. The practice has been for universities to recruit their teaching staff based on the minimum criterion set by the National Council for higher education. The council for instance, sets the qualification of a lecturer as a PhD. This means that, it is possible that the lecturers in the universities under review may not have previously undertaken a teaching course.

However, it is possible to deduce that, throughout their studies right from primary school, the academic staff has experienced their teachers and instructors employ the various models of teaching with positive results. Thus, out of personal experience, the teaching staff may employ different models of teaching in their teaching and therefore all the available models of teaching are well represented in the Ugandan Universities.

Equally, it is possible that members of the academic staff, during their department, faculty and other meetings carry out reviews and appraisals on the best methods of teaching and out of such meetings they agree on the possible use of the available models of teaching. Thus, the application of all the models of teaching by their family sources reviewed could be as a result of deliberately agreed plan by the members of academic staff.

Equally, universities are open and learning systems and through the various learning processes, the various models of teaching emerge as a learning outcome. This can be explained from different perspective. On one account, university academic staff is under a requirement to conduct research as part of their career progress and job description. This means that, in the process of undertaking research, they learn of the various pedagogies and their possible outcomes. Thus, it is possible that the academic staff apply the various pedagogies from a point of informed decision after undertaking research.

Further, the university students are a source of information and their views can be incorporated in the teaching-learning process. Ideally, in a university setup, students have a say as to how well they would want their lectures delivered. This being the case, the university as a learning organisation, is likely to accept student views which may explain why there is a variety of models of teaching employed in the Ugandan context.

Still, as a process of knowledge acquisition, universities have collaboration with different learning institutions, companies, non-government organisations, government entities and international bodies. These bodies can be partners or employers and as such may recommend different means of teaching methods to be applied in order to make the students more effective. As such the universities may have decided to employ the various pedagogies available.

In another explanation, the respondents of the study are from 31 different programmes that ideally has approximately 6 course units per semester under which each course units have a number of topics which may be about or above 10. Thus, by the end of a three year course, the student may have studied about 36 course units and if each had about 10 topics, then one student undertaking just one programme may have had about 360 taught topics. This means given the 31 programmes, the topics under review could be about 1,290. It is thus not surprising that the respondents to this study must have witnessed all the models of teaching being used during their entire programmes.

The above results are an acceptable factor of university options of delivering knowledge to the learners and are a reflection of the normal practice in the various universities both within the country and outside. For instance, Nicolaides( 2012) observed that universities should use a mixture of the different teaching models given the diversity of the learners they serve.

Similarly, Westbrook (2013) emphasised on the need to try different models of teaching as a mixture or based on the one that yields the best results. Similar views have also been shared by various scholars like, Wilson(2016), Bhavin (2013), Ganyaupfu, (2013), Beigzadeh ( 2016), 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 that fits in all situation and it is thus upon the teachers / lecturers to pick the best that suits the condition and aim at hand.

With the above results, it can be argued that Ugandan private universities like what is recommended by different scholars, have embraced the variety of modls of teaching that are available and they are employing them.

**5.2 The perception of the importance and adequacy of the families of models of teaching**

The results indicate that the learners felt that the models of teaching employed in their universities were appropriate for their learning. This means that the members of academic staff of the universities under review have always attempted to tailor their lecture delivery models / methods using the appropriate teaching approaches. As such the students feel contented with the models of teaching used in ensuring that learning takes place. There are a number of explanations that can be advanced to explain the said results as elaborated in the following discussion.

On one account, the National Council for Higher Education requires the universities to regularly update their courses and apply the appropriate teaching methods, also known as models of teaching. Thus, the universities are likely to have heeded this requirement and as such tailored their teaching to the appropriate models of teaching to the satisfaction of the students.

Further the universities under review are private institutions. These universities are competing against other such universities that are over 20 in number in addition to the traditionally well established public universities like Makerere. This being the case then, it is within the main expectation that such universities would have to tailor their programmes to the expectation of the students in order to attract more clients.

Added to the above, students in the private universities tend to pay a high price since they receive no subsidies from the government as is the case with public institutions. This means that they place their expectations to the university who in response have to heed to the expectation of the students. It is thus not surprising that the universities employ the various models of teaching by their family sources that are tailored to meet the expectation of the learners who are also clients.

