

**EVALUATING LIVE NON-FORMAL EDUCATIONAL
PROGRAMMES ON RADIO NIGERIA NETWORK - CIPP
EVALUATION MODEL IN PRACTICE**

Nkemdilim Patrick Ijeh

Department of Mass Communication, Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University,
Abraka, Delta State, Nigeria.
Email: poni716@yahoo.com, ijehnp@delsu.edu.ng

ABSTRACT: Educational radio programmes have been successful in promoting education in different fields. Radio Nigeria Network aired Focus and Consumer Speaks as live non-formal educational radio programmes from 2012 to 2016. This study attempted to find out how educational the objectives, production procedures and contents of these programmes were and what impact they had on listeners from the perspective of the CIPP Evaluation Model. The study adopted ex post facto design and generated data through in-depth interview, content analysis and survey, which were analyzed with explanation building technique, simple percentages, mean scores and standard deviations. Findings indicate that the programmes had clearly defined educational objectives and that their production procedures/inputs conformed to educational criteria except for the transmission of Consumer Speaks at odd hours. The programmes' contents met standard content specifications for educational radio programmes significantly and they recorded high impact in the cognitive and affective levels of learning among listeners. The study recommends continued use of live non-formal educational radio programmes to promote education because of the high level of interactivity that they provide. Educational broadcasters should also keep the components of CIPP Evaluation Model in mind while planning their programmes to enhance effectiveness and avoid transmissions at odd hours.

Keywords: *Educational Radio Programmes, Non-Formal Education, Audience, Interactivity, Evaluation Model*

INTRODUCTION

Radio emerged as a non-commercial venture with educational broadcasting as a major non-commercial function with many early radio stations started by educational institutions (Gross, 2000). Educational broadcasting started in Nigeria in 1933 when the West African Overseas Service of British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) transmitted educational radio programmes. This revealed the potentials of radio in education in the country and the colonial government was urged to introduce educational radio into schools (Nwamadi, 1988). Educational broadcasting is the dissemination of instructional messages through radio/television to the audience to enlighten, develop and improve its knowledge in specific knowledge fields (Nwabueze, Ugwonno, and Ngomsor, 2012). Educational broadcasting is also deliberate conceptualization, development, production, and transmission of educational radio/television programmes that facilitate learning (Nkom, 2000). It covers the three domains of knowledge viz: formal; informal; and non-formal

(Anaeto, 2006). Formal educational broadcasts dwell on classroom-based subjects derived from prescribed syllabuses while informal programmes dwell on everyday society-based issues. Non-formal educational broadcasts dwell on utility and/or skill-based knowledge that require planning and co-ordination such as functional/remedial/continuing literacy and vocational/aesthetic/cultural/civic education outside the regular classrooms (Oladapo, 2008; Osokoya, 2008; Adejo, 2006; Ogbebor, 1997).

Educational radio broadcasts have been used to improve literacy in different parts of the world. Ojebode and Sonibare (2004) report that radio was used to teach children in Europe as early as the 1920's and in the United States in the 1940's, while in Nigeria, the then Nigerian Broadcasting Service, Ibadan, (now the Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria [FRCN] Ibadan), in the late 1960's and 1970's, featured programmes that were designed to teach classroom subjects. Many countries including Nigeria; India; Japan; Kenya; Togo; Cuba; Tanzania; Australia; Thailand; Nicaragua; Columbia; Niger Republic; Cote D'Ivoire and El Salvador have recorded instances where educational radio programmes successfully taught Mathematics; English Language; better farming skills; healthcare practices; and lots more (Venniyoor, 2005; Ojebode and Sonibare, 2004; Aderinoye and Olajide, 2004; Onabajo, 2002; Christensen, 1985; Galda, 1984; Jenkins, 1981).

Non-formal educational radio programmes (the focus of this study) are expected to possess elements of educational criteria such as deliberate plans to impart knowledge and skills and influence behaviour; clarity of programme concept; specific objectives; guiding curriculum; audience-cum-learner centered contents; cumulative learning; recapitulation; interactivity/feedback; evaluation of learning; and exploring the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning (Anaeto, 2006; Adepoju & Abiona, 2004; Ojebode & Sonibare 2004; Fadare & Abu, 2004; Okediran & Momoh, 2004; Ogunranti, 1988; Kemp & Dayton, 1985). This study evaluated *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks*, which were live non-formal educational programmes aired on the network service of Radio Nigeria (2012-2016), against the above yardsticks to see how they fit in.

Statement of the Problem

Educational radio broadcasting has attracted research attention. Anaeto (2006) focuses on community participation in educational broadcasting through community radio, while Oyinloye and Adeleye (2010) reveal that the issues of instructional strategy, good planning, proper timing of transmission, and collaboration with classroom teachers are vital for effective educational radio programming. The Commonwealth Education Media Centre for Asia (Cemca) points out that appropriate research input is an essential requirement for the success of any educational media project - including educational radio programmes (Cemca, 2011).

The above studies provide useful insights on educational broadcasting on radio generally but did not evaluate specific live non-formal educational radio programmes (like *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* - two live non-formal educational programmes of Radio Nigeria Network from 2012 to 2016) from the perspectives of the CIPP Evaluation Model. Were the objectives of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* consistent with standard objectives of educational radio programmes? Did the

programmes' production procedures conform to the criteria for producing educational radio programmes? To what extent did *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* meet the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes? In what ways have the programmes impacted on listeners? These questions indicate gaps in knowledge that this evaluation of live non-formal educational programmes on Radio Nigeria Network from the perspectives of the CIPP Evaluation Model attempted to fill.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are to:

1. find out how the objectives of the selected programmes were consistent with standard objectives of educational radio programmes.
2. find out how the production procedures of the selected programmes conformed to the criteria for producing educational radio programmes.
3. find out to what extent the selected programmes met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes.
4. Find out the impact of the selected programmes on the audience.

