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Ensuring representation and involvement of learners on discussion method’s features towards ensuring effective teaching is the submission in this article. Thirty two (32) classroom teachers drawn from Junior and Senior Secondary Schools in sections of Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria, participated in the research. A ‘Use of Discussion Method by Classroom Teachers’ (UDMCT) formed the instrument. Three features of discussion method: questioning, listening, (and) responding, were the central elements of the instrument. A copy of the instrument was used to record the performance of each teacher that was observed. Data obtained were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and Chi-Square ($X^2$) statistics. Findings showed that features of discussion method were (i) identifiable with classroom teachers in Junior Secondary School (JSS) more than with classroom teachers in Senior Secondary School (SSS) (ii) were significantly not available in lesson notes/plans of teachers in both JSS and SSS (iii) were significantly available in JSS but not in SSS in practical presentation of objectives (iv) significantly not represented under methodology in lesson notes/plans of the classroom teachers in both types of secondary schools. (v) The classroom teachers did not significantly involve learners in discussion. Recommendations are made to reduce the inadequacies: classroom teachers should be representative enough in lesson preparations on paper and increase involvement of learners in discussion; teacher preparation should underscore efficiency in paper-work preparation and in-service programmes should stress required improvements.
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INTRODUCTION

Akande (2002) presented activity based methods, namely, research, project, experiment, discussion, demonstration, problem-solving, games and simulations, play-way, role playing, field – work, (and) assignment. The author commented that what makes each of the methods valuable is that learners are actively involved in lessons by learning through activity. Sadker and Sadker (1997) presented new directions for effective teaching in four constructs which were considered fundamental to new research on effective teaching, namely, multiple forms of knowledge, significance of deep rather than shallow teaching, importance of prior knowledge, and social nature of learning.

In explaining each of these constructs, one teaching method emerged as vital to effective teaching, namely, discussion. Only in multiple forms of knowledge is the method not pronounced because in it, content specific teaching skills peculiar to each subject area, are needed. But amount of content details are expected to be reduced to summary so that students may gain in-depth understanding, in deep rather than shallow teaching. Instead of lecturing to cover superficially a vast body of information, teachers need to organize their content around a limited set of key principles and powerful ideas and then engage students in discussing the concepts. The teacher should elicit prior knowledge of students through discussion and high cognitive levels questions. When prior knowledge is made explicit, teacher could
help students' link new information to the prior knowledge or guide them to confront and correct prior knowledge that is not accurate. On social nature of learning, the teacher should assume the position of a guide or facilitator that is skillful in conducting discussions, group work, debates, and dialogues. In this process, the teacher empowers students to talk with each other.

It is visible that discussion is pivotal in three out of the four constructs for new directions of effective teaching. In a later version of Sadker and Sadker (2005), there is a slight modification particularly affecting multiple forms of knowledge. Differentiation of instruction is stressed where teachers are asked to carefully consider each student's needs, learning style, life experiences, and readiness to learn. Nonetheless, the modification appears not to reduce the major role of discussion.

If a method is so pronounced, it implies that sufficient attention should be paid to it (Marland 2002; Alvey (Jr.) 2006; Bloom 2007). Two main ideas are relevant in the word ‘discussion’. One is to talk about something with another person or a group in order to exchange ideas or decide something. Two is to talk about or write about something in detail and consider different ideas or opinions on it (Woodford and Jackson (Eds.) 2003; Wehmeier (Ed.) 2006; and Summers (Ed.) 2007). Thus discussion is doing either thing or both things. Fundamentally, discussion goes on through three skills, namely, questioning, listening, (and) responding (Brookfield and Preskill 1999; Larson 1999; Biggs 2003; and Pollard et al., 2008; Arends 2009; Kauchak and Eggen 2011). These skills may be termed, the main features of discussion.