Further still, establishing a university is an expensive affair. The proprietors of many private universities thus have to be compelled by a strong conviction or aim that requires them to prepare well in advance to have an impact in the society. For instance, in Uganda, there are a number of private universities that have been founded on religious grounds and aim at positively transforming the youth to be reliable in the community. Other private universities have been established to fill education gaps beyond the boundaries of Uganda. As such the universities are keen, guided by their strategic aims, to ensure that they tailor their teaching to the expectation of the learners.

The above results serve to support the views advanced by scholars that a private university reputation is largely dependent on their ability to meet the learners’ expectations. Such scholars like Beigzadeh (2016), Baryamureeba (2014), Otaala (2013), and Nabayego (2014) observed that higher learning institutions can only expect to survive if they satisfy their clientele expectations.

With the above results, it can be said that the universities under review are sensitive to the needs of their students and have made effort to tailor their teaching practices to the expectation of the students.

**5.3 The effect of the Four Families of Models of Teaching on employability of students in private universities in Uganda**

The results show that the respondents did not believe the models of teaching by their family sources used in their universities fostered their employability. This is in contrary to the expectations that depending on the models of teaching by their family sources used in a given programme, the students would acquire competences that would foster their employability. For instance, it was expected that practical methods would enhance an Information Technology student to get a job in a related area.

Many previous studies have shown that the employers weigh the ability of a student’s using different selection criteria that may include practical exercise. Thus, alternative explanation to the finding may, as explained hereafter provide a possible reason why the respondent felt that the models of teaching by their family sources employed would not enhance their employability. On one account, the employment practices in Uganda have been faulted.

Both in the popular media and in normal daily conversations, employers have been accused of favouritism, discrimination and other unfairness. For instance, even in the places like Parliament where fairness needs to be done, there were accusations that Parliamentarians were involved in employment malpractice of influencing the employment of their relatives. As such the respondents may feel that other factors than just mere qualifications influence employability.

The high level of unemployment rates may also have informed the believe by the respondents that their studies may not necessarily propel them to employment. For instance, it has been said that Ugandan high learning institutions release over 400,000 graduates and only 150,000 jobs are available(Baryamureeba, 2014)**.** Thus, the respondents may have witnessed some of the students who in the past may have performed well in the universities fail to get a job and as such may have prompted their belief that the quality of their studies may not have a strong impact on their employability in the job market.

Given the results, it can be said that other factors may explain the employability of private university students than just the outcomes of the education they achieve. This mainly may be as a result of context-specific factors. Many previous studies have shown that the quality of education one had is among the key determinant of employability especially where best employment practices are done. For instance, follow-up studies in developed countries like Europe, USA, and Australia showed that the content and quality of university studies are instrumental in enhancing employment opportunities (Barends et al., 2016: Benson,2013; Cheong et al.,2014; Tustin et al. ,2012).

Most like the content could be another factor explaining why employability is still a bottleneck on the side of university students. Further studies need to be done regarding the quality of content besides the models of teaching to rule out the unemployability major causes, like the lack of proper use of models of teaching.

# 5.4 Conclusions

This study set out to examine the degree of usage of the popular models of teaching by their family sources in Ugandan private universities and their effect on employability of the students. The findings indicate that the universities have embraced the popular models of teaching under the four key families of teaching models approach. It was also revealed that the learners found the usage of the various models appropriate to their learning. However, appropriateness of the models of teaching by their four family sources was not found to positively influence their employability. The study has revealed the appreciation and attempt to tailor the four families of teaching models to student needs by the private universities in Uganda. It has also provided a dilemma that Ugandan students are facing as to whether education adds value to the possibility of being employed.

# 5.5 Recommendations

Given the results the following recommendations can be advanced.

