Lecturers' professional practices from the perspectives of adult learning principles

Dr.T.Sharon Raju
Associate Professor & Head; Chairman, BOS in Education (UG) Department of Education, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam-530003, A.P., India

Temesgen Oljira Geleta
Research Scholar, Department of Education, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam-530003 Andhra Pradesh, India.

Abstract
This study sought to examine the practice of university teachers' professional endeavors in using adult learning principles in facilitating learning at a university. The study employed an explanatory sequential design. Questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions were used to gather data from instructors and learners who were chosen using simple random sampling for the quantitative phase and purposive sampling for the qualitative phase. The study revealed that the learning theory that consider adult learners was poorly practiced. The teaching approaches, assessment strategies, and institutional services fail to meet the adult learners needs. The study implies that instructors must revisit their assessment and teaching approach. Likewise, the institution should properly communicate with its learners before trying to serve them.
Keywords: adult learning; professional practice; learning activities
----

I.   Introduction
Learners can be empowered with agency and a sense of purpose, as well as the skills necessary, via Education, to alter their own lives and the lives of others and to contribute to the lives of others (Schmidt, 2010;Song & Bonk, 2016). Educational approaches that reach knowledge and skills to address them happen in student-centered or teacher-centred (Zhou & Brown, 2015). Learning techniques have progressed from teacher-centred to learner-centred, then learning-centred, which Harpaz labelled as the third paradigm (Harpaz, 2014). Learning techniques have progressed from teacher-centred to learner-centred, then learning-centred, which Harpaz labelled as the third paradigm (Harpaz, 2014). According to this third model, Harpaz explains, neither the teacher nor the learner is central, but rather the encounter between them – anactive, critical, creative, and thoughtful encounter. In the continuum of learning approach change, how learning can be effectively delivered has been emphasised. The influence of ages upon learning, however, was not emphasised till Knowles popularised adult learning theory, Andragogy (Knowles, 1980; Merriam, 2008).

Knowles (1988) considered that adults learn in different ways from children. He claimed that emphasis was not given to adult learners' learning; rather, pedagogical approach which treated learners as less experienced was primarily applied to all kinds of learners (Knowles, 1980). Later, Knowles popularised a different approach to adult learning called Andragogy, the concept of self-directed learning, which is central to the psychology of adult learning and teaching. The concept of Andragogy requires recognition of adults' experiences, immediate application of learning, making adults responsible for their learning, valuing adults' initiation toward learning and orienting adults toward tasks (Harrison, 2000; Thomas, 2005).This is particularly important because many adult learners expect to be treated as a responsible and regarded people.

Knowles developed a set of five assumptions that enveloped his concept of Andragogy: adults are self-directed learners, adult learners bring a wealth of experience to the educational setting, adults enter educational settings ready to learn, adults are problem-centred in their learning, and adults are best motivated by internal factors (Knowles, 1980;Blondy, 2007).Unlike pedagogy, Andragogy looks deeper into various adult dimensions to reach their learning needs (Merriam, 2009).The andragogical approach of helping adult learning greatly prepares individuals to become autonomous learners (Knowles, 1980, 1984, 1998). This self-directed learning leads them to be lifelong learners, which is highly required in the 21st Century (Wittmann& Olivier, 2019).

Ambo University, educational and behavioural sciences institute, runs in-service summer programs. The learners of this program are mature adults who have already graduated with a diploma and continue learning to upgrade to a degree. Most learners are in middle adulthood (see Appendix 1), so they prefer self-direction and autonomy in their learning. This learner's autonomy is viewed as the ability to take charge of one's own learning ,i.e.to be responsible for all the decisions concerning all aspects of learning (Holec, 1981; Yasmin&Sohail, 2018). However, learners' participation might be low because of various reasons. For instance, Cross (1981) identified three main constraints making learner participation low: Situational, Institutional and Dispositional. For her, situational constraints were related to the learner's situation in life, like lack of time or money required; dispositional barriers included features of personality which affect learning as lack of motivation or confidence, while institutional constraints included the practices that may hamper learners from participation. Therefore, a learning method that respects learners' self-guidance and encourages engagement is essential for meaningful learning. Andragogical methods of learning, however, do make learners not only active but also distinctively address the needs of adult learners, which, as many argue, differ from the needs of children (Knowles et al., 1998; Prince, 2004; Robinson, Wilson &Mcneill-Cook, 2017; Seyoum &Basha, 2017). Furthermore, by using andragogical principles, as Seyoum & Basha (2017) stressed, the trainer can tailor the instruction to meet learners' interests by involving them in planning the learning objectives and activities and solving real-world business problems. Hence, it is argued that andragogical approach will address the needs and interests of adult learning by engaging them.