**Literature review**

Brookfield and Preskill (1999) published a volume on discussion as a way of teaching. The authors held that discussion is an indispensable aspect of democratic education. They presented fifteen benefits of the method as follows: (1) helping students to explore diverse perspectives (2) students’ awareness of and tolerance for ambiguity or complexity is increased (3) students receive assistance to recognize and investigate their assumptions (4) attentive, respectful listening is encouraged (5) new appreciation for continuing differences is developed (6) intellectual agility of students is increased (7) students become connected to a topic (8) respect for voices and experiences of students is shown (9) students learn the processes and habits of democratic discourse (10) students are affirmed as co-constructors (co-creators) of knowledge (11) capacity for clear communication of ideas and meaning is developed (12) habits of collaborative learning are developed (13) breadth of students is increased and it makes them empathic (14) skills of synthesis and integration are developed in students, and (15) discussion leads to transformation.

Brookfield and Prieskill (1999) have a key chapter (5) on keeping discussion going through questionning, listening, and responding. In chapter 6, the authors progressed on keeping discussion going through creative grouping. In the two chapters, there are references spanning 1984 and 1998 on the features in a broad form. A major issue raised was that discussion requires more time than methods such as lecture and expository. Another issue was that learning to question took the most practice and skill. It was obvious that empirical researches on the reports were not clear and limited and the last date 1998 is old enough for other researches especially empirical investigations. Brookfield and Prieskill (1999) observed that discussion can be done online. Benefits of online discussion include later response especially on controversial issues and reduced anxiety for introverts. However, teachers are required to encourage, guide, and facilitate online discussion as they do in face to face discussions.

Larson (1999) was an empirical article on influences on social studies teachers’ use of classroom discussion. Findings showed that teachers were aware that discussion requires learners’ involvement; learners were noted as powerful influence on teachers’ actions. Teacher educators should model how to lead discussion; that if teachers were to use discussion method, practice in leading discussion seemed important. Moreover, through classroom discussion, learners might learn to interact with others about issues of common interest. Larson (1999) also stated benefits of discussion which are covered by those of Brookfield and Prieskill (1999). Larson observed sadly however, that in spite of its numerous benefits, discussion did not frequently occur in classrooms. It is apparent that Larson (1999) did not dwell on features of discussion method; he or she rather suggested their development and institutionalization.

Situations observable from several other authors are not considerably at variance with those above. Sadker and Sadker (1997, 2005) are basic and pointed educators’ attention to the new directions on effective teaching; Akande (2002) included discussion among activity based methods of teaching which involve learners, and Imogie (2006)’s reference is similar. Kukuru (2006) was a theoretical article; it was informative and ended with suggestions for researches on discussion method. Shulman (2007) indirectly referred to discussion on an exposition that the image of teaching involves exchange of ideas (inter-action) between the teacher and learners through questions and probes, answers and reactions, and praise and criticism.

Pollard et al., (2008) included discussion as one of four types of class or individual dialogues. Discussion was perceived as exploratory talk where participants explore ideas and feelings together; it makes absolutely fundamental contribution to learning, and is relevant for learners of all ages. Studies on the specified features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, in a unit form, were nevertheless wanting. Arends (2009) has a chapter (12) on classroom
discussion. On a section on overview, the author presented questioning from teachers to learners, from learners to teachers, and from learners to learners. Beyond that section, the author stated that patterns of discussion were in three forms, namely, the teacher asking a question about the lesson; next, is response where learners raise their hands and reply; and finally teacher evaluates learners’ responses with praise and corrects their responses. With respect to conducting discussion, this author identified five points for whole class discussion, namely, clarify aims and establish set, focus the discussion, hold the discussion, end the discussion, (and) debrief the discussion. This author added that discussion can be done online with advantages similar to those of Brookfield and Prieskill (1999). Arends (2009) ended the chapter with a negative observation as did Larson (1999) that discussion was not really practiced in classrooms (Arends 2009: 446). It should be observed that Arends (2009) did not report critically on the features. Role of the teacher in discussion is what is rather pronounced in his or her presentation.