Research Questions

The research questions for the study are:

1. How were the objectives of the selected programmes consistent with standard objectives of educational radio programmes?
2. How did the production procedures of the selected programmes conform to the criteria for producing educational radio programmes?
3. To what extent did the selected programmes meet the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes?
4. What impact did the selected programmes have on the audience?

These research questions were developed to suit the components of the CIPP Evaluation Model. CIPP is an acronym for Context; Input; Process; Product (Johnson, 2012) and the research questions aligned with components of the model as follows: Context Evaluation = Research Question 1; Input Evaluation = Research Question 2; Process Evaluation = Research Question 3; Product Evaluation = Research Question 4.

Delimitation of the Study

This study is delimited to the evaluation of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* (on Radio Nigeria Network) against the yardstick of educational radio programmes. The study is also delimited to Oyo State, which has a relatively appreciable radio listening culture.

Evaluation in Educational Broadcasting

Evaluation is generally seen as the organized process of determining the worth or true nature of something. In the words of Ogunmilade (1984:115) “Evaluation, basically is the act of finding the value of the amount of, or determining the quality or worth of something”. It happens at intermittent stages in a systematic approach intended to improve interventions (formative evaluation) or the final stage intended to make a judgment about the worth and effectiveness of a process (summative evaluation) (Eseryel, 2002). This view is corroborated by Ayodele, Adegbile and Adewale (2009) and Adegbile (2004), who cite Akin’s definition of evaluation as the process of ascertaining the decisions to be made, selecting related information and analyzing it in order to report summary data useful to decision makers in selecting among alternatives. Evaluation therefore requires information gathering, data analysis, and drawing conclusions about phenomena. It therefore affords scholars the opportunity to make valid judgments about process with clearly identified yardsticks. Evaluation is basically about making judgments on how well something is or has been done. It provides a basis for deciding how well an educational endeavour has achieved its objectives (Akanbi, 1988).

An evaluation of the selected educational programmes on the Radio Nigeria Network will help determine the degree of programmes’ conformity to educational criteria; the input processes that go into their production; levels of programmes’ effectiveness and how they can be improved. Evaluating educational programmes of Radio Nigeria Network will ascertain their viability given the prospects of using the station for educational purposes, especially as it is the only national radio network in Nigeria.

Live Non-Formal Educational Broadcasting on Radio Nigeria Network

Live radio programmes are transmitted simultaneously as they are produced so that there is no time lag for content editing and modification. These programmes allow for audience-participation through phone calls, text messages, emails and social media posts and therefore accommodate instant interactivity between programme presenters and audience. Non-formal educational broadcasting, according to UNICEF, is the use of radio (and television) to deliver organized knowledge outside the school system, whether operating separately or as an important feature for some broader activities that are intended to serve identifiable objectives (Akintayo & Kester, 2004). They deal with skill acquisition and specialized knowledge on defined issues of social significance that require specific course of actions such as healthcare, political participation, consumer protection and lots more.

Radio Nigeria was launched in the late seventies and is owned and operated by Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria. It is the only national public radio network in the country and its programmes are transmitted across the country in 15 languages with the aim of serving a diverse variety of listeners (Radio Nigeria 2018). The station is a viable medium for educational broadcasting in Nigeria which is vital for improvements in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor levels of learning of Nigerians in all domains.

The station offered two live non-formal educational programmes (*Focus* and *Consumer Speaks*). The programmes contained education element identified by Ojebode and Sonibare (2004) as deliberate plan to impart knowledge/skills to influence behaviour. They also possessed elements of educational criteria such as clarity of programme concept; specific objectives; guiding curricula; audience-cum-learner centered contents; cumulative learning; recapitulation; interactivity/feedback; evaluation of learning; and exploring the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning (Anaeto, 2006; Adepoju and Abiona, 2004; Fadare and Abu, 2004; Okediran and Momoh, 2004; Ogunranti, 1988; Kemp and Dayton, 1985). An overview of the two programmes is presented below:

Focus: This programme was a live 30-minute programme transmitted on the network service of *Radio Nigeria* from 2:30pm to 3pm on Tuesday. The programme's format was a combination of narrative; vox pop; discussion; testimonial; and question-and-answer via live phone-in and SMS. The programme was introduced by the presenter as an educative and enlightening programme designed to ensure that electoral processes in Nigeria go in the right direction. *Focus* was sponsored by the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and was on air from 2012 up till 2016.

Consumer Speaks: This programme was introduced by the presenter as a programme that "... educates you on your rights and responsibilities as a consumer". The programme was jointly sponsored by the Consumer Protection Council (CPC) and the Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON). It was a live 30-minute programme aired from 8:30am to 9am on Wednesdays from 2012 up till 2016 and presented in segments of narratives; vox pop; discussions; and question-and-answer through live phone-in and live SMS.

These programmes were deliberately tailored to the specific fields of knowledge which pass for respective curricula and were intended to inform, educate and/or direct listeners on specific social subjects to enable them gain knowledge, skills and abilities. Furthermore, the knowledge, skills and abilities gained by listeners could be measured from live interactivity and feedback which they accommodate.