Educators' knowledge and understanding about what to be studied, how to be studied, when to be learned and institution's response to learners needs are pivotal to effectively help adult learners' learning. Being knowledgeable about learning theories that fit most adult learning and becoming practitioners is imperative for educators of adult learners. As researchers and insiders, we have informally observed that adult learners in our university are not given autonomy for self-direction in their learning. This informal observation needs to be assessed and supported by empirical evidence. Therefore, this research wants to examine existing practices in helping adult learners learn. In such a way, the applicability of adult learning principles was assessed in line with the learning theory set by Knowles. To this end, research questions that led the study are: What is the perceived status of the application of Andragogy? How do lecturers' teaching methods and assessment techniques consider learners' learning?

II. Methodology

The study aimed to assess the usage of adult learning principles at the University. In doing so, the researchers employed explanatory sequential design (also referred to as the explanatory design), which occurs in two distinct phases within one study (Creswell, 2011; Ivankova, Creswell and Stick; 2006). It starts with the collection and analysis of quantitative data. Then followed is the collection and analysis of qualitative data to explain or expand on the first-phase quantitative results. This design was appropriate because we wanted to examine and explain the application of andrgogical principles in our institution. We believe that this design provides a general picture of the research problem; more analysis, specifically through qualitative data collection to refine, extend or explain the general picture of the issue under consideration (Subedi, 2016). The qualitative data and their analysis refine and explain those statistical results by exploring participants' views in more depth (Ivankova, Creswell and Stick, 2006).

Participants

The study was conducted in the institute of educational and behavioral science and focused on senior summer in-service learners. The justification for selecting senior learners was based on the assumption that the learners had appropriate exposure to the institute's teaching-learning process and could deliver more trustworthy responses during the data collection procedure. Using simple random sampling methods, 45 students were chosen from a pool of 230 for the study. Using simple random sampling methods, 45 students were chosen from a pool of 230 for the study. Fourteen lecturers were selected for data collection. From those lecturers, seven respondents were randomly selected. For the qualitative data collection phase, the researchers interviewed 8 learners and 4 lecturers who were purposively selected.

Data Collection

In this study, various data-gathering instruments were employed to generate data from the participants in two phases. For the quantitative phase, a five-point Likert scale questionnaire was used (Ranging from 'strongly disagree =1'; 'disagree =2'; 'undicided =3'; 'agree =4' and 'strongly agree =5') to collect data from both learners and instructors. The questionnaire was developed and employed to collect data on the teaching methodology, assessment approach and institutional services. After completing the quantitative phase, interviews and focus group discussions were used to obtain data that explained, clarified and confirm quantitative findings. Interviews were semi-structured with open-ended questions to allow learners and lecturers

to express their experiences on the application of adult learning principles and institutional approaches to learners. Furthermore, focus group discussion was used with six learners to gain in-depth experience on the practices of pedagogical principles. All interviews and focus group discussions were audio-recorded to be transcribed and analysed.

Data Analysis

In this study, the sequential explanatory design was employed by giving more attention to the quantitative approaches because the quantitative data collection comes first in the sequence and often represents the major aspect of the data collection process. Thus, the first data collected by questionnaire were analysed quantitatively. This phase aimed to examine the status of the application of andragogical principles in the summer in-service program and to allow for purposefully selecting informants for the study's second phase.Then,data were collected and analysed qualitatively to substantiate the quantitative findings. The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) with the following interpretation rates on a five-point Likert Scale. Greater than or equal to 4.5 = strongly agree, 3.5-4.49 = agree, 2.5-3.49= undecided, 1.5-2.49= disagree, and less than1.5= strongly disagree. In the case of qualitative data, recordings from interviews and focus group discussions were transcribed verbatim. Then repeated readings of the transcriptions were made. From the transcription, texts and descriptions were summarized, categorized and presented in line with the quantitative data. In the analysis, verbatim quotations were used to substantiate the interpretation. In order to more comprehensively address our research questions, interpretation-level integration has occurred, connecting the quantitative data from phase one of the study with the qualitative data from phase two of the study using a joint display. According to Fetters, Curry, and Creswell (2013), this joint display of data allows the data to be visually brought together to draw out new insights beyond the information gained from the different quantitative and qualitative results. The analysis compares and contrasts quantitative results from statistical analysis with sample quotes from qualitative data to see points of contention and convergence to develop an understanding of the current application of andragogical principles through the integration of the two data.

