

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology  
of Egypt / Egyptology

**STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE ABOUT LECTURE-BASED AND SEMINAR  
METHODS OF TEACHING: A CASE STUDY OF M.A. STUDENTS IN  
JORDAN**

*Mohammed M. Obeidat*

Faculty of Educational Sciences, the Hashemite University, P.O. Box 330127, Zarqa 13133,  
Jordan

*Arqam M. Mohideen*

Amman the First Directorate of Education, the Ministry of Education, Jordan

Correspondent: Mohammed M. Obeidat, Faculty of Educational Sciences, the Hashemite  
University

E-mail: [moh.obai29@yahoo.com](mailto:moh.obai29@yahoo.com)

**Mohammed M. Obeidat & Arqam M. Mohideen-Students' Perspective about Lecture-  
Based and Seminar Methods of Teaching: A Case study of M.A. Students in Jordan—  
PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(8), 100-120. ISSN 1567-214x**

**Key Words: M. A. Students, Perspective, Seminar, Lecture, Jordan**

**ABSTRACT**

This study aimed at investigating M.A. students' perspective about lecture and seminar methods of teaching applied with them interchangeably during their study at two Jordanian universities. The researchers used a closed-item questionnaire and an open-ended question in order to achieve the aim of the study. They also used three independent variables so as to detect if there were any statistical significant differences between students' responses to each teaching method and to both together. These variables are: gender, study-field, and university. The results obtained from this study showed that the lecture method helped students to develop their oral skills, enabled them to understand large amounts of information, and allowed them to follow the topics during class times. The results also showed that over half of the students preferred this method of teaching for different reasons. In addition, the results revealed that the seminar method encouraged students to participate, to engage in class activity, to discuss topics, and to defend ideas. Finally, the results indicated that there were significant differences in students' responses

to both seminar and lecture methods of teaching in favor of females, and in favor of Hashemite University students regarding seminar method of teaching.

## INTRODUCTION

The teacher-centered and student-centered approaches to teaching are the main approaches which are commonly used in the classroom. The former approach is normally described as traditional; whereas the latter is characterized as contemporary. Many methods of teaching, such as lecture-based and seminar methods of teaching, are branched out from these approaches. According to the lecture method, the classroom activity is normally governed by the teacher and the students have no active role but merely listen and prescribe notes after the teacher. The students have been described by educationists as passive recipients in the class activity (British Council BBC, 2020 & IGI Global, 2020).

Contrary to the educational orientation of the teacher-centered approach represented by lecture method of teaching, the student-centered approach, exemplified by many contemporary methods of teaching, has come to the scene in different teaching-learning contexts. This approach to teaching takes students' culture and their learning styles, interests and goals into consideration (Fulton, 2018, Fulton, 2019, & McMillan, 2020 ). One of the methods of teaching which attempts to take these elements into account is seminars, which mainly aims at activating students' roles and giving them the chance to interact and exchange ideas more effectively. In general, the pedagogical orientations of the two approaches stated above have influenced the way lecture and seminar methods are defined and the way the teacher and students are looked at in the teaching-learning context.

### *Lecture-based method*

From the term "lecture", one may recognize the way this method of teaching addresses matters in the classroom. This term is often defined as a verbal display of information related to a specific topic in the subject scheduled for teaching. The lecturer usually stands at the front of the room and delivers these information orally. Despite the criticisms made of lecture method of teaching, university instructors are still using this method in their courses (Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia (2020)).

A lecture is regarded to be the oldest teaching method applied in higher education institutions. It uses the lockstep technique which makes instruction a one-way channel of communication of information. Students have no role but just

listening, jotting down notes, and combining information and organizing it. There are two main problems in using this method of teaching, which are: the difficulty of grasping the attention of students in classroom and the lack of their ability to follow the theme. In spite of these problems, literature identified six main advantages for using this method of teaching: (1) It gives the teacher the chance to cover a large amount of topics in a single class period; (2) it excludes the use of any equipment or lab; (3) it does not necessitate using learning material, (4) it develops student listening skills; (5) it allows the teacher to arrange the material logically to present it orally; and (6) it helps to learn languages. On the other hand, literature highlighted five main disadvantages for applying this teaching method. They are: not recognizing the individual differences between students, causing students to just listen to the teacher rather than to actively participate in the classroom, using language which is above the standard of the students, making students forget the lecture easily, and not catering for students' attention since attention level is not the same while student listening the lecture (Study Lecture Notes, 2020).

Many experts insist on the completion of lecture method of teaching, and so they used blended teaching methods, which are actually a combination of two or more methods (Sadeghi, Sedaghat, & Ahmadi, 2014). Such a combination of methods gives the teacher the chance to vary his or her methods of teaching in the classroom. However, there are five main styles of teaching used in the classroom. Some teachers use only one style and some use two or more styles. These styles are: The authority style which requires students to take notes and recite them later for examination; the demonstrator style through which information are presented by means of multimedia, activities, and other contemporary instructional techniques; the facilitator style which fosters independent learning and critical thinking skills; the delegator style, which requires peer feedback, debate and creative writing; and the hybrid style which attempts to blend the teacher's interest with students' needs (Gill, 2020).