Theoretical Framework - Cipp Evaluation Model

CIPP Evaluation Model was developed by Stufflebeam and is an acronym of four levels of evaluation viz: Context evaluation; Input evaluation; Process evaluation; and Product evaluation (Johnson, 2012; Educational Technology, 2012; Payne, 1994). The model represents a multi-faceted evaluation which can be individual or collective and provides useful insights into the philosophies, activities and effectiveness of selected programmes to measure their true worth. Context evaluation examines and describes the situation leading to the production of the selected programmes to help us understand the phenomenon. Context evaluation of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* focused on their planning decisions such as audience needs assessment and definition of programmes' objectives. The CIPP Evaluation Model Checklist for context evaluation is "What needs to be done?" (Stufflebeam, 2007:1). This examined the extent to which the planning environment of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* such as audience needs assessment, goal setting,

curricula, personnel, sponsorship, production technology and other available resources affected their conceptualizations and definition of objectives. This is the thrust of Research Question 1.

Input evaluation centred on “How should it be done?” (Stufflebeam, 2007:1). This focused on description of programmes inputs and other resources that were actually engaged in programmes’ developments and productions. Here, the selected programmes’ were examined for content generation; programmes’ strategies, formats, durations; and time of broadcast. This led to Research Question 2. The checklist for process evaluation is “Is it being done?” (Stufflebeam’s, 2007:1). Here, the study focused on presentation strategies such as transmission, level of interactivity and audience accessibility and how execution helped to keep programmes’ contents educational. This is the interest of Research Question 3. Product evaluation centred on: “Did it succeed?” (Stufflebeam, 2007:1). This focused on the achievement of the objectives of the selected programmes. It examined the specific ways that the programmes have affected the audience at the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning. This is the kernel of Research Question 4.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted the ex post facto research design with in-depth interview, content analysis and survey research methods. In-depth interview provided data to answer research questions 1 and 2 (corroborated with content analysis and survey data), while contents analysis and survey provided data to answer research questions 3 and 4 respectively. This triangulation (combination of research methods) enabled the study to evaluate the selected programmes from different perspectives. The population for the study comprised all episodes of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks*, as well as their producers and listeners. The sample for this study is as follows:

In-depth Interview: 2 respondents (1 producer for each of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks*).

Survey: 1500 respondents (500 listeners from each of Oyo, Ogbomosho and Ibadan towns in Oyo State.

Content Analysis: 12 episodes of the two selected programmes (six episodes per programme).

One producer each of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* was purposively selected for in-depth interview, while the episodes of the programmes for content analysis were randomly selected by blind balloting. Cluster random sampling was used to select Oyo, Ogbomosho and Ibadan from Oyo Central, Oyo North and Oyo South Senatorial Districts respectively, while purposive sampling was used to select the 500 listeners of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks* on Radio Nigeria Network from each of the three towns.

The study adopted explanation building technique, which discerned convergence and divergence in relation to relevant central themes based on objectives of the study, to analyze qualitative data. Quantitative data were analyzed with Mean Score and Standard Deviation with Decisions Rules adapted from Nworgu (2006) as follows:

Mean Score: Where Computed Mean is “equal to” or “less than” Benchmark Mean, outcome is NEGATIVE; and Where Computed Mean is “greater than” Benchmark Mean, outcome is POSITIVE. Benchmark Mean: Table 3 = 50% of Aggregate Mean ($4.63 \div 2 = 2.32$); Tables 4-5 = Sum of Response Values \div Number of Response Categories ($[4+3+2+1] \div 4 = 2.50$).

Standard Deviation: High Mean and Low or Moderate Standard Deviation indicates POSITIVE OUTCOME, while Low Mean and Low or Moderate Standard Deviation indicates NEGATIVE OUTCOME.

Data Analysis

Research Question 1: *How were the objectives of the selected programmes consistent with standard objectives of educational radio programmes?*

In-depth interview served as major data source for answering Research Question 1, corroborated by content analysis. The objectives of each of the programmes and how they relate to education are examined below.

FOCUS: The producer of *Focus* revealed that its objectives were primarily ‘... to enable the electorate to know its rights and responsibilities in the electoral system in Nigeria and to help the electorate understand the power of votes’ and ‘... to inculcate a sense of public accountability among elected public political office holders and by so doing, getting the electoral processes in Nigeria on the right path’. What this means is that *Focus* educated listeners on their rights and duties during elections and what to do to improve electoral process in the country. This explored the three levels of education which are “to inform”; “to teach”; and “to direct” listeners on well-defined electoral issues with the aim of building their knowledge base, shaping their attitudes, and mobilizing them for action.

Content analysis confirmed that *Focus* was guided by the above objectives as every episode was introduced thus: ‘*Focus* is an educative and enlightening programme by INEC and it is aimed at ensuring that our electoral system moves in the right path’. In pursuit of this objective, the programme dwelt on evaluating past elections, contemporary electoral issues and previewed upcoming elections to educate Nigerians on what had been done well, what went/was wrong, and what to do in the circumstances. Another good example of evidence of objectives in the programme was the sponsor’s message which was repeated in each episode thus:

Play your parts well. Do the right thing. Show interest in the activities of those you elected into office. Surely you deserve good governance. Keep an eye on electoral events around you both at the national and state levels. Keep your voter’s card safe. Use it truthfully any time the need arises. Nigeria is your country. It is your right to enjoy democracy.

Content analysis revealed that episodes of the programme handled the following topics: ‘How far with the Mandate’; ‘When Do You Recall Your Elected Representatives?’; ‘Are You Reaping

the Dividend of Democracy?'; 'Is Election a 'Do-or-Die' Affair?' and Special appearance by the Chairman of INEC. The foregoing analysis shows that the objectives of *Focus* were consistent with educational radio programmes.