Kauchak and Eggen (2011), Chapter 13, is on instruction in today’s schools. The authors underscored involving of learners in lessons through questioning which they observed as the ‘most effective tool’ for teachers to involve and motivate learners. The authors stressed frequency, equitable distribution, wait time, and prompting with respect to questioning. It may be remarked that questioning is the key element in the three features as it alerts for listening, and listening for responding. Wiles and Bondi (2011) asserted that teachers should not base their practice on imparting information alone but must help learners learn how to learn. This assertion in a perspective implies assisting learners to be independent. Developing thinking skill through discussion is a good means to achieving that independence. Equally embedded in these authors’ assertion is the issue that imparting information had become a practice for teachers. This practice should be consciously discouraged because it only ensures shallow teaching and dwarfs thinking skill of learners.

It may be noted that occurrences on the features of discussion method would roughly be balanced in a situation, if well perceived. A question would send cognitive signal to learners to listening and thinking, and listening and thinking would elicit responding; the same features should be perceivable even outside classroom. Thus the observation of Brookfield and Preskill (1999) that learning to question took the most practice and skill, suggests bias and imbalance on investigations with respect to features of discussion method. In another perspective however, the bias might have been due to the key role of questioning just highlighted such that it meant discriminately concentrating on the most significant feature. Notwithstanding, there is need for balance by researching into the other features and especially combined investigations of all the main features in single researches.

Statement of the problem
On the whole, the fore-going literature review portrays discussion method as vital to effective teaching. However, although educators admit it, two points are evident. One is that discussion occurs infrequently in classrooms. Two is that empirical researches on the method’s features, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, particularly in single researches are limited. These situations are not peculiar to a local societal environment but universal. This author’s awareness of the inadequacies prompted the title of this research, namely, ensuring representation and involvement of learners on discussion method’s features towards ensuring effective teaching.

Purpose of research
The purpose of this research was to:
1. Determine extent to which features of discussion method namely, questioning, listening, and responding, could be identified in classrooms of teachers.
2. Ascertain degree to which features of discussion method namely, questioning, listening and responding, are available in lesson notes/plans of classroom teachers.
3. Ascertain expand to which features of discussion method namely, questioning, listening, and responding, would be available in practical presentation of objectives in lessons by classroom teachers.
4. Identify magnitude to which features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, would be represented, under methodology, in lesson notes/plans of the classroom teachers.
5. Verify magnitude to which classroom teachers involve learners in discussion through its features.

Research questions
The following questions guided this research:
1. To what extent would features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, be identified in classrooms of teachers?
2. To what degree would features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, be available in lesson notes/plans of classroom teachers?
3. What is the expanse to which features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, would be available in practical presentation of objectives in lessons by classroom teachers?
4. What is the magnitude to which features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, would be represented, under methodology, in lesson notes/plans of classroom teachers?
5. To what magnitude would classroom teachers involve learners in discussion through its features?

Research Hypotheses
The following hypotheses were generated for this research:
1. There will be no significant difference between performances of classroom teachers that would be
positive in relation to identification of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative, in relation to identification of same features of discussion method, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools.

2. There will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to availability of features of discussion method namely, questioning, listening, and responding and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative in relation to availability of same features, in lesson notes/plans in junior as well as in senior secondary schools.

3. There will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to availability of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding in practical presentation of objectives in lessons and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative in relation to availability of same features of discussion method, on same presentation, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools.

4. There will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to representation of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative, in relation to representation of same features of discussion method under methodology, in lesson notes/plans, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools.

5. There will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to involvement of learners in discussion method and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative, in the same relation, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools.