Many studies were carried out on the effectiveness of using lecture-based method of teaching in the classroom. Some of these studies compared the effectiveness of this method with that of other methods and techniques of teaching and some focused only on it. With regard to comparison, Carpenter (2006) investigated the impact of using lecture, lecture/discussion, case study, team project, and Jigsaw. The researcher found that the lecture/discussion combination method of teaching the most valuable to students. The researcher also found that lecture and Jigsaw methods of teaching were regarded to be the next most valuable, followed by the case study and team project methods. Struyven, Dochy and Janssen (2008) explored 178 students' likes and dislikes of lecture-based teaching and student-activating teaching. The researchers found that the students perceived lecture-based teaching positively and without variation and saw student-activating teaching differently. The researchers also found that students' likes and dislikes in teaching influenced their perception of the learning environment and their performance in general. Nakada (2017) compared the impact of a traditional-

based lecture course with that of a redesigned one, which used games, on students' achievement and views. The researcher found that the achievement levels of students in the redesigned course were not improved and their views did not lessen their dissatisfaction of lecture-based methods in general.

As for the studies which focused only on the effectiveness of using lecture method of teaching, Ohazali, Ishak, Saat, Arifin, Hamid, Rosli, Mohammed, and Kamarulzamar (2011) investigated undergraduate and postgraduate students' perception of the effectiveness of lecture delivery performed by University Kebang Saam Malaysia lecturers. The quantitative analysis of questionnaire results indicated a positive correlation between lecture delivery, characteristics of a lecturer, and students' attitude or satisfaction. However, they indicated no correlation between lecture delivery and GPA. In addition, the results revealed that 89% of the postgraduates considered lecture delivery effective; whereas, only 58% of the undergraduates regarded lecture delivery effective. Menah and Charles (2016) Explored 652 students' attitudes and perceptions of their lectures at a university in Ghana. Results of this study showed that the participants evaluated lectures as strong in areas that require knowledge of subject, use of good examples, and interest in students but weak in teaching techniques, providing learning activities, providing efficient feedback, activities allowing students to express their minds freely, and sharing personal experiences with colleagues. They also showed that the participants had positive attitudes towards lectures in general.

### *Seminar method*

a Seminar is a form of teaching which aims at bringing together small groups of people to discuss a specific topic each time. At North Indian universities, the term "seminar" refers to the intensive study of a subject area. Seminars often have fewer students for each professor than normal courses, and are commonly more specific in topics for discussion (Olivia, 2011 & Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia, 2020; Abbas et al., 2020).

The historian Charles Kendall Adams was the first educator who introduced the European seminar method to U.S. universities and Henry Adams was the first to employ this method in the American teaching history (Encyclopaedia Britannica's Editors, 2020). Despite the long record of its use in the American teaching-learning context, seminar is regarded to be the most modern method used in higher education. As a method of teaching, seminar is defined as a form of class organization that employs a scientific approach for analyzing a particular problem chosen for discussion. It normally consists of ten to fifteen informal groups who are expected to do considerable library search prior to the seminar. The aim is to give them the chance to enhance self-learning and promotes independent thinking (Jaikumar, 2013; Abbasi et al., 2020; Ahmad et al., 2018).

The seminar method of teaching has two main objectives. Some of these objectives are cognitive and some are affective. As for the cognitive objectives,

this method aims at developing students' ability of precise observation, developing their ability of researching clarifications, and improving their skill of defending ideas effectively. With regard to the affective objectives, it aims at developing students' tolerance to opposite ideas, developing their spirit of cooperation, and gaining the good manners of raising and answering questions effectively (Al-Kumaim et al., 2021; Arshad et al., 2020; Ashraf et al., 2020; Balakrishnan et al., 2019).

Seminars have been classified into four types. They are: (1) mini seminars, (2) major seminars, (3) national seminars, and (4) international seminars. Mini seminars are the most commonly used ones in higher education. They usually require a small population to hold them and the discussion is often held over the topic taught or to be taught with the students. They have many advantages, which are: giving good motivation and learning experience, helping to evaluate learners' learning ability, regulating the creation and organization of facts and information, developing the ability of self-reliance, and engraving the responsibility and cooperative nature (Lecture Notes on Teaching of Science, 2009). As for their disadvantages, mini seminars cause some learners to get left behind in the process and do not provide them with complete knowledge. The individual feels that he needs other sources of knowledge (Wiki User, 2014 & Techievp, 2018; Jabarullah et al., 2019).

One of the styles of teaching used with higher education students is "Socratic seminars", which is regarded as an alternative to the traditional style of teaching. With this style of teaching, the teacher presents the class with a text to discuss among themselves. He or she acts as a facilitator of learning rather than a spoon feeder of information. The aim is to give students the chance to learn from each other and to feel more empowered in the classroom. There are many benefits for using socratic seminars in general. They bring new attitudes and expertise into the classroom; they help students examine their own perspectives and build a deeper understanding of the text itself; they empower them to learn how to learn, and they forces them to participate and stay engaged (Socratic Seminar, 2017; Khan et al., 2019).