CONSUMER SPEAKS: The main objective of *Consumer Speaks*, according to the producer was to '... educate consumers on what to expect from goods and services they consume' and to '... enlighten members of the public on the consequences of consuming substandard goods and services'. The objectives of the programme also included influencing consumers to shun substandard goods and services, and acquainting them with steps in seeking redress when they are dubiously misled to procure substandard goods and services.

The above objectives were discernible from content analysis. *Consumer Speaks* was introduced as a programme with the intention of enlightening listeners on their rights and responsibilities as consumers of goods and services. A clear indication that its objectives included educating listeners on how to avoid consuming substandard goods and services was seen in two sponsors' jingle/messages relayed in each episode. The jingle/messages read:

JINGLE:

<u>Lead vocalist</u>	<u>Response</u>
<i>No paddy for jungle:</i>	<i>Look well well.</i>
<i>Before you buy O:</i>	<i>Look well well.</i>
<i>No be everything wey glitter na im be gold.</i>	
<i>Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON) dey say!!</i>	<i>Look well well.</i>
<i>Because substandard fit cause accident.</i>	
<i>SON dey say!</i>	<i>Look well well.</i>

MESSAGE AFTER JINGLE

Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON) don ready to stop all substandard product for we country. If you see or suspect any substandard product, call the SON office wey near you or any of these numbers wey I dey give you now: 08127751226, 08152790097-8.

Standard Organization of Nigeria ... Improving life through standards!!!

MESSAGE 2

Have you ever seen money fall with rain? So when you spend your hard earned money for a product or service, you want to get your money's worth but some like to play smart with other people's money. You pay for one thing and they give you another. You agree on one thing and then they do something else. When you ask for a refund or the actual product or service you agreed on, they just treat you like a fool and play on your intelligence. Big companies, small companies, landlords and even government agencies are sometimes guilty of this. If you find yourself in this situation, you are not powerless. All you need to do is lodge a complaint with the Consumer Protection Council (CPC) and the matter will be quickly resolved. Remember, if you don't complain, we can't help you and if they get away with it, they will do it to someone else. Nevertheless, you do have a duty to be very watchful before committing your money. Contact CPC on 08056003030, 08056002020 or email at cpcnigeria@yahoo.co.uk.

CPC!!! Protecting the interest of the consumers.

These sponsored jingle/messages from SON and CPC portrayed the core objectives of the programme as protecting consumers in the country and urging all to join the fight against fake and substandard products and services. Furthermore, content analysis revealed that different episodes of *Consumer Speaks* focused on different issues of consumption of goods and services viz: 'Consumer Use of Mobile Phones'; 'Cashless Society and the Consumer'; 'Product Labeling'; 'Standard Organization of Nigeria Conformity Assessment Programme [SONCAP]'; 'Efficient Use of Energy'; and a special episode that dwelt on responding to general comments from listeners and addressing unresolved issues brought before the CPC. This indicates that *Consumer Speaks* had predetermined educational objectives which were consistent with educational radio programmes.

Research Question 2: How did the production procedures of the selected programmes conform to the criteria for producing educational radio programmes?

The in-depth interview provided data to answer Research Question 2, corroborated with content analysis and survey data. Quantitative data emanating from the questionnaire were analyzed with standard deviation to measure the extent to which the responses of "Appropriateness" and "Non-appropriateness" were different from the average (Moderate). The standard deviations were used to prove or disprove revelations from the in-depth interview and observations from content analysis. Production procedures evaluated here include audience needs assessment; content sourcing from curricula; backgrounders; appropriate personnel; interactivity; feedback; transmission schedule; duration and programme format. The analyses of data to answer Research Question 2 are presented below for each selected programmes.

FOCUS: In-depth interview and content analysis data show that the inputs/procedures for the production of *Focus* rely heavily on audience needs assessment. According to the interviewee,

the programme's production procedure was people-oriented. What members of the public thought, said, knew and needed to know about the day's episode were considered seriously in every episode. As a live programme, listeners were encouraged to phone-in and send SMS while *Focus* was on air and the feedback was incorporated into the programme where necessary. This interactivity between studio personnel and audience was clearly observed in content analysis, which reveals that *Focus* was produced with a combination of narratives presenting research-based backgrounder; discussion; vox pop; question-and-answer via live phone-in and SMS; and sponsored specialized messages. This pot-pourri of radio programme formats, according to the interviewee, '... help to create a variety of message delivery channels and prevent monotony'.

The choice of time of transmission (2.30 PM) and duration of 30 minutes were described as a good input decisions by the producer thus: 'At 2.30PM, many people in Nigeria are still at work but being a programme with political orientation, it is easily listened to jointly in groups by people who share ideas on the subject of the day's episode as the programme is on air even in their offices or shops'. This was said to have enhanced its use to improve electorate education in Nigeria. The fact that the programme lasted for 30 minutes was also claimed to make it good for educational purpose.

Another production procedure of *Focus* related to education was the resort to a guiding curriculum. According to the producer, decisions on the contents of the programme emanated from non-formal curricula based on electoral laws; election timetables; significant developments in the electoral process in Nigeria; as well as previews and reviews of specific elections. Topics were scheduled into a work plan to cover a period of time. The input in *Focus* also involved the use of guests with relevant competencies in electoral issues in Nigeria such as the Chairman of INEC; independent election monitors; key members of civil society groups; lawyers and public analysts among others. This was clearly observed in the content analysis.

The above revelations were corroborated by the standard deviations computed from audience perception of its needs assessment; programme format; transmission time; and programme duration as indicated by responses to the questionnaire (See Table 1 in Appendix). The standard deviations indicate that the production of *Focus* incorporated appropriate audience needs assessment, good programme format, good timing of transmission and programme duration with high mean scores (and corresponding low standard deviations) of 4.04 (1.02); 3.53 (1.14); 3.79 (1.07); and 3.72 (0.99) respectively. Arising from the foregoing, this study concludes that the procedures for the production of *Focus* adequately conformed to the criteria for the production of educational radio programmes.