**Significance of the study**

The literature review above established that empirical researches on the main features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, particularly in single researches are limited. This research would reduce the dearth by providing some needed empirical information on the method’s features. Consequently, classroom teachers, curriculum researchers, and other educators would find this research of utility to them in their quest for contributions toward societal advancement.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This was an observational research where teachers were observed in real classrooms as they interacted with learners. All secondary school teachers both junior and senior, in west, central, and southern sections of Akure, capital of Ondo State of Nigeria, formed the population of this research. Thirty two (32) teachers (sixteen teachers each for the junior secondary school and the senior secondary school) were selected using non-probability quota sampling technique (Bandele 2004) from the identified population, participated in the research. Teachers in the junior secondary school taught Social Studies, Christian Religious Knowledge (CRK), English Language, and Mathematics while teachers in the senior secondary school taught Economics, Government, Geography, and Accounts/Commerce. Each teacher taught one subject only, which was or related to his/her area of specialization. A ‘Use of Discussion Method by Classroom Teachers’ (UDMCT), developed by the researcher, was the major instrument employed for this research. Its structure was informed by Brookfield and Preskill (1999), Larson (1999), Biggs (2003), Pollard et al., (2008), Arends (2009), and Kauchak and Eggen (2011). Main features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, (and) responding, were the factors on which the instrument rested. Supportive information required were: name of school, lesson note/plan whether available or not, subject taught by teacher, topic taught by teacher, and class taught by teacher. Copies of the instrument were produced, enough for the required sample of 32 teachers. As each teacher was observed, a copy of the instrument was used to record his/her performance in class. All observations were conducted by the researcher for the purpose of uniformity in recording. Validity of the instrument was ensured by concurrent validity procedure. The ‘Use of Discussion Method by Classroom Teachers’ (UDMCT) developed by the researcher, was used by 20 Principals to assess two teachers each from their various secondary schools. The original instrument from which the UDMCT was adapted was simultaneously used by the same Principals to assess the same teachers. The scores of the two instruments that were administered by the 20 Principals were subjected to correlation analysis, which yielded a value of 0.81. This result shows that both instruments are measuring similar traits. A test-retest method of estimating reliability coefficient was employed by engaging 20 Principals to use the adapted instrument: UDMCT to assess two teachers each from their various secondary schools. Two weeks later, the same Principals administered the instrument to the same teachers. The assessment scores of the 20 Principals at the two different ratings of the 40 teachers were subjected to Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis. The obtained ‘r’ (correlation) value was 0.79. This result indicates that the instrument is reliable. Obtained data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) statistics because the nature of the data collected did not suggest more sophisticated analysis or further probing.

**RESULTS**

Results obtained from analysis of data collected now
follow on tables.

In table I, ‘A’ implies the summary result for identification of discussion method through its features. Thus out of the 16 teachers in the junior secondary school (JSS), 15 had positive while 1 (one) had negative. The result shows that features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, could be identified from 15 out of the 16 teachers. In senior secondary school (SSS), 9 out of the 16 teachers had positive while 7 had negative results. ‘B’ implies the summary for availability of the features of discussion method in lesson notes/plans of the teachers. In JSS, availability was 2 as against 14 for non-availability. In SSS, the figures are the same as those in JSS. ‘BII’ connotes availability of the features in practical presentation of objectives. In JSS, the ratios are 13 to 3 for availability and non-availability respectively. In SSS, the ratios are 5 to 11 for similar comparisons.

In table II, ‘A’ represents summary on degree of representation of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding by teachers under methodology in their lesson notes or plans. In JSS, 3 out of the 16 teachers represented the features whereas 13 did not. In SSS, 2 teachers represented while 14 did not represent. ‘B’ represents degree of involvement of learners in discussion method in classes or lessons. In JSS, 5 teachers involved their learners while 11 teachers did not. In SSS, 1 (one) teacher only, involved learners in discussion method. Chi-Square ($X^2$) comparisons of the summary results on tables I and II above are presented on Tables III and IV below.

In tables IIIa, IIIb, IIIc, the three in two sections on Table I above are presented in Chi-Square comparisons. The title of each table is obvious as well as result of each comparison. The results of the comparisons would be employed to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3.

In tables IVa and IVb, the two sections on Table II above (summary in A, B) are presented in Chi-Square comparisons. The title of each table is obvious as well as result on each comparison. The results of the comparisons would be utilized in testing hypotheses 4 and 5.

Testing hypotheses
The hypotheses generated for this research may now be tested.

Hypothesis 1
The hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive, in relation to identification of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative on identification of same features of discussion method, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools. At the junior secondary school level, this hypothesis is rejected: there is a significant difference in favour of class teachers with positive performances in relation to identification of features of discussion method: $X^2 = 77.440$ at .000 levels of significance. At the senior secondary school level, the hypothesis is accepted: there is no significant difference between the teachers with positive performances and teachers with negative performances: $X^2 = 1.440$ where critical value is 3.841.