III.   Findings

This part of the study deals with the presentation and analysis of data gathered from different sources through questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions.

Table 1.
The approach of Teaching Methodology Applied

No	Items	Instructors' Response		Students Response	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	Instructors tell the relevance of course to learners	4.6	0.5	3.9	1.1
2	Instructors help learners know benefits of course	4.4	0.5	3.9	0.9
3	Instructors give chances to learners to take responsibility	3.9	1.3	1.8	0.7
4	Instructors empower learners for their learning	3.7	1.4	1.8	0.6
5	Instructors value the experience of learners	4	0.8	1.9	0.8
6	Instructors engage learners to share what they know	4.1	0.7	4.0	0.9
7	Instructors builds teaching on what learners know	4	1.0	3.7	1.1
8	Instructors make learners decide content	3.3	1.1	2.2	1.0
9	Instructors create environment for co-learning	4.2	0.9	3.4	1.3
10	Learners have proper degree of independence	3.6	0.8	1.8	0.7
11	Learner get immediate application of lesson	3.4	1.0	2.1	0.9
12	Instructors make learners be active in learning process	4.1	0.7	3.3	1.1
13	Learners practice new skills before leaving session	3.4	1.0	1.9	1.0
14	Learners test new knowledge before leaving session	3.6	1.0	1.9	0.9
15	Learners are empowered to solve problems by themselves	3.9	0.7	1.6	0.6
16	Content of teaching gives many opportunities for learners	4	0.8	3.6	1.1

Table 1 displays different strategies used toward teaching methodologies. Regarding informing relevance of the courses to learners, both groups of respondents (instructors and learners)notified that learners were informed of the relevance of courses, as seen from the mean values 3.6 and 3.9 for instructors and learners,

respectively. As shown in item 2, both learners' and instructors' responses (mean, 3.9 and mean 4.4) confirmed that learners were made to know the benefit of the courses they learn. Regarding giving chances for learners to take responsibility, the response of instructors and learners vary. As item 3 indicates, the mean value of teachers' responses is 3.9,meaning instructors gave their learners an opportunity. In contrast, learners' responses with a mean value of 1.8 indicate that instructors failed to make learners responsible for their own learning. The Participants of FGD strengthened learners' responses by stating that some lecturers cover three to four units in a day. As a result, learners were passive listeners and unable to get opportunities of interacting either with one another.

Item 4 displays the empowerment of learners. Accordingly, instructors' responses (mean, 3.7) revealed that they empowered their learners. However, learners' responses showed that instructors failed to empower their learners, as shown by their response (Mean 1.8).

Regarding valuing learners' experiences, the instructors' response indicated in item 5 that learners' experience was valued (mean, 4.),whereas learners' response showed that learner experience was not meaningfully considered (mean, 1.9).The following excerpts, made during an interview with learners, exemplify the ideas illustrated by almost all interviewees:

Learning is boring for adults unless supported by practice. Since practice allows them to discuss, share and reflect, learners want to relate learning to their daily life. Learning facts and principles from theory are not a concern of adult learners, but what matters most for learners is sharing lived experiences. However, because of the lack of time and the nature of the curriculum, it is not easy to put it into practice. (L1)

In the same vein, here is an excerpt reported by an interviewee
Although we have accumulated various experiences in life, they are not recognised by our lecturers. We are treated as someone who has little experience. (L3)