The impact of seminar method of teaching on students' learning has been explored by many researchers. Some of the studies executed by them are quantitative, some are qualitative, and some use both quantitative and qualitative. For example, In a quantitative study done by Ruchi, Pradeep, MR., and Ramji (2012) on students' perception about various aspects of seminar, results showed that 94% of the students perceived seminar to be informative and 88% of them viewed the preparation time, which is more than two days, adequate. Results also showed that 93% of them saw support was provided by classmates in the seminar and 89% considered it be a good source of extra knowledge. Finally, the results revealed that 62 of the students were in favor of its implication in the university system and 88% were in favor of the idea that it reduces their hesitation to public speaking. Spruijt, Leppink, Wlofhagen, Scherpier, Beukelen, and Jaarsma (2014)

investigated the way in which students perceived teaching performance in seminars. Findings of the Utrecht seminar Evaluation questionnaire revealed that group interaction and seminar content had in general positive effects on the perceived teaching performance scores, whereas students' preparation and group size had negative effects on these scores. Palappallil, Sushama, and Ramnath (2016) explored 120 university students' perception about traditional and modified seminars. The results of the study showed that the modified seminars were more interesting and more enthusiastic when compared to the traditional ones. They also showed that they increased peer coordination and group dynamics.

In a study conducted by Spruijet, Wolfhagen, Bok, Schuurmans, Scherpbier, Beukelen, and Jaarsma (2013) on the views of 24 student teachers regarding the aspects which affect seminar learning, results revealed that there were seven main aspects influenced seminar learning in the view of participants. They are: The teacher's role, students' participation, students' preparation, facilities, seminar goals and content, and course coherence. Al'Adawi (2017) investigated 40 second-year male and female students' perception of the value of implementing seminars as a teaching method in a children literature course in a college of applied sciences in Oman. The data were collected through observation and questionnaire. The results of qualitative and quantitative analysis indicated that the seminars allotted to participants enriched classroom learning and enhanced students' responsibility for their own learning.

The literature above indicates that the use of lecture and seminar methods of teaching in the classroom has merits and demerits. This indicates that both methods are important in higher education. Despite that, the majority of studies done in this area showed that the seminar method was more effective in activating students' thinking, in enriching their knowledge, and in developing their discussion skills. A few of these studies were conducted in Jordan in this respect, particularly at the postgraduate level. As a result, this study explores M.A. students' perspective about the two methods of teaching, which are commonly used with them interchangeably in the classroom.

### *Aims and questions of the study*

This study aims is to investigate M.A. students' perspective about the seminar and lectures-based methods of teaching used with them interchaneably during their study at two Jordanian universities. It also aim is to investigate the method of teaching the students prefer and the reason(s) for their preference to this method. More specifically, the study attempts to answer 4 research questions:

1. How do M.A. students view lecture-based and seminar methods of teaching regarding the features of each method and its impact on the learning process?

2. Are there any statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha= 0.05$ ) between the means of students' perspectives due to gender (male and female)?

3. Are there any statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha= 0.05$ ) between the means of students' perspectives due to study-field (curricula and instruction and psychology)?
4. Are there any statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha= 0.05$ ) between the means of students' perspectives due to university (Hashemite University and Al-Albyt University)?

## **METHOD**

### ***Study design***

A quasi-experimental design was used in the present study. That is, this study is quantitative, qualitative as well as inferential. A survey questionnaire was developed to collect the required data from the students. These students were chosen randomly from two departments: Department of Curricula and Instruction and Department of Psychology.

### ***Participants of the study***

The study participants (N=40 ) consisted of M.A. students in their second and third years of study at the university. 43% of them were males (N=17), whereas 58% were females (N=23). They were 21 curricula and instruction students and 19 psychology ones. 20 of them were chosen from Hashemite University and 20 from Al-Albyt University.

### ***Data collection and instrument***

The target data were distributed and collected through students' emails. In order to ensure the validity of the instrument, it was handed to two professors in the faculty of Educational sciences in my university. Some items were reformulated and some were deleted by them because they were repetitive. The most important recommendation suggested by them is not to mix seminar with lecture items together. The purpose is for the students to focus only on one method of teaching at a time. Then, the questionnaire was translated into Arabic since the majority of participants are not competent in the English language. The translated copy was offered to a specialist in Arabic and corrected it linguistically.

In order to guarantee the reliability of the questionnaire, it was distributed to seven M.A. students available in the faculty and who were not involved in the study. 3 weeks later, the questionnaire was handed out again to them. As soon as the copies of the questionnaire were received, the data were transcribed for statistical analysis and then the correlation coefficient was calculated. it was found to be 0.87. In addition, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient test was done for the items of the questionnaire. Results showed that the alpha value was found to be 0.84. In terms of the questionnaire interview, the main recommendation suggested by the professors was to ask only one question, which requires yes or no answer and why.