Hypothesis 2
This hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to availability of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding in lesson notes/plans and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative, in relation to availability of same features in lesson notes/plans, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools. This hypothesis is rejected at both junior and senior secondary schools levels. At the junior secondary school level, the $X^2$ value is 54.760 at .000 levels of significance. At the senior secondary school level, same indices are incidentally observable: $X^2$ value is 54.760 at .000 levels of significance.

Hypothesis 3
It states that there will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to availability of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding in practical presentation of objectives (in lessons) and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative in relation to availability of same features of discussion method, on same presentation, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools. At the junior secondary school level, this hypothesis is rejected: there is a significant difference in favour of class teachers with positive results: $X^2 = 38.440$ at .000 levels of significance. At the senior secondary school level, the hypothesis is also rejected: there is significant difference against classroom teachers with positive performances: $X^2 = 14.440$ at .000 levels of significance.

Hypothesis 4
The hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to representation of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative, in relation to same representation of features in discussion method, under methodology, in lesson notes/plans, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools. This hypothesis is rejected at both junior and senior secondary schools levels. At the earlier level, $X^2 = 38.440$ at .000 levels of significance. At the latter level, $X^2 = 54.760$ at .000 levels of significance.
### Table I: Identification as well as availability of discussion method’s features from classroom teachers in Secondary Schools: JSS & SSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Name of School/Indiv- dual Name of School</th>
<th>Identification of Discussion method through features</th>
<th>Degree of Availability of Features</th>
<th>Identification of Discussion method through features</th>
<th>Degree of Availability of Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning, Listening, Responding</td>
<td>In lesson Note/Plan</td>
<td>Practical Presentation of Objectives</td>
<td>Individual Name of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGS JSS</td>
<td>All identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None identifiable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAC JSS</td>
<td>All identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAS JSS</td>
<td>All identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHS JSS</td>
<td>All identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None identifiable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quite obvious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fairly obvious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>0/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>0/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- PTE means Positive
- NTE means Negative

**Note:**

OGS: Oyemekun Grammar School, Akure Junior and Senior = two (2) schools.
UCAC: United C.A.C Grammar School, Aule Road, Akure: Junior and Senior = two (2) schools
STAS: St. Thomas Anglican Comprehensive High School, off Oke Aro, Akure: Junior and Senior = two (2) schools
ACHS: Alakure Comprehensive High School, Ijoka, Road, Akure: Junior and Senior = two schools

Total Number of Schools= Eight (8)

**Hypothesis 5**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference between the performances of classroom teachers that would be positive in relation to involvement of learners in discussion method and performances of classroom teachers that would be negative, in same relation, in junior as well as in senior secondary schools. This hypothesis is rejected at both school levels: $X^2$ value for junior schools is 14.440 at .000 levels of significance while $X^2$ value for senior schools is 77.440 at .000 levels of significance.

**DISCUSSION**

Comparison of summary result under hypothesis 1 shows that there is a significant difference in favour of classroom teachers with positive performances in relation to identification of features of discussion method at the junior secondary school level but no significant difference at the senior secondary school level. It implies that classroom teachers in the junior secondary school involved discussion method more than classroom teachers in the senior...
Table II: Degree of representation of features of discussion method under methodology and degree of involvement of learners in discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Name of School</th>
<th>Individual Name of School</th>
<th>Degree of Representation of Features under Methodology</th>
<th>Degree of Involvement of Learners in Discussion</th>
<th>Individual Name of School</th>
<th>Degree of Representation of Features under Methodology</th>
<th>Degree of Involvement of Learners in Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td>Not well</td>
<td>Very Actively</td>
<td>Moderately Actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGS</td>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAC</td>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAS</td>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHS</td>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>13/16</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>3/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