Regarding learners' engagement in sharing their knowledge, both instructors' responses (mean, 4.1) and learners' responses (mean, 4) proved that they were sharing what they knew. The interview result also confirmed that lecturers motivated learners to share their experiences, and in a daily lesson, they were made to share their experiences with the class. Furthermore, both instructors and learners' responses indicated that during facilitation, learners' knowledge was used as input in the learning process. These were indicated by instructors' responses (mean,4) and learners (mean, 3.7). The following were responses to an interview conducted with lecturers:
What matters in class is not teaching but learning. So, I consider learners' backgrounds, learning styles and capabilities. I usually face diverse age categories in my class- 25to 50 (almost doubled), so addressing their needs is very important. (I2)
Correspondingly, the following was raised by another instructor:

Adults have rich experiences; they are self-directed and goal-oriented. So, they need a special approach to teaching. Having this knowledge, I usually entertain learners' needs as it is a source of knowledge. (I4)
Regarding sources of content, the instructors responded that they could not decide whether learners participate in deciding contents they learn (mean, 3.3). Learners' responses, however, exposed that learners' participation in generating content was poor (mean, 2.2). A participant in the interview stated that he knew adults were self-directed learners but did not fully trust learners. Hence, he said that he dominated learners in teaching-learning because they could not successfully do activities by themselves. The attribution was that the contexts did not allow an andragogical approach.

Regarding the creation of an environment for co-learning by instructors, responses of both instructors and learners (mean, 4.2 and 3.4) confirmed that instructors create a conducive situation within which learners learn from one another. The result of the interview also confirmed that co-learning needs to be given attention. Maintaining a similar view, an instructor offered the following quotation:
From my experience, I noticed that adults want to listen to others' experiences and want to share their experiences. So, I believe that considering the needs of adult learners makes learning more effective. (I1)
For the idea raised on learners' independence in their learning, instructors and learners responded differently. The instructors notified that learners were independent in their learning (mean, 3.6) whereas learners revealed that they were not fully independent (mean, 1.8). Regarding the immediate application of the knowledge and skills by learners, the instructors' response means the value is 3.4, which proves that there were immediate applications of a lesson. However, learners' responses with a mean value of 2.1 contested that immediate lesson application was not expressed. During the focus group discussion, participants explained that most contents of the courses were not immediately applicable to their life. The contents were theory in which lecturers merely

narrated, and learners could not use them in real life. They revealed that they were not given enough time to internalise and assimilate their experiences.

The responses of instructors (mean, 4.1) indicated that learners were made active by their instructors, whereas learners' responses (mean, 3.3) showed that learners tend to agree neither nor disagree. The following quotes are reflective of the descriptions given on matters of active learning and ways of catering to learner's needs by one ofthe participants:

The teaching approach in our class is neither teacher-centred nor learner centred. Because in teacher centred, it is assumed teachers dominate the class yet address the content. These are not being practised. In learner-centred, the assumption is valuing learners' needs, and this is far from happening. The only focus was to cover the content. What mattered was not our learning but the finishing content of the course. (L4)

In the same vein, another learner added:

Since summer time is short, listening to learners to address their needs is uncommon as lecturers are busy covering the contents of the course they teach. So, without considering our needs, they do what they think is right. Let alone trying to address learners' needs, most lecturers do not even check whether learners are following their class lessons. (L5)

Admitting what has been said by the learners, here is an excerpt reported by the instructor:

It is challenging to address learners' needs. So, I usually took the average learners as a reference point and continued my teaching. The university uses predetermined and accelerated curricula, rushing to finish the content. Since the curriculum is ridged and not flexible, I cannot change my approach depending on the need of the learners (I6).

Correspondingly, another instructor added:

Lectures highly dominate my teaching approach because of a shortage of time. I know it is defective, but to finish the course, I must use it. Another reason I use a teacher-centred approach is the nature of the curriculum. It is pedagogically coined. (I7)

Regarding learners' practice of new skills before leaving the session, instructors' responses (mean, 3.4) tend to agree that learners practice new skills. In contrast, learners' responses (mean, 1.9) showed that learners fail to accept that they practice new skills. Response varies for the idea raised about testing new knowledge before leaving class. Although instructors indicated that learners are made to test new knowledge to some extent (mean, 3.6), learners' responses (mean, 1.9) showed that they were not adequately encouraged to test new knowledge. During an interview, lecturers stated that the needs of learners and using various motivational activities according to learners' needs are essential while teaching adult learners. According to their responses, the contents need to be inviting and practical.