CONSUMER SPEAKS: An interview with a producer of *Consumer Speaks* revealed that the programme relied on audience needs assessment to determine what issues to handle in every episode. According to him, the programme '... is transmitted live and accommodates a phone-in segment where listeners' comments help to determine what they need to know'. Listeners were encouraged to register their complaints through phone calls, SMS and email any time and these served as audience needs assessment. This interactive phone-in segments and pre/post programme transmission complaints were observed in the content analysis of the programme.

The production procedure of *Consumer Speaks*, according to the producer, combined research-based backgrounder narratives; discussion; vox pop; question-and-answer via live phone-in and SMS; a jingle and two sponsored specialized messages. This pot-pourri of programme formats, clearly seen from the content analysis, according to the producer, helped to introduce variety into message delivery approaches which made it interesting. The production procedure of the programme also incorporated a guiding curriculum derived from laws and conventions bordering on consumer protection, faking of products and fraudulent business dealings, in addition to emergent issues from vox pop and feedback SMS, phone calls and emails from listeners. There was also the input of relevant personnel as guests on every episode of the programme. This claim is corroborated by the content analysis where it was observed that all the episodes evaluated featured personnel from CPC. With regards to transmission time and duration, the producer opined that 8.30AM was a good enough time for the programme's transmission and that 30-minutes duration was appropriate to adequately educate listeners on their rights as consumers, and how to seek redress when such rights are violated.

The above revelations were however partly corroborated by computed standard deviations of audience responses to the questionnaire (See Table 2 in Appendix). The quantitative data from the survey indicate that levels of audience needs assessment, format, and the duration of *Consumer Speaks* are appropriate for education with high mean and low standard deviations of 3.92 (1.04), 3.63 (1.13) and 3.58 (0.92) respectively but that the time of transmission of the programme (8.30 AM on Wednesdays) was not appropriate with a low mean score of 2.35 and low standard deviation of 1.50. The listeners claimed that 8:30AM on Wednesdays was too early in the morning of a working day for people to follow the programme adequately as they were still on the way to their respective places of work/business or just settling down. The study therefore concludes that production procedures of *Consumer Speaks* adequately conform to the criteria for the production of educational radio programmes in audience needs assessment, programme format and programme duration but not in the timing of transmission at 8.30AM on Wednesdays.

Research Question 3: *To what extent did the selected programmes meet the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes?*

Answers to Research Question 3 came solely from content analysis data measuring levels of needs assessment; reliance on curriculum; depth of education; cumulative learning; interactivity; use of recapitulations; accommodation of feedback mechanism and incorporation of evaluation device which were analyzed with mean scores for the selected programmes (See Table 3 in Appendix). The analysis is discussed below for each programme against benchmark mean of 2.32.

FOCUS: Mean scores for content ratings of *Focus* in Table 3 indicate that it met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes more than *Consumer Speaks* with an aggregate mean of 3.22 against a benchmark mean of 2.32. The programme fared well in reliance on guiding curriculum (3.67 out of 4 [91.8%]) and depth of instruction (2.67 out of 3 [89%]). *Focus* was sponsored by INEC and that significantly streamlined issues handled on the programme. The depth of instruction also adequately touched the three levels of education (i.e.

inform-educate-direct). All episodes of *Focus* content-analyzed significantly informed listeners about elections, educated them on what to do, and directed them to show interest in government activities. The programme accommodated vox pop and live text-in segments which scored it high in interactivity (4.10 out of 5 [82%]).

Focus also sufficiently met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes in cumulative learning (4.04 out of 5 [80.8%]); use of recapitulations (4.00 out of 5 [80%]); presence of backgrounder (3.50 out of 5 [70%]); and accommodation of feedback mechanism (3.48 out of 5 [69.6%]). Cumulative learning provided links among episodes as observed in five out of the six episodes content-analyzed ('How Far with the Mandate?'; 'When Do You Recall Your Elected Representative?'; 'Are You Reaping the Dividend of Democracy?'; and two consecutive episodes on 'Is Election a 'Do-or-Die' Affair?'). Each episode was linked to the following episode by the moderator's closing announcement of the next topic. The day's topic was repeated severally and the sponsor's message relayed twice in each episode, and this recapitulation helped to keep the objectives of the programme in focus to drive home the core messages. Provision for feedback scored 3.48 out of 5 (69.6%) as a phone number through which listeners could register their questions, complaints and contributions even after the programme was announced. However, the programme scored low in the incorporation of evaluation devices with a score of 0.33 out of 5 (6.6%). Only 1 of the episodes content-analyzed ('Is Election a 'Do-or-Die' Affair?') posed an evaluative question to the listeners on the day's topic. Nevertheless, *Focus* clearly met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes.

CONSUMER SPEAKS: *Consumer Speaks* aggregate mean score of 3.10 against a benchmark mean of 2.32 indicates that it significantly met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes. The programme scored the maximum points of 4 out of 4 for reliance on guiding curriculum and 3 out of 3 on depth of education. These are followed by accommodation of feedback mechanism (4.44 out of 5 [88.8%]) and interactivity (4.41 out of 5 [88.6%]). The programme was jointly sponsored by SON and CPC and this streamlined its contents to the objectives of these agencies. *Consumer Speaks* was very good at the three levels of education (informing; teaching; and directing). All episodes content-analyzed contained information about fake and substandard goods/services, educated listeners on how to identify them and directed them on what to do about them. These episodes focused on 'Consumer Use of Mobile Phones'; 'Cashless Society and the Consumer'; 'Product Labeling'; 'Standard Organization of Nigeria Conformity Assessment Programme'; 'Efficient Use of Energy' and a special episode which dwelt on responding to general comments from listeners and addressing unresolved issues brought before CPC.