A  B

3  :  13 PTE  :  NTE
5  :  11 PTE  :  NTE

Note: PTE means Positive
NTE means Negative

Abbreviations for dual names of secondary schools that participated

OGS means Oyemekun Grammar School, Akure Junior and Senior = two (2) schools.
UCAC means United C.A.C Grammar School, Aule Road, Akure: Junior and Senior = two (2) schools
STAS means St. Thomas Anglican Comp. High School, off Oke Aro, Akure: Jnr and Snr schls
ACHS means Alakure Comp. High school, Ijoka, Road, Akure: Jnr and Snr = two schools
Total Number of Schools= Eight (8)

secondary school. It should be noted, however, that this is the least qualitative concern, which is a peripheral identification of features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding. Findings in the subsequent comparisons would give more qualitative and critical picture.

Under the second comparison, the hypothesis is rejected at both secondary school levels. The implication is that classroom teachers in this sample generally, significantly did not represent features of discussion method, namely, questioning, listening, and responding, in their lesson notes/plans. Incidentally, the result is the same for both types of secondary school levels. Four (4) classroom teachers only, represented the features in both types of secondary schools while twenty-eight (28) classroom teachers did not represent the features. A finding, following the result of the first comparison is that, the classroom teachers were less effective in representing features of discussion method on paper than verbalizing them practically. This situation suggests in a perspective, that the
Table III: Chi-Square ($X^2$) Comparisons of summary results on Table 1: Totals of positive performances compared to totals of negative performances of the classroom teachers in Secondary Schools: JSS & SSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Teachers with positive performances</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Teachers with Negative performances</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Chi-Square ($X^2$)</th>
<th>Comparison of Positive and Negative Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Table value</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSS (i)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77.440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant (ST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS (i)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>Not Significant (NST)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IIa: Identification of discussion method through its features: questioning, listening, and responding at JSS and SSS levels

| JSS (i) | 15 | 93.75 | 1 | 6 | 77.440 | 1 | 3.841 | .000 | Significant (ST) |
| SSS (i) | 9  | 56    | 7 | 44| 1.440  | 1 | 3.841 | .230 | Not Significant (NST) |

professional backgrounds of teachers in this sample appeared weak in paper–work preparation. Following the observation of Larson (1999) and Arends (2009) that discussion did not frequently occur in classrooms, it seems not to be a surprise since it is what someone is used to doing that he/she would do. Another support to this situation is that of Kane (2002) which stated that pre-service teacher education programmes tended to reinforce a model of teaching as telling and Wiles and Bondi (2011) observed that imparting information had been a practice of teachers. A model of teaching as telling can hardly go beyond writing-board and talk method which is lecture or expository; the perspective is virtually agreed to by Bloom (2007). Moreover, understanding, which is one of the most cherished goals of teaching (Biggs 2003; Perkins 2007), would be wanting in such a model.

In the third comparison, there is a significant difference in favour of classroom teachers with positive results in relation to availability of features of discussion method in practical presentation of objectives in the junior secondary schools. It portrays that the classroom teachers that represented questioning, listening, and responding, in real presentation of objectives were significantly more than classroom teachers that did not represent the features practically. This finding partly supports the comment in the last paragraph that the classroom teachers in this sample were less competent on paper work; they performed better in real lesson presentations. In the senior secondary schools, reverse is the situation. Classroom teachers that did not represent features of discussion method in real lesson presentations were significantly more than classroom teachers that did represent the features. There seems to be an order from the second findings situation to that of third situation: there is a decrease in discussion in the third situation, that is, classroom teachers in SSS were less willing to use discussion in practical presentation of objectives than classroom teachers in JSS. Perhaps, such classroom teachers felt that more advanced learners require less discussion than less advanced learners. While that view may hold sway for some people, it seems that all secondary school learners (including SSS) require discussion. In a sense, SSS learners should be better developed intellectually hence they should employ discussion to tap its numerous benefits (Brookfield and Preskill 1999; Larson 1999; Sadker and Sadker 2005; Pollard et al., 2008; Arends 2009; Kauchak and Eggen 2011).