### *Data analysis*

Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed in the present. The data obtained from the closed items in the questionnaire were analyzed by using descriptive statistics (i.e., frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations). They were also analyzed by using the t-test. The means and standard deviations were used to show the extent to which the students were satisfied with the aspects related to each method of teaching. The T-test was used to disclose the statistical significance of the observed differences between males and females, curricula and instruction and psychology specialists, and between students according to university. With regard to students' responses to the open-ended question, they were analyzed by categorizing the raw data and labeling them according to the students' preference of the teaching method and to the reason(s) behind which they preferred this method.

## RESULTS

### *Results related to the first research question*

Results of the first question about students' perspective of lecture-based and seminar methods of teaching were divided into two sub-results: results associated with lecture-based method and results relevant to seminar method. The means of students' responses to the aspects of each method were arranged decreasingly in order to show which aspect the students see it more positively than the other (see table 1a and table 1b). Furthermore, each set of quantitative results were supported by a qualitative one, which is represented by students' preference of a teaching method and the reasons behind which this method is chosen or prioritized.

**Table 1a. The mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) of students' responses to the aspects of lecture-based method**

Rank	Item	M	SD
1	Lectures help me develop my listening skills well.	3.50	1.408
2	Lectures do not give me the chance to discuss the material with my classmates freely.	3.33	1.516
3	Lectures enable me to understand large amounts of information since my role is just listening and absorbing.	3.30	1.393
3	Lectures enable me to follow the topics given by the lecturer during class times.	3.30	1.236
5	Lectures give me good opportunity to express my	3.17	1.487

---

	mind regarding the ideas presented by the instructor.		
6	Lectures help me benefit from the multimedia, activities and presentations demonstrated during sessions.	3.13	1.502
7	Lectures encourage me to participate actively in the classroom.	3.03	1.450
8	Lectures help me share personal experiences with colleagues.	2.97	1.245
9	Lectures give me the chance to get good examples from the instructor.	2.93	1.552
10	Lectures often include discussions and team project methods which make them more valuable to me.	2.90	1.470
10	Lectures do not cause forgetting information easily because they are conveyed by the instructor.	2.90	1.398
12	Lectures often integrate the instructor's interest with students' needs.	2.87	1.332
13	Lectures help me provide feedback to my instructor and/or colleagues.	2.80	1.375
14	Lectures help me to be selective in my focus on the topics presented by the instructor.	2.73	1.363
15	Lecture delivery methods normally affect my Grade Point Average.	2.67	1.322

---

Results in the table above show that the aspect the students perceived it the most satisfactory in the lecture method ( $M=3.5$ ) is associated with its help in the development of listening skills. This aspect is followed by the lack of chance this method gave to students to discuss the material freely ( $M=3.3$ ) and the opportunity which enabled them to understand large amounts of information ( $M=3.3$ ) and to follow the topics during class times ( $M=3.3$ ). On the other hand, the impact of lecture delivery on students' Grade Point Average ranked last with a mean ( $M=2.7$ ).

As for students' views, results reveal that 22 students (60%) preferred lecture-based method of teaching. 13 of them stated that lectures are more relaxing than seminars because they are given by the professor rather than by students: see the examples below.

I think the lecture method is better because it is easier. I am not asked to prepare and give a lecture to students.

I prefer lectures because my role is just jotting down important notes emphasized by the lecturer.

I prefer lecture method because they not heavy burden to me.

I prefer the lecture method of teaching because everything is given by the professor not by the students.

Lectures are more suitable for students. The majority of them have no sufficient time to prepare for presentation because they are school teachers.

Results also reveal that 6 of the students preferred lecture method of teaching because of the characteristics professors or lecturers have in the teaching-learning context. That is, they vary their methods and techniques of teaching; they deliver their lectures clearly; and they have more knowledge and experience than students, as stated in the examples below:

I prefer the lecture method of teaching because my professor presents ideas clearly by means power point, or power point slides.

I prefer lectures because the professor's explanation to ideas is clearer than student's explanation.

I am satisfied with the lecture method because my professors deliver their lectures well and focus on ideas which will be included in the exam.

I prefer lectures professors are more knowledgeable and have more experience than students.

I am satisfied with the lecture method of teaching. My professors work hard and clarify everything in the subjects.

In addition, results indicate that two of the students preferred this method of teaching because it ensures good scores and success in general, as illustrated in the examples below:

Lecture method of teaching is better for me. It ensures obtaining good scores.

Lectures are more suitable to me because the ultimate goal is success in the subject.

Finally, the results show that one of the students preferred the lecture-based method because it gives him the chance to be self-reliant: see the example below.

...As a postgraduate student, I prefer to be self-reliant in my study.