* The universities should continue tailoring their teaching to the appropriate teaching models. These have been found to enhance learning in their institutions.
* The private universities should continue employing the variety of teaching models in their universities. These have been found to promote learning in their universities.
* University lecturers to create awareness among students regarding the use, purpose and outcomes of the four families of teaching models to enable them find value in the teaching strategies, especially as outlined in the course outlines
* The universities should consider engaging the employers entering into memorandum of understanding with various companies and encourage them to consider employing their students. This may enhance the chances of their students being recruited.
* On another serious note, private universities should further do research on the content being delivered, as this may be of low standard to match with the employer expectations, either by way of standardized educational materials for each and every course or programme of undertaking.
* Government authorities should endevour to provide support of all kind to private universities as well in order to eliminate perceptions about the skill imbalances among private and public universities students. Where educational resources are insufficient, it is a situation which affects the entire society, nationally and globally.
* There is an opportunity to undertake a similar study by employing longitudinal study design. This is a more comprehensive study that may provide a long period focus to clearly understand the importance of the study models of teaching by their family sources.
* There is an opportunity to undertake a similar study in public universities. This can be important for comparison purposes and also fill gaps where they exist for purposes of uniformity in delivery of education and achievement of the educational goals.
* Finally, there is an opportunity of assessing what are the compelling factors that explain employability of the young graduates in Uganda. This would reduce on the continued blames put on universities as failing to produce employable graduates.

In an in-depth literature review, both constructs were discussed, along with a look at the Four Families of Models of Teaching relevant to employability and the relevant development areas. From the empirical study, it can be concluded that the respondents. The results of this study make a valuable contribution to the field of career development/guidance, individual students, employers, and higher education institutions, and the study is deemed to have been successful.
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#

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX I

# RESEARCH MODELS OF TEACHING BY THEIR FAMILY AFFLIATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Behavior Modification Family models**
 | 1. **Social Interaction Family Models**
 |
| Heuristic  | Discussion / Debate |
| Role playing  | Cooperative teaching |
| Analytical | Collaborative work |
| Laboratory | Problem based learning |
| Case Study | Demonstration |
| 1. **Information Processing Family Models**
 | 1. **Personal Family Models**
 |
| Inductive | Brainstorming |
| Deductive | Practical |
| Verbal / oral | Activity |
| Written / essay | Project design and presentation |
| Synthetic | E-learning |

## **APPENDIX II**

## **THE SELF ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESPONDENTS**

Dear Respondent,

**Re: Request to complete the research questionnaire:**

I, Nakamanya Sophie, a student of Masters of Educational Planning and Management at Nkumba University - School of Education carrying out a study on The Perception of the Four Families of Teaching Models Approach and its effect on Employability among Private University Students in Kampala District. This is part of the requirement for successful completion of the course. You have been selected as a potential respondent in this study. Therefore, this is to request you to complete this questionnaire as honestly as possible. Your opinion will not only be respected but will also be treated with utmost confidentiality. The responses you will give will be strictly used for this purpose

Kind regards.

**SECTION ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

**Please tick or circle the appropriate answers to questions below.**

1. Sex

 i) Female

 ii) Male

2. Age bracket

 i) 18-20

 ii) 21-30

 iii) 31-40

 iv) 41-50

 v) Above 50 years

3. Position or status or role at the University. Please tick in the box on your right what is applicable:

 i) Administrator

 ii Teacher / Lecturer

 iii) Student

4. Highest Level of education. Please tick in the box

 Primary Secondary

 Certificate Diploma

 Bachelor’s Degree Master’s Degree

 PHD

 ii) Experience – if student indicate years spent at university. If teacher indicate working experience.

 a) 2-3yrs................. b) 4-5yrs.................... c.) 6-7yrs..................

 iii) Commitment **(only teachers / lecturers to respond here)**

 Full-time Part-time Both

 iv) Publications

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

5. If student, please write or give the name of the course or programme you are undertaking at the university. E.g. Degree in Business Administration.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**SECTION B: MODELS OF TEACHING BY THEIR FAMILY AFFLIATION**

1. What models of teaching used by your university to develop the employability skills?

 Please use checklist below and fill in as indicated

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of pedagogy practice** | **Family /Source** | **Yes**  | **No** |
|  |
| Discussion/debates. |  |  |  |
| Cooperative teaching |  |  |  |
| Collaborative work |  |  |  |
| Problem-based learning (PBL) |  |  |  |
| Heuristic method / step by step problem solving |  |  |  |
| Case study |  |  |  |
| Brain storming |  |  |  |
| Role-playing games and simulations |  |  |  |
| Demonstration method |  |  |  |
| Inductive method |  |  |  |
| Deductive method |  |  |  |
| Analytical method |  |  |  |
| Synthetic method |  |  |  |
| Verbal or oral method / lecture |  |  |  |
| Written method / writing essays |  |  |  |
| Laboratory method |  |  |  |
| Practical methods |  |  |  |
| Explanatory method |  |  |  |
| Activity-oriented teaching |  |  |  |
| Designing and presenting a project |  |  |  |
| E-learning |  |  |  |
| Other (Specify) |  |  |  |