The feedback and interactivity levels of *Consumer Speaks* were also appreciably high because it was a live programme with phone-in segment and vox pop. The high levels of interactivity and feedback in *Consumer Speaks* (4.44 out of 5 [88.8%] and 4.43 out of 5 [88.6%] respectively) enabled the moderator and guests on the programme to decipher what the listeners knew and needed to know about topics of the programme. *Consumer Speaks* also scored well in the presence of backgrounder with a score of 3.92 out of 5 representing 78.4%. The level of recapitulation was also high at 3.67 out of 5 (73.4%) because in addition to the repetition of the topic of discussion, two sponsors' messages were relayed in each of the episodes content-

analyzed. The programme however scored 0 in the area of evaluation. None of the episodes evaluated contained questions to assess the level of listeners' learning from the programme. This notwithstanding, *Consumer Speaks* significantly met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes.

Research Question 4: *What impact did the selected programmes have on the audience?*

Answers to Research Question 4 were derived solely from the analysis of data emanating from listeners responses to the questionnaire items that measured levels of impact of the two programmes on the audience with mean scores against the benchmark mean of 2.50 (See Tables 4 and 5 in Appendix). The outcomes of the survey data analysis are presented for each programme below:

FOCUS: Data on the impact of *Focus* (Table 4 in Appendix) indicates that it had significant and marginal impact on listeners. Significant impact was observed in its enriching audience' knowledge on electoral issues (3.17); enabling them to enlighten others on electoral issues (3.15); influencing them to correct their impression on specific electoral issues (3.11); reinforcing their notions of electoral issues (3.09); and educating them to appreciate the electoral environment in Nigeria (3.08). On the other hand, data indicated marginal impact in persuading listeners to participate in electoral activities (2.78) and influencing them to improve relationship with persons involved in the electoral processes (2.74). The marginal impact of *Focus* is attributable to listeners' response that they were selective in imbibing the programme's content because it dwelt on elections and politicians – two issues that many of them reportedly lacked interest in. Some respondents claim that since Radio Nigeria Network is government-owned, whatsoever it had to say about elections would be pro-government and that electoral irregularities were mainly perpetrated by the ruling party with the connivance of INEC (sponsors of *Focus*). Nevertheless, the overall impact of *Focus* was significant with an aggregate mean of 3.02 against the benchmark mean of 2.50.

CONSUMER SPEAKS: Table 5 (Appendix) indicates that *Consumer Speaks* had significant impact on listeners in all areas with mean scores well above 2.50 benchmark as it enriched listeners' knowledge on consumer rights and consumer protection (3.37); enabled them to enlighten others on related consumer rights and consumer protection (3.20); corrected their impression on specific issues related to consumer rights and consumer protection (3.17); and reinforced their notions of consumer rights and consumer protection (3.07). Listeners were also influenced to insist on their rights as consumers in relation to issues treated in the programme (3.28); appreciate the plight of consumers and persons involved in safeguarding consumer rights and ensuring consumer protection (3.24); and improving relationship with persons involved in safeguarding consumer rights and ensuring consumer protection (3.22). Overall, the impact of *Consumer Speaks* on listeners is significant with an aggregate mean of 3.22 against the benchmark mean of 2.50.

Discussion of Findings

It was observed from listeners' responses to the demographic items in the questionnaire that a link exists between programmes' intellectual profile and the educational level of listeners. This is because majority of the respondents (84.5%) had post secondary education. This corroborates the postulation by Ojebode and Adegbola (2010) that educated people are more likely to listen to educational programmes than illiterates and that the higher the educational attainment of people, the higher their tendency to tune in to educational programmes on radio.

Answers to research questions in this study indicate that the two programmes of Radio Nigeria Network evaluated have clearly defined educational objectives. This was revealed by context evaluation under CIPP Evaluation Model which examined the situations in which the radio programmes were conceived and developed with "What needs to be done?" (Stufflebeam, 2007:1). The model indicates that successful educational radio programmes must be based on clearly defined objectives (Nkom, 2000) and this is true of *Focus* and *Consumer Speaks*. The objectives of the selected programmes show that the programmes were deliberately designed to impart knowledge and skills, and to influence behaviour, and these, according to Ojebode and Sonibare (2004) make them consistent with the standard objectives of educational radio programmes.

The study reveals that the procedures adopted in the productions and presentations of the programmes selected for this study were tilted towards education from input evaluation checklist of "How should it be done?" in the CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam, 2007:1). This examined production procedures such as content generation; programmes' strategies/formats, durations as well as programmes' scheduling (time of broadcast). Findings indicate that the two programmes were produced with a combination of narratives, discussions, vox pop, testimonials, question-and-answer, jingles, and sponsored specialized messages. Audience needs assessments were also major inputs in their production, while they lasted for 30 minutes. However, listeners complained that the transmission of *Consumer Speaks* at 8:30 AM on Wednesdays was too early in the morning of a working day. This upholds the submission by Oyinloye and Adeleye (2010) that a major problem with educational radio in Nigeria is the transmission of educational programmes at odd hours.