**Table 1b. The means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of students' responses to the aspects of seminar method**

Rank	Item	M	SD
1	Seminars encourage me to participate and stay engaged during the class time.	3.70	1.208
2	Seminars give me the chance to discuss the assigned topics in small groups.	3.57	1.305
2	Seminars are limited to dialogue and debate with the instructor.	3.57	1.194
2	Seminars develop my ability to defend ideas effectively.	3.57	1.135
5	Seminars give me the opportunity to work in informal groups.	3.53	1.408
6	Seminars often use suitable content for group-work and discussion.	3.50	1.358
7	Seminars give me the opportunity to prepare for the topics to be discussed during session times.	3.47	1.252
8	Seminars improve my ability of raising questions and answering others' questions effectively.	3.43	1.357
8	Seminars make me feel empowered in the classroom.	3.43	1.331
10	Seminars give me the courage to communicate with people without hesitation.	3.40	1.404
11	Seminars help me work in a non-threatening environment.	3.23	1.331
12	Seminars give me the chance to be more responsible and to learn by myself.	3.13	1.383
13	Seminars help me build a deeper	3.13	1.432

	understanding of my ideas.		
14	Seminars allow me to analyze problems related to the subject area.	3.00	1.365
15	Seminars often use suitable content for group-work and discussion.	3.00	1.252

The table above shows that seminar's encouragement to participation and engagement ( $M=3.70$ ), its encouragement to discuss the assigned topics in small groups ( $M=3.57$ ), its limitation to dialogue and debate with the instructor ( $M=3.57$ ), and its development to students' ability to defend ideas ( $M=57$ ) received successively the highest means of students' agreement. On the other hand, the problem analysis to subject area and the suitability of content for group-work and discussion received the least mean ( $M=3.00$ ).

In terms of students' views, results indicate that only twelve students (32%) out of the thirty seven, who responded to this question, preferred seminar method of teaching. eight of these students declared that they prefer this method because it gives them the chance to cooperate, exchange ideas, and interact with each other freely. Below are illustrative examples of students' responses:

I prefer seminars because they give me the chance to co-operate with my colleagues and not to depend on the professor.

I prefer seminars since each group has the freedom to exchange ideas in the absence of the professor.....

I think seminars are more suitable for M.A. students because each student has more than one source of information. Going to the library and exchanging ideas with the professor and colleagues broaden his or her mind.

I like seminars because students interact with each other freely. This interaction enriches my knowledge of subjects and guarantees success in them.

I prefer seminars because the majority of us in the classroom are females. This gives us the chance to exchange ideas without hesitation.

Some students ( $N=3$ ) stated that they prefer seminars because they are interesting and an opportunity to get rid of boredom: see the examples below.

Seminars are better than lectures. They are not boring since one student in each seminar presents and discuss with the students a different topic. This gives us the freedom to ask the colleague presenter for further explanation.

I prefer seminars because they are interesting.

I prefer seminars to get rid of some boring professors.

One of the students proclaimed that she prefers seminar method of teaching because it gives her time to prepare the appropriate material for presentation, as stated below:

Seminars are better. My turn is every two weeks to give a seminar. This gives me time to prepare the suitable material for presenting the seminar well.

### *Results related to the second research question*

The results connected with the second research question about whether there were any statistical significant differences in students' responses according to gender indicated significant differences with respect to seminar method and to both seminar and lecture methods, in favor of females. However, the results show no significant differences in their responses to lecture method. **Table 2** shows the results of this analysis:

**Table 2. T-test results of students' responses due to gender.**

	Gender	N	M	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Seminar Method</b>	male	13	2.77	.776	-	28	.000
	female	17	3.84	.507	4.542*		
<b>Lecture-Based Method</b>	male	13	3.30	.802	1.813	28	.081
	female	17	2.84	.596			
<b>Both</b>	male	13	3.04	.346	-	28	.030
	female	17	3.34	.366	2.286*		

\*Significance value (0.05)

### *Results related to the third research question*

The results relevant to the third research question about whether there were any statistical significant differences between the means of students' responses due to study-field revealed no significant differences in their responses to seminar

method, to the lecture-based method and to both according to study-field (Curricula and Instruction; Psychology). As indicated in **table 3**:

**Table 3. T-test results of students' responses due to study-field**

	Field	N	M	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Seminar Method</b>	<b>Curriculum</b>	16	3.54	.758	1.141	28	.264
	<b>Psychology</b>	14	3.20	.886			
<b>Lecture-Based Method</b>	<b>Curriculum</b>	16	2.90	.672	-1.109	28	.277
	<b>Psychology</b>	14	3.19	.764			
<b>Both</b>	<b>Curriculum</b>	16	3.22	.374	.182	28	.857
	<b>Psychology</b>	14	3.19	.407			

\*Significance value 0.05

***Results related to the fourth research question***

The results related to the fourth research question about any statistical significant differences in the means of students' responses attributed to university indicated significant differences with regard to seminar method, in favor of Hashemite university students. They also showed significant differences in this respect to lecture-based method, in favor of Al-Albyt university students. On the other hand, the results revealed no significant differences between Hashemite and Al-Albyt university students' responses to the two methods together, as shown in **Table 4**:

**Table 4. T-test results of students' responses according to university**

	UNIVERSITY	N	M	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Seminar Method</b>	<b>Hashemite</b>	15	3.80	.564	3.231*	28	.003
	<b>Al-Albyt</b>	15	2.96	.841			
<b>Lecture-Based</b>	<b>Hashemite</b>	15	2.73	.674	-2.549*	28	.017

<b>Method</b>							
	<b>Al-Albyt</b>	15	3.34	.643			
<b>Both</b>	<b>Hashemite</b>	15	3.26	.385	.822	28	.418
	<b>Al-Albait</b>	15	3.15	.385			

**\*Significance value 0.05**

## DISCUSSION

This study aimed at investigating M.A. students' perspective about the seminar and lecture-based methods of teaching used with them during their study at two government universities. In order to achieve this aim, the study answered four research questions through the results presented above. This section will discuss the results of each question with the available literature and with the researchers' experience in methods of teaching in general.