2. a) Perception - Rate each item based upon how important that item is **to you**

1 - Not Important 2 - Somewhat Important

 3 – Neutral 4 – Important

 5 - Very Important

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of model of teaching** | **Family** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Discussion/debates.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooperative teaching |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborative work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-based learning (PBL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heuristic method / step by step problem solving |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case study |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brain storming |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Role-playing games and simulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstration method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inductive method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deductive method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analytical method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Synthetic method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Verbal or oral method / lecture |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Written method / writing essays |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Practical methods |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explanatory method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity-oriented teaching |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Designing and presenting a project |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E-learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2. b) What perception do you have towards the model of teaching used by your university?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of pedagogy practice** | **Family / source** | **Adequate** | **Fairly adequate**  | **Inadequate** |
| Discussion/debates. |  |  |  |  |
| Cooperative teaching |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborative work |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-based learning (PBL) |  |  |  |  |
| Heuristic method / step by step problem solving |  |  |  |  |
| Case study |  |  |  |  |
| Brain storming |  |  |  |  |
| Role-playing games and simulations |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstration method |  |  |  |  |
| Inductive method |  |  |  |  |
| Deductive method |  |  |  |  |
| Analytical method |  |  |  |  |
| Synthetic method |  |  |  |  |
| Verbal or oral method / lecture |  |  |  |  |
| Written method / writing essays |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory method |  |  |  |  |
| Practical methods |  |  |  |  |
| Explanatory method |  |  |  |  |
| Activity-oriented teaching |  |  |  |  |
| Designing and presenting a project |  |  |  |  |
| E-learning |  |  |  |  |

3. Do you think the model of teaching used by the university develop the employability skills both practically and theoretically?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of pedagogy practice** | **Family / Source** | **SA** | **A** | **NT** | **D** | **SD** |
| Discussion/debates. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooperative teaching |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborative work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Problem-based learning (PBL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heuristic method / step by step problem solving |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Case study |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brain storming |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Role-playing games and simulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demonstration method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inductive method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deductive method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analytical method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Synthetic method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Verbal or oral method / lecture |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Written method / writing essays |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Laboratory method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Practical methods |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explanatory method |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity-oriented teaching |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Designing and presenting a project |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E-learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX III**

**INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR KEY INFORMANTS QUESTIONNAIRE**

The items in this interview guide will be used to collect data from Administrators and teachers

1. In your opinion, do you think that model of teaching are important for development of employability skills?

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. What would you have to say about the current state of the following model of teaching:

 i) Teaching \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 ii) Learning\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. What challenges are encountered by the University during the development of employability?

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. Do you think these challenges explain the fact that model of teaching by family affliation used are not consistent with the development of employability?

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

5. What do you think could be done to improve on the situation?

## **APPENDIX IV**

## **BUDGET ESTIMATES**

The expected expenditure for the study will be as follows

Stationery 400,000/=

Equipment (computer typing, flash disks, data processing) 500,000/=

Transport / travel expenses 300,000/=

Research Assistant 450,000/=

Photocpying, binding, printing 400,000/=

Miscelleneous 300,000/=

**Total 2,350,000/=**

## **APPENDIX V**

## **RESEARCH TIME FRAMEWORK**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Period** | **Research stage** | **Activity** |
| June 2015 – January 2016 | Development of the proposal | Research proposal |
| February 2016 - March 2016 | Research Pilot Study | Analysis of research pilot study results |
| April 2016 – July 2016 | Field Research | Collection of data and drafting |
| August 2016 – September 2016 | Reading more literature and data analysis | Data analysis and revising |
| October 2016 – November 2016 | Submission of the research report | Final revisionHanding over work to the Supervisor and relevant departments |
|  |  |  |