Concerning learners' empowerment to solve the problem by themselves, instructors stated that learners solved their own problems (mean, 3.9). Nevertheless, learners' responses (mean, 1.6) showed they were not adequately empowered to solve problems alone. The responses of instructors (mean, 4) and learners (mean, 3.6) demonstrated that the contents provide learners with several opportunities.

During an interview, the respondents reflected on the following points regarding approach teaching:

The font sizes of power point the instructor used for teaching were lacking, considering the age of adult learners. Learners face difficulty reading power points prepared by most of their lecturers. Their voice was not audible for most of us, too. Sometimes, the condition worsens when lecturers combine two groups in the lecture hall, where the number of students becomes very large in class. (L1).

Another respondent provided evidence that the reading materials produced for them could not be understood by older persons who were acquiring new skills because the font sizes were too small. Regarding the very same topic, the viewpoint of a different participant was presented as follows: "Priority is provided to cover the course as the contents are wide." As a result, teachers are so hurried to finish the course that they neglect to examine how well their students are learning.

Table 2.
Assessment Approach

No	Items	Instructors' Response		Students' Response	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	Assessment recognises multiple sources	3.7	0.9	1.8	0.5
2	Assessment includes the three domains of learning	2.4	0.8	1.9	0.6
3	Assessment gives chances for self-assessment	1.8	0.7	2.1	0.9

4	Assessments accommodate life experiences	2.0	0.6	2.1	0.7
5	Assessment entirely depends on handout	4.0	0.5	4.3	0.6
6	Assessment result is shown to learners	4.1	0.9	4.0	0.5
7	Participatory assessment approach is used	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.6

Various statements were presented for lecturers and students to investigate the assessment approach used for adult learners. Accordingly, for incorporating multiple sources during an assessment, while instructors' responses (mean, 3.7) confirmed that multiple sources are recognised, learners' responses (mean, 1.8) indicated that various sources were poorly incorporated during an assessment. The interview with learners showed that the source of assessment was the materials provided by the learner and mainly depended on the contents included in the handout. Regarding incorporating balanced concepts, values and skills in the assessment process, both lecturers and learners confirmed that the three domains were not sufficiently balanced as respondents' responses revealed instructors' responses (mean, 2.4) and learners' responses (mean, 1.9). Concerning learner self-assessment, both groups of respondents, lectures (mean, 1.8) and learners (mean,2.1) ,stated that the self-assessment practices were poor. The response from the focus group discussion revealed that learners had not been given chances to assess one another. The respondents stated that lectures communicate the result, but self-assessment was not standard, according to their responses. Accommodation of life experiences by assessment provided for learners was another area to be investigated. Accordingly, the responses of instructors (mean, 2) and learners (mean, 2.1) revealed that learners' experiences were not adequately included in the assessment.

The focuses of assessment were also another area of concern. The responses of instructors (mean, 4) and learners (mean, 4.1) confirmed that assessment mainly depends on the handout provided for the learners. The result of the interviews confirmed that the handout was the primary source of assessment, and the respondents complained that it ignored their diverse experiences. The following quotation was taken from the interview to illustrate this view:

The assessment entirely depends on the materials prepared by the university. Our assessors do not consider our experiences. The nature of treatment in the class is not inviting to incorporate our life experiences in the assessment. There was a time when adult learners were considered naive depending on the result of the handout. (L5)

Regarding the provision of assessment results to the learners, the responses of both instructors (mean, 4.1) and learners(mean, 4) ensured that the assessment results were communicated to learners. For the participatory assessment approach usage, both instructors' responses (mean, 1.8) and learners' responses stated that the participatory assessment approach was not meaningfully applied.

IV. Discussion

It has been established that adults learn best when they are self-sufficient and choose the things they want to study (Brookfield, 2013). Therefore, the learning approach needs to consider adult experience, the self-responsibility of adults, motivation, and the immediacy of the knowledge and skills for their life. To help adults learn meaningfully, addressing those principles is mandatory. The study tried to investigate the practice of adult learning principles at University. This section summarises identified findings on teaching methodology, assessment approach and institution approach and discusses them by relating them with existing literature.