In terms of the first question relevant to students' views about each of the lecture and seminar methods of teaching, quantitative results related to lecture method of teaching showed that this method helped them develop their listening skills and enabled them to understand large amounts of information. However, this method did not give them the chance to discuss the learning material freely and did not influence positively their GPA. In terms of students' views, results indicated that 60% of the students preferred this method of teaching. They stated lecture method was relaxing and they benefited from the professors' knowledge, experience and lecture delivery. However, some of the drawbacks of lecture method of teaching, which are related to the development of listening skills and the accumulation of large amounts of information, were considered by the students strengths in this method. This result did not agree, for example, with Study Lecture Notes (2020) that students in lecture-based classes have no role but just listening and jotting down notes. They are not also able to follow the lessons all the time. On the other hand, the result agreed with what was obtained by Menah and Charles (2016) that the participants evaluated lectures as strong in areas that require knowledge of the subject. It also coheres with what was found by Ghazali, Ishak, Saat, et al. (2011) that there was no effect of the way lecture is delivered on students' GPA. As for students' views, the result agreed with that obtained by Struyven, Dochy, and Janssen (2018) in terms of students' satisfaction with lecture-based teaching.

The results associated with seminar method of teaching indicated that the features which received the highest means of students' agreement are: Seminar encouragement to cooperation, participation, discussion of the assigned topic in small groups, dialogue and debate with the instructor, and defense of ideas effectively. They also indicated the features which received the least mean of students' agreement are: The suitability of content for group-work and discussion and with enabling students to analyze the problems of the subject area. As for students' views, results revealed that only 33% of the respondents preferred

seminar method of teaching. They stated that they preferred this method because it gave them the chance to cooperate, exchange ideas, interact freely with each other. However, the seminar encouragement to cooperation, participation, dialogue and debate with the instructor, and defense of ideas in the two universities means that this method of teaching achieved its both affective and cognitive objectives. These objectives were highlighted by Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia (2020). In addition, This result cohered with socratic seminar, which is defined as a group of people coming together for discussing and learning particular topics and techniques (Socratic Seminar, 2017). It also agreed with the definition of seminar in general. Jaikumar (2013), for example, states that seminar is a form of class organization that employs a scientific approach to problem analysis. As for students' views, the results obtained indicated that they countered what was found by Ruchi, Pradeep, MR., and Ramji (2012) that over half of respondents were in favor of seminar inclusion in the university system. However, these results agreed with what was obtained by Spruijt, Leppink, Wlofhagen, Scherpbier, Beukelen, and Jaarsma (2014) that group interaction had in general a positive effect on teaching performance and students' learning.

Regarding the second research question related to whether there were any statistical significant differences in the means of students' responses due to gender, results revealed significant differences in this regard concerning seminar method and both seminar and lecture methods of teaching, in favor of females. It seems that sensitivity to context and students' learning histories, which can be regard as important factors to the success of either seminars or lectures, did not affect females greatly in the Jordanian context. That is, it appears that female students can adapt themselves easily whether the matter comes to lecture-based or to seminar method of teaching. The reason lies in the fact that females' B.A. study influenced positively the degree of their adaptation to different methods of teaching. This means that study at the B.A. level on the part of females compensates them for the lack of presence or even contact with males at the school level. This argument is supported by Al'Adawi (2017), particularly when she suffered during seminars with second-year female students that "...their school teenage years were spent in single-gender schools and thus students tended to work and pair with classmates of the same gender" (p.6).

AS for the third research question about whether there are any statistical significant differences between the means of students' responses due to study-field, results indicated no significant differences with respect to seminar method, to the lecture-based method, and to both together. It was anticipated that the students studying in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction had more positive attitudes towards seminars than those who were studying in the Department of Psychology. The reason may lie in the fact that professors of the former department are more familiar with or have more experience in methods of teaching than those of the later department. Therefore, the experience and familiarity these professors have may enable them to vary these methods and to handle seminars more professionally.

Concerning the fourth research question related to whether there are any statistical significant differences between students' responses according to university, results showed significant differences in terms of seminar method, in favor of Hashemite university students. They also showed significant differences regarding lecture-based method, in favor of Al-Albyt university students. This may indicate that the seminars implemented in the Hashemite University were more satisfactory and more effective to students than those carried out in Al-Albyt University. This may also signify that the lecture-based method used in Al-Albyt University was more helpful and beneficial than the seminar method. This anticipation may be looked at from a different angle in this regard. That is, since some of the students stated that the lecture-based method is more relaxing and does not need any preparation, it may be regarded as one of the important reasons for the students' positive attitude towards this method.