Findings in this study equally indicate that the contents of the two programmes evaluated significantly met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes as both of them accommodated instant interactions with listeners through live phone-in and SMS. The programmes also met educational radio programmes' content specifications in the areas of needs assessment; reliance on guiding curricula; depth of education; cumulative learning; use of recapitulations; and provision for feedback mechanism. However, only *Focus* contained minimal element of evaluation. The assessment here was from Process Evaluation checklist of 'Is it being done?' (Stufflebeam, 2007:1).

The evaluation of the impact of selected programmes on listeners falls under Product Evaluation checklist of 'Did it succeed?' (Stufflebeam, 2007:1). Listeners to the two programmes reported that the impact of the programmes on them were very significant at the cognitive, affective and

psychomotor domains of learning. The two live non-formal educational radio programmes of Radio Nigeria Network evaluated in this study were deliberately designed to build knowledge of facts, relations, rules and principles of one kind or another into the mind of listeners hence they succeeded in achieving learning outcomes (Nkom, 2000; Oroka, 1990) and qualify as part of what Onabajo (2000) describes as the management of learning.

Conclusion

This study set out to find out how the objectives of the selected educational programmes on Radio Nigeria Network were consistent with the standard objectives of educational radio programmes and to find out the extent to which the programmes' production procedures conformed to the production criteria of educational radio programmes. The study equally enquired into how much contents of selected educational programmes conformed to the standard content specifications of the educational programmes on radio and their impact on listeners.

The findings indicated that programmes, which were evaluated along the lines of the CIPP Evaluation Model, were predicated on clearly defined educational objectives and that these objectives were consistent with the standard objectives of educational radio programmes. The findings also revealed that the procedures/inputs adopted in the production and presentations of the programmes were in line with the criteria for the production of educational radio programmes except in the transmission of *Consumer Speaks* at odd hours. The actual contents of the programmes met the standard content specifications for educational radio programmes significantly. However, only *Focus* incorporated minimal evaluation mechanism. Lastly, the selected programmes recorded significant impact in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor levels of learning among listeners.

Recommendations

The study makes the following recommendations:

1. There should be continued use of live non-formal educational radio programmes to promote cognition, attitude formation, and behaviour modifications in the country because of the high level of interactivity that they provide;
2. Educational broadcasters should keep the components of CIPP Evaluation Model in mind during planning, production and transmission to enhance effectiveness of educational broadcasting in Nigeria;
3. Educational broadcasters should enhance their programmes' effectiveness by avoiding transmission at odd hours;
4. Educational broadcasters should keep to the 30 minutes time frame for their programmes;
5. Educational broadcasters should adequately incorporate educational criteria such as guiding curricula; recapitulations; interactivity; cumulative learning; feedback and evaluation devices into their programmes to enhance their effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- Adegbile, J. A. (2004). Applicability of the Various Strands derived from Alkin's Definition of Evaluation to an Educational Programme. In Obemeata, J. O. and Okwilagwe, E. A. (Eds). *A handbook on evaluation research*. Ibadan: Pen Services. Pp 12-21.
- Adejo, O. (2006). Educational Planning for Community Development. In Babalola, J. B.; Ayeni, A. O.; Adedeji, S. O.; Suleiman, A. A.; and Arikewuyo, M. O. (Eds). *Educational management, thoughts and practices*. Ibadan: Codat Publications. Pp 108-140.
- Adepoju, T. and Abiona, I. A. (2004). Evaluation of Radio Literacy Programmes. *Literacy by Radio (Special Edition of International Journal of Literacy Education)* 1.1: Pp 47-53.
- Aderinoye, R. A. and Olajide, O. E. (2004). Literacy by Radio: What Lessons can we Learn from other Countries? *Literacy by Radio (Special Edition of International Journal of Literacy Education)* 1.1: Pp 21-27.
- Akanbi, K. (1988). Systems Approach in Educational Technology. In Ogunranti, A. (Ed). *Problems and prospects of educational technology in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Institute of Education, University of Ibadan. Pp 60-71.
- Akintayo, M. O. and Kester, K. O. (2004). Concept and Merits of Non-Formal Education. *Literacy by Radio (Special Edition of International Journal of Literacy Education)* 1.1: Pp 1-5.
- Anaeto, S. G. (2006). Educational Broadcasting for Community Development: A Community Radio Approach. *Babcock Journal of Mass Communication* 1.1: Pp 11-21.
- Ayodele, S. O.; Adegbile, J. A; and Adewale, J. G. (2009) *Evaluation studies*. 2nd ed. Ibadan: Powerhouse.
- Christensen, P. R. (1985). The Radio Language Arts Project: Adapting the Radio Mathematics Model. *Development Communication Report* 48 (Featured in *Cover to Cover: Development Communication Report*. Pp 17-18).
- Commonwealth Education Media Centre for Asia (2011). Research in Educational Broadcasting. Retrieved April 20, 2011, from <http://www.cemca.org/books/Chapter%201.pdf>.
- Educational Technology (2012). General Evaluation Models. Retrieved May 17, 2012 from www.edtech.vt.edu/edtech/id/eval/eval_models.html.
- Eseryel, D. (2002). Approaches to Evaluation of Training Theory and Practice. *Educational Technology and Society* 5.2. Retrieved Jan. 5, 2011, from www.ifets.info/journals/5_2/esryel.html