The findings revealed that instructors introduced the relevance and benefits of the courses to learners. Supporting the findings, Case (2005) stated that telling objective assist facilitators in selecting relevant content, methods, assessment and resources. In the same way, Merriam (2008) confirmed that making learners know the objectives of the courses helps them focus on their own intention. Although instructors' responses proved that their learners were made responsible and empowered, learners were unsatisfied with the treatments. The findings exposed that learners fail to recognise what instructors assumed as independence. Andragogical approaches to teaching assert that adult learners need to feel independent and confident in the learning process because self-managing and wanting to know how and where to learn are fundamental guiding principles for adult learning (Harrison, 2000; Knowles, 1980; Merriam, 2008). Therefore, it is crucial to create an environment where learners are independent, self-guiding and responsible for playing a more significant share in guiding their learning pace.

According to lecturers' responses, learners' experiences were regarded in the facilitation process, yet learners' responses showed that they were not. Learning is enriched and becomes effective (Carol et al., 2002; Knowles,1980; Nuckles, 2000) if the learning experience is meaningfully valued in adult learning. Acknowledging prior experiences it is stated that learning is a process of drawing a connection between what is already learned and new information. Hence, it is emphasised that building knowledge on what already exists can foster learning and make learning more effective. As noted in the analysis section, co-learning was practiced in the learning process. Learning from one another is highly encouraged these days. Effective learning

is actualised if learning from one another is in the learning process. In addition to creating a positive relationship,co-learning can help learners work together to maxim is etheir learning(Baines et al., 2008).

As signalled by processed data, the finding showed that lecturers' responses are notwithstanding with learners' responses. Instructors tended to argue that learners have a proper degree of independence; on the contrary, learners' responses refuted it in which learners were dissatisfied with lecturers dealing. It is confirmed that adult learners succeed if they are autonomous (Hanson, 1996).Regarding the immediate application of lessons in the life of learners, while the instructors failed to be sure whether the lesson's content had immediate application, learner responsesshowed that the lessons were not significantly applied to their lives. According to adult learning principles, however, adult lessons should be practical(Merriam & Caffarella ,1991).

Although instructors expressed that the learning process was participatory, learners failed to recognise it as participatory. Adult learning is more effective when learners are more directly involved rather than passively receiving knowledge transmitted by lecturers(Bartos, 2007: Herod, 2012).

On the practice of new skills and testing new knowledge before leaving a session, the finding revealed that instructors tend to agree, whereas learners did not accept that it could give them chances to practice. According to Merriam (2008) ,practising new skills in the class and testing new knowledge before leaving class is recommended. Regarding learners' empowerment to solve the problem by themselves, instructors believe that learners were empowered to tackle the problem they faced. However, the responses of learners showed the opposite. Helping learners to be independent and autonomous is actualised if they are empowered(James, 2006). Therefore, creating a condition in which learners are satisfied with their empowerment is found to be necessary. According to adult learning principles, learners' empowerment to solve their problems is highly encouraged (Merriam &Caffarella, 1991).

The findings revealed that the contents of teaching included in the curriculum provided many opportunities for learners. While selecting content, considering the ranges of their applicability in diverse purposes is indispensable to achieving multiple objectives (Kolb, 1984). In addition, the programs learners' learn to lead them to personal growth. Personal development as a result of learning is focused on adult learning principles. Unlike children, adults want to instantly fulfil their desires from the material they learn (Merriam, 2008).

On the approach of using multiple sources for assessment, while the response of lecturers revealed that they were using multiple approaches, learners' responses indicated that multiple sources were not expressively used. Nonetheless, the assessment ought to be from diverse dimensions of life if it is meant to measure learning outcomes effectively (Klinge, 2015). According to Carol et al. (2002),the assessment process must address learning on multiple levels_ perception, action and critical reflection. Supporting this idea, Watkins (2005) stated that learning occurs from interaction with a wide array of knowledge sources, and these can be assessed by driving learning from multiple features. The finding revealed that the assessment delivered for learners did not incorporate the three learning domains. Carol. et.al. (2002) pointed out that assessment is geared toward achieving learning domains in which learners' knowledge and practical skills are tested.