### **CONCLUSION**

Conducting research studies on the methods of teaching postgraduates is essential nowadays. The reason lies in the fact that these students will be the future leaders of education, either at the school level or at the university level. Therefore, their perspective about the aspects which influence their performance in the field should be taken into consideration. The results obtained from any study conducted on students at this level of education may be beneficial for university teachers and policy-makers. They may also be beneficial for researchers. Therefore, further research studies should be conducted in this regard. Moreover, this study may be considered as an endeavor to shed light on the strong and weak points of seminar and lecture-based methods of teaching despite the criticisms made of the latter method of teaching. The aim is to outdo the weak points and support the strong ones.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

**I would like to thank Prof. Ali Abu-Sweileek for prof reading this study.**

### **REFERENCES**

- Al'Adawi, S. S. (2017). Exploring the effectiveness of implementing seminars as a teaching and an assessment method in a children's literature course. *English Language Teaching*, 10(11), 1-14. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n11p1>
- Abbas, M., Muhammad, S., Shabbir, M. S., Nimer, Q., Mir, Bibi, A., & Siddiqi, A. (2020). Ciencias Sociales y Arte Año 10 N° 28 Septiembre -Diciembre 2019 Tercera Época Maracaibo-Venezuela Ecological Consequences of Climate Change on Pioneer Business. *REVISTA DE LA UNIVERSIDAD DEL ZULIA*.

Abbasi, S. G., Shabbir, M. S., Abbas, M., & Tahir, M. S. (2020). HPWS and knowledge sharing behavior: The role of psychological empowerment and organizational identification in public sector banks. *Journal of Public Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2512>

Abbasi, S. G., Tahir, M. S., Abbas, M., & Shabbir, M. S. (2020). Examining the relationship between recruitment & selection practices and business growth: An exploratory study. *Journal of Public Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2438>

Ahmad, J., Ahmad, D., Abbas, m., Ashraf, M., & Shabbir, M. S. (2018). Effect of Debt Overhang on the Development of Heavily Indebted Poor Countries: Debt Laffer Curve Analysis. *Revista Publicando*, 357-379.

Al-Kumaim, N. H., Hassan, S. H., Shabbir, M. S., Almazroi, A. A., & Abu Al-Rejal, H. M. (2021). Exploring the Inescapable Suffering Among Postgraduate Researchers: Information Overload Perceptions and Implications for Future Research. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education*, 17(1), 19-41. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijicte.2021010102>

Arshad, M. A., Shabbir, M. S., Mahmood, A., Khan, S., & Sulaiman, M. A. (2020). An exploration of IQ, EQ, spiritual quotient (SQ) elements in the human reengineering program (HRP) practices: A study on the drug rehabilitation Centre in Malaysia. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise - 2020 - Winter Conferences of Sports Science*. <https://doi.org/10.14198/jhse.2020.15.proc2.32>

Ashraf, M., Ahmad, J., Sharif, W., Raza, A. A., Shabbir, M. S., Abbas, M., & Thuramy, R. (2020). The role of continuous trust in usage of online product recommendations. *Online Information Review*, 44(4), 745-766. <https://doi.org/10.1108/oir-05-2018-0156>

British Council BBC (2020). *Teacher-centred/ Teaching English*. [www.teachingenglish.org.uk](http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk)

Balakrishnan, P., Shabbir, M. S., & Siddiqi, A. (2019). Current status and future prospects of renewable energy: A case study. *Energy Sources Part A Recovery Utilization and Environmental Effects*, 42, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15567036.2019.1618983>

Carpenter, J. (2006). Effective teaching methods for large classes. *Journal of Family & Consumer Science Education*, 24(2), 13-23. [Nalefac.org/pages/vo24no2/v24n2carpenter.pdf](http://Nalefac.org/pages/vo24no2/v24n2carpenter.pdf)

Encyclopedia Britannica's Editors (2020). *Seminar: Educational method*. [Britannica.com/topic/seminar](http://Britannica.com/topic/seminar)

Fulton, J. (September 13, 2018). *The student-centered approach works*. [www.studentcenteredworld.com/student-centered-approach](http://www.studentcenteredworld.com/student-centered-approach)

Fulton, J. (December 7, 2019). *What is a student-centered learning approach?* [Classcraft.com/blog/features/what-is-a-student-centered-learning-approach](http://Classcraft.com/blog/features/what-is-a-student-centered-learning-approach)

Gill, E. (2020). *What is your teaching style? 5 Effective teaching methods for your classroom*. Resilient Educator. <https://resilienteducator.com/classroom-resources/5-types-of-classroom-teaching-styles/>

IGI Global (2020). *What is teacher-centered approach*. [Igi.global.com/dictionary/developing-oadagogical-skills-for-teachers/55851](http://Igi.global.com/dictionary/developing-oadagogical-skills-for-teachers/55851)

Jaikumar, M. (Apr 3, 2018). *Seminar method of teaching*. [Slideshare.net/maheswarijaikumar/seminar-method-of-teaching-92749722](http://Slideshare.net/maheswarijaikumar/seminar-method-of-teaching-92749722)

Jabarullah, N. H., Shabbir, M. S., Abbas, M., Siddiqi, A. F., & Berti, S. (2019). Using random inquiry optimization method for provision of heat and cooling demand in hub systems for smart buildings. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 47, 101475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101475>

Khan, M., Shabbir, M. S., Tahir, m. S., Ali, R., & Hussain, M. (2019). Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivity in Family Owned Pakistani Firms. *Revista Amazonia Investiga*, 8, 376-386.