Significant differences are observable in the fourth comparison at both school levels. It implies that the classroom teachers in both JSS and SSS significantly did not represent features of discussion method, under methodology (lesson procedure, lesson presentation: pedagogical cycle on paper) in their lesson notes/plans. This result further supports the comment made under comparisons two and three above that the classroom teachers in this sample performed less effectively on
Table IV: Chi- Square ($\chi^2$) Comparisons of summary results on Table II above: Totals of positive performances compared to totals of negative performances of the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Teachers with positive performances</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Teachers with negative performances</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) Comparison between Positive and Negative</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
<th>Significance Level obtained</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSS (i)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS (i)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54.760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IVa: Degree of representation of features of discussion method under methodology in lesson notes/plans by class teachers at JSS and SSS levels

| JSS (ii)       | 5                                   | 31          | 11                                  | 68.75       | 2.250                                                         | 1               | 3.841       | .134                       | Not Significant |
| SSS (ii)       | 1                                   | 6           | 15                                  | 94          | 77.440                                                        | 1               | 3.841       | .000                       | ST     |

Table IVb: Degree of involvement of learners in discussion method by class teachers at JSS and SSS levels: JSS & SSS

Paper work compared to practical teaching in classrooms. It may be noted that an order of development is movement from theory to practice (Akande 2002; Tanner and Tanner 2007; Wiles and Bondi 2011). Thus it is an inadequate foundation if a teacher training programme is weak in paper- work preparation. Besides the need for paper-work to serve as evidence of competence on the part of the teacher, Igwe (2003) observed that a well documented preparation makes it easy for one teacher to stand in for another in case of an unavoidable circumstance and Biggs (2003) noted that such a preparation is needed to avoid derailing in a curriculum based system.

Significant levels exceeding probability of one thousand (.000) are observable at both secondary school levels (JSS, SSS) in the final comparison. It connotes that a significantly greater number of the classroom teachers in the secondary schools did not involve learners in discussion. Table IV above shows that only 6 (six) classroom teachers involved learners in discussion whereas 26 (twenty six) classroom teachers did not. Furthermore, Tables II and V, (above and below respectively) show that two classroom teachers only, actively involved learners in discussion. This finding agrees with that of Larson (1999) and Arends (2009) that discussion did not frequently occur in classrooms during lesson presentations. It also seems to confirm the observation of Kane (2002) that pre-service teacher education programmes tended to re-enforce a model of teaching as telling and in a related observation by Wiles and Bondi (2011) that imparting information had been a tradition of teachers. Yet several educators including Akande (2002), Sadker and Sadker (2005), Shulman (2007), Perkins (2007), Pollard (2008), and Kauchak and Eggen (2011) stressed that teaching involves exchange of ideas.

CONCLUSION

Two main points are obvious from this discussion:

One is that the classroom teachers in this sample were not quite effective in representing what they were presenting in real lessons, on paper: in lesson notes/plans. Second is that learners were significantly not involved in discussion by the classroom teachers.

Recommendations

Following are major recommendations that are meant to help reduce the inadequacies identified from the findings:

1. Classroom teachers should be made to be representative enough in their lesson preparations on paper. Summary characteristics of issues on objectives to be presented, major questions and answers, teaching media and how they should be used, are better stated on paper. Indeed, the work would be scientific (objective) and would give both classroom teacher and supervisor of any type or researcher, evidence of competence. Teacher training/preparation programmes in the faculties and colleges of education need to underscore efficiency in paper work preparation for trainees more than before, following the results of this research.

2. Extent of representation and involvement of learners on discussion method’s features should be increased in view of the ascribed role of discussion method in the new directions for effective teaching with respect to significance of deep rather than shallow teaching, importance of prior knowledge, and social nature of
learning; it will still play considerable role in multiple forms of knowledge especially in social science disciplines where reflection/critical scrutiny of issues is a focus.

3. In-service training programmes in form of short-term courses, conferences, seminars, and workshops, could be organized for service teachers, to fill current vacuum in good paper – work preparation.

4. This research may be replicated in other populations of Ondo state, Nigeria, and beyond for comparative data generation and provision of additional empirical findings on representation and involvement of learners on discussion method’s features by classroom teachers.
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