As the study findings showed, assessment approaches used by instructors failed to give chances for learners to assess their learning. Adult learning assessment principles, however, encourage learners' self-assessment. Thomas and Smith (2004) stated that learners should be fully involved in the assessment process to understand how to improve and become independent learners.

The life experience of learners was not impressively accommodated by assessment practice. Both instructors and learners confirmed that the assessment mainly depends on the handout. This approach does not equip learners with a range of experiences. The assessment employed needs to contain diverse areas that address learners' academic, social and emotional development (Fox, 1992). The results of the finding confirmed that assessment results were communicated to learners. Turnbull (2009) pointed out that it encourages learners to learn from their mistakes and become competent. Although the importance of participatory assessment is known as a promising approach to making learning more effective(Carol, 2002),the study revealed that the assessment is teacher dominated.

An institutional approach toward adults is indispensable for their successful learning. Andragogically, adults learn more if the leadership listens to adult commentary. As the findings indicated, the institution failed to give learners chances to decide on their own affairs, which is against adult learning principles. Swaffield (2008) pointed out that allowing learners to decide on their own affairs makes teaching and learning more effective. As per the findings of this study, proper materials were not provided for learners by their institution. However, the provision of proper materials for learners is recommended for the success of learning Merriam and Caffarella, (1991).While considering the learners' experience is a core approach in teaching adult learning (Knowles, 1980;Nuckles, 2000), the result of this study manifested that their institution less valued the learners' experience. The decision made by the university/ institution was made without the proper consultation of learners. The participatory approach to decision-making is very crucial in adult learning. It is an ingredient for better learning. Swaffield (2008) stated that learners perform better and engage more if they feel respected and appreciated.

V. Conclusion

The traditional approach of teaching in which teachers dominate the learning process has been subjected to severe criticism as it assumes learners' passive receipt of knowledge. The active learning approach has got much emphasis on making learners construct knowledge by using their prior experiences. Andragogy is the teaching approach that considers learners' experiences and needs in the teaching-learning process. This study focused on the practice of adult learning principles and attempted to investigate the treatment of adult learners.

Unfortunately, this study revealed that the adult learning approach teaching was not meaningfully practised. According to the findings, teaching methods were unable to becoined andragogically. The experiences and needs of learners were not centralised in the learning process. The assessment was not inline with empowering learners. Self-assessment and proper feedback provisions were absent. The institution's services chiefly ignored learners' needs and delivered its services as pre-planned. Of course, the result of the findings revealed that there was a discrepancy between the lecturer's responses and the learners' responses. Lecturers' responses inclined toward showing that learners' needs and experiences were considered. However, it is worth noting that learners say it was crucial to identify the practice of adult learning principles.

Therefore, valuing adult learners' needs which make learning meaningful, encourage lifelong learning and enhance professional development, is crucial if we mean learning has to have happened. Reconsidering the teaching methods, types of assessment employed and the nature of service provided by the institution are recommended. Furthermore, to know and address the needs of adult learners, the university needs to create an online system particularly to address non-academic matters.

References

[1]. Baines, E., Blanchford, P. and Kurnick, P. (2008).Promoting Effective Group work in   Primary Classrooms TLRP Improving Practice Series. London: Routledge.

[2]. Bartos, K. (2007). Constructivism in Action.Retrieved from http://kathleenbartos.blogspot.com/2007/04/introduction-in-completing-kam-ii-goal.html.

[3]. Blondy, L. C.(2007).Evaluation and Application of Andragogical Assumptions to the Adult Online Learning Environment.Journal of Interactive Online Learning,6(2):116-130

[4]. Brookfield.S.D., (2013). Powerful techniques for teaching adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[5]. Carol E. Kasworm, Catherine A. Marienau. (2002). Principles for Assessment of Adult Learning.New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 75: 5-16.

[6]. Casey,A. (2005). Enhancing individual and Organisational learning: A sociological Model. Management learning 36(2):131-147.

[7]. Creswell, J. W., (2011). Educational research:planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Pearson Education, Boston.

[8]. Cross, K. P. (1981). Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[9]. Fetters, M. D., Curry, A. L. and Creswell.W. J. (2013). Achieving Integration in Mixed   Methods Designs - Principles and Practices."Health Services Research,48(6):   2134- 2156. http:doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

[10]. Fox, P. (1992). Involving Adult Students in Assessment.Adult Assessment Forum, 2 (1), 11.