- Fadare, B. and Abu, P. (2004). Effective Utilization of Radio for Literacy Delivery and Promotion in Nigeria. *Literacy by Radio (Special Edition of International Journal of Literacy Education)* 1.1: Pp 6-12.
- Galda, K. (1984). The Radio Mathematics Project: New Examples of Technology Transfer. *Development Communication Report* 45 (Featured in *Cover to Cover: Development Communication Report*. Pp 15-16).
- Gross, L. (2000). *Telecommunications: an introduction to electronic media*. 7th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Jenkins, J. (1981). Do Audiovisual Media Posses Unique Teaching Capabilities? *The Educational Use of the Mass Media – World Bank Staff Working Paper* 491: Pp 11-25
- Johnson, B. (2012). Lecture Two: Evaluation Models. Retrieved February 8, 2012 from www.southalabama.edu/coe/bset/johnson/660lectures/Lect.doc.
- Kemp, J. E. and Dayton, D. K. (1985). *Planning and producing instructional media*. 5th ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Nkom, A. A. (2000). *Instructional communication for effective teaching in university education*. Kaduna: BI-SHAAN Publishing.
- Nwabueze, C.; Ugonno, C.; and Ngomsor, B. (2012). Achieving Food Security in Nigeria through Educational Broadcasting. *Journal of Media and Aesthetics (Special Issue)* January 2012: Pp 47-58.
- Nwamadi, C. O. (1988). The Future of Educational Broadcasting in Nigeria. In Ogunranti, A. (Ed). *Problems and prospects of educational technology in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Institute of Education, University of Ibadan. Pp 256-265.
- Nworgu, B. G. (2006). *Educational research – basic issues and methodology*. 2nd ed. Enugu: University Trust Publishers.
- Ogbebor, G. G. (1997). *An introduction to psychology of learning*. 2nd ed. Ibadan: End Time Publishers.
- Ogunmilade, C. A. (1984). *Media in education*. Ile-Ife: University of Ile-Ife Press
- Ogunranti, A. (1988). Educational Technology and Curriculum Development. In Ogunranti, A. (Ed). *Problems and prospects of educational technology in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Institute of Education, University of Ibadan. Pp 96-117.

- Ojebode, A. and Sonibare, S. (2004). A Little more than a Strong Urge: an Investigation into the Influence of Radio Reading Programmes on Listeners' Practice of Reading. *West African Journal of Education* XXIV.1: Pp 79-89.
- , and Adegbola, T. (2010). *Engaging development: environment and content of radio broadcasting in Nigeria*. Ikeja: Institute for Media and Society and Panos Institute West Africa
- Okediran, A. and Momoh, M. (2004). Introduction to the Development of Radio Programme Guide in Literacy and Non-Formal Education. *Literacy by Radio (Special Edition of International Journal of Literacy Education)* 1.1: Pp 28-37.
- Oladapo, C. O. (2008). Millennium Development and Empowerment of Grassroots Women through Non-Formal Education in Nigeria: Situation Analysis. In Boucouvalas, M. and Aderinoye, R. (Eds) *Education for millennium development: essays in honour of Professor Michael Omolewa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books. Pp 93-103.
- Onabajo, O. (2000). *Principles of educational broadcasting* Palm Grove: Gabi Concept.
- Oroka, O. (1990). *The philosophy of education: an introduction*. Warri: International Publishers
- Osokoya, I. O. (2008). Towards Maximizing Women's Contributions to National Development through Education in Nigeria. In Boucouvalas, M. and Aderinoye, R. (Eds) *Education for millennium development: essays in honour of Professor Michael Omolewa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books. Pp 68-77.
- Oyinloye, G. O. and Adeleye, L. O. (2010). Impact of the Media on the Senior Secondary School Students Performance in Speech Work in English Language. Retrieved July 5, 2011, from <http://www.academicleadership.org/article/impact-of-the-media-on-the-senior-secondary-school-students-performance-in-speech-work-in-english-language>.
- Payne, D. A. (1994). *Designing educational project and program evaluation: a practical overview based on research and experience*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishing.
- Radio Nigeria (2018) Profile. Retrieved October 15, 2018 from <https://radio.org.ng/nigeria/>
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2007). CIPP Evaluation Model Checklist. 2nd ed. Retrieved May 17, 2012 from www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/cippchecklist_mar07.pdf.
- Venniyoor, S. (2005). Sound Schooling – Radio for Distance Education. Retrieved April 24, 2009, from <http://www.digitallearning.in/jan06/soundschool.asp>.

APPENDICES

Table 1: Computation of Standard Deviations for Audience Perception of Production Procedures of *Focus* from Responses to the Questionnaire

AUDIENCE NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN <i>FOCUS</i>						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X}-X$	$(\bar{X}-X)^2$	$f(\bar{X}-X)^2$
Very appropriate	5	130	650	0.96	0.9216	119.81
Appropriate	4	138	552	-0.04	0.0016	0.22
Moderate	3	41	123	-1.04	1.0816	44.35
Poor	2	22	44	-2.04	4.1616	91.56
Very poor	1	11	11	-3.04	9.2416	101.66
Σ		342	1380			357.60
$\bar{X} = 1380 \div 342 = 4.04$						
$SD = \frac{\sqrt{357.6}}{342} = 1.02$						
FORMAT OF <i>FOCUS</i>						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X}-X$	$(\bar{X}-X)^2$	$f(\bar{X}-X)^2$
Very appropriate	5	72	360	1.47	2.1609	155.59
Appropriate	4	117	468	0.47	0.2209	25.5
Moderate	3	102	306	-0.53	0.2809	28.65
Poor	2	22	44	-1.53	2.3409	51.50
Very poor	1	29	29	-2.53	6.4009	185.63
Σ		342	1207			447.22
$\bar{X} = 1207 \div 342 = 3.53$						
$SD = \frac{\sqrt{447.22}}{342} = 1.14$						
TIME OF TRANSMISSION OF <i>FOCUS</i>						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X}-X$	$(\bar{X}-X)^2$	$f(\bar{X}-X)^2$
Very appropriate	5	110	550	1.21	1.4641	161.05
Appropriate