McMillan, A.C. (2020). *Student-centered learning strategies*. Teach HUB: K-12 Resources by Teachers, for Teachers. [teachhub.com/teaching-strategies/2020.07/student-centered-learning-strategies/](http://teachhub.com/teaching-strategies/2020.07/student-centered-learning-strategies/)

Menah, D., & Charles, A. (2016). The perceptions and attitudes of students towards lectures at a Ghanian Public University. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research Methods*, 3(1), 1-9. [www.eajournals.org](http://www.eajournals.org)

Munyaradzi, G.E. (2013). Teaching methods and students' academic performance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 2(9), 29-35. [www.ijhssi.org](http://www.ijhssi.org)

Nakada, T. (2017). Gamified lecture courses improve student evaluation but not exam scores. *Frontiers: ICT*. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fict.2017.00005>

Ohazali, A., Ishak, I., Saat, N., Arifin, R., Hamid, A., Rosli, Y., Mohammed, Z., Othman, M., & Kamarulzamar, F. (2011). Student perception on lecture delivery effectiveness among the faculty of health sciences lecturers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 60 (2012), 67-72. [Core.ac.uk/download/pdf/81212365.pdf](http://Core.ac.uk/download/pdf/81212365.pdf)

Palappallil, P., Sushama, J., & Ramnath, S. (2016). Effectiveness of modified seminars as a teaching-learning method in Pharmacology. *International Journal of Applied Basic Medical Research*, 6(3), 195-200. <http://doi:10.4103/2229-516x.186971>

Ruchi, K., pradeep, B., MR, S., & Ramji, S. (2012). Students' perception on seminars: a Questionnaire study. *South-East Asian Journal of Medical Education*, 6(2), 20-22. [Seajme.md.chula.ac.th/articleVo16N2/OR3.kothariRuchi.pdf](http://Seajme.md.chula.ac.th/articleVo16N2/OR3.kothariRuchi.pdf)

Sadeghi, R., Sedaghat, M.M., & Ahmadi, F.S. (2014). Comparison of the Effect of lecture and blended teaching methods on students' learning and satisfaction. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 2(4), 146–150. PMID: 25512938-PMCID: PMC4235559. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4235559/>

Struyven, V., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2008). Students' likes and dislikes regarding student-activating and lecture-based educational settings: Consequences for students' perceptions of the learning environment, student learning and performances. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 23(3), 295-317. <http://doi:10.1007/BF03173001>. [link.springer.com/article/10.1007/](http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/)

Study Lecture Notes (2020). *Lecture method of teaching , Definition, advantages & disadvantages*. [Studylecturenotes.com/lecture-method-of-teaching-definition-advantages-disadvantages/](http://studylecturenotes.com/lecture-method-of-teaching-definition-advantages-disadvantages/)

Socratic Seminar (Oct 1, 2017). *What is a socratic seminar?* [Socraticseminar.com/what-is-a-socratic-seminar/](http://Socraticseminar.com/what-is-a-socratic-seminar/)

Spruijt, A, Leppink, J., Wolfhagen, I, Scherpbier, A, Beukelen, P., & Jaarsma, D. (2014). Investigating teaching performance in seminar; a Questionnaire study with multi-level approach. *BMC Medical Education*, 14(203), 1-10. <http://doi:10.1186/1472-6920-14-203>

Spruijet, A., Wolfhagen, I., Bok, H., Schuurmans, E., Scherpbier, A., Beukelen, P., & Jaarsma, D. (2013). Teachers' perspectives of aspects affecting seminar learning: a Qualitative Study. *BMC Medical Education*, 13(22), 1-10. <http://www.bjomedcentral.com/1472-6920/13/22>

Study Lecture Notes (2020). *Lecture method of teaching: Definition, advantages & disadvantages*. [Studylecturenotes.com/lecture-method-of-teaching-definition-advantages-disadvantages/](http://studylecturenotes.com/lecture-method-of-teaching-definition-advantages-disadvantages/)

Techievp (March 13, 2018). *Advantages and disadvantages of seminar*. [Advantagesndisavantages.com/advantages-disadvantages.seminar.html](http://Advantagesndisavantages.com/advantages-disadvantages.seminar.html)

Olivia (July 1, 2011). *Difference between seminar and lecture*.  
<https://www.differencebetween.com/difference-between-seminar-and-vs-lecture/>

Wiki User (2014). *Educational methods and theories: Advantages and disadvantages of seminars as teaching method?* Answers.com/Q/Advantages-and-disadvantages-of-seminars-as-teaching-method

Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia (2020). *Lecture*.  
<En.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lecture>

Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia (2020). *Seminar*.  
<En.wikipedia.org/wiki/seminar>