[11]. Hanson, A. (1996). The Search for a Separate Theory of Adult Learning. Does Anyone   Need Andragogy? New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[12]. Harpaz, Y. (2014). Teaching and Learning in a Community of Thinking: The Third Model. Dordrecht: Springer.

[13]. Harrison,R. (2000). learner managed to learn: managing to learn or learning to manage?International Journal of Lifelong Education, 19(4): 312-321, DOI: 10.1080/02601370050110374.

[14]. Herod, L. (2003). Adult learning from theory to practice. Family Literacy Events Committee.

[15]. Holec, H. (1981). Autonomy and foreign language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

[16]. Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. Field Methods, 18(1), 3-20. doi: 10.1177/1525822X05282260

[17]. James, M., Black, P., McCormick, R., Pedder, D., &Wiliam, D. (2006). Learning how to learn, in classrooms, schools and networks: Aims, design and analysis. Research papers in Education, 21(02), 101-118.

[18]. Klinge, C. (2015). A Conceptual Framework for Mentoring in a Learning Organization: Adult learning. 26(4), 160-166.

[19]. Knowles, M. (1980).The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge Books.

[20]. Knowles, M. S. (1984). Andragogy in action.San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[21]. Knowles, M., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human development. Boston: Elsevier.

[22]. Knowles, M.S., R. Elwood, R. Holton III and A. Swanson (1998). The Adult Learner: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development.(5th ed.). new York: Heinemann.

[23]. Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential Learning: Experience as a Source of Learning and Development. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[24]. Merriam, S. B. (Ed.). (2009). An Update on Adult Learning Theory: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[25]. Merriam, S., and Caffarella, R. (1991).Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

[26]. Merriam, S.B. (2008). Adult Learning Theory for the Twenty-First Century. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 119:93-98.

[27]. Nuckles, C. R. (2000). Student-centered teaching: Making it work. Adult Learning, 11(4), 5-6.

[28]. Robinson, K. O., Wilson, M. and Mcneill-Cook, S. (2017). Evaluating the Application of Andragogical Principles Beyond the Classroom," Adult Education Research Conference. https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/2017/roundtables/1

[29]. Schmidt, M. (2010). Learning from teaching experience: Dewey's theory and preservice teachers' learning. Journal ofResearch in Music Education, 58(2), 131 -146.

[30]. Seyoum, Y., &Basha, G. (2017).Andragogical Methods to Sustain Quality Adult Education in Ethiopia.International Journal of Instruction, 10(3), 47-62.doi: doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1034a

[31]. Song, D. & Bonk, J.C. (2016) Motivational factors in self-directed informal learning from online learning resources,Cogent Education, 3:1,1205838, doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2016.1205838

[32]. Subedi, D. (2016). Explanatory Sequential Mixed Method Design as the Third Research Community of Knowledge Claim.American Journal of Educational Research, 4(7), 570-577. doi: 10.12691/education-4-7-10

[33]. Swaffield, S. (2008). Critical friendship, dialogue and learning in the context of leadership for learning. School Leadership and Management, 28(4), 323-336.

[34]. Thomas, F., Katahoire, A. and Akpovireoduaran (2005). African Perspectives on Adult Learning: The psychology of Adult learning in Africa. David:Langhan.

[35]. Thomas, W. and Smith, A.(2004). Coaching Solutions: Practical Ways to Improve Performance in Education.Stafford: Network Educational Press Ltd.

[36]. Turnbull, J .(2009). Coaching for Learning.London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

[37]. Watkins, C. (2005). Classrooms as learning communities: What is in it for schools? London: Routledge.

[38]. Wittmann,G.,&Olivier,J. (2019). Professional development in fostering self-directed learning in German second additional language teachers.A journal for language Learning 35(3),125-142

[39]. Yasmin, M &Sohail, A. | (2018) Socio-cultural barriers in promoting learner autonomy in Pakistani universities: English teachers' beliefs, Cogent Education, 5:1, 1501888

[40]. Zhou, M. (2015). Learning Theories Molly Y. Zhou David Brown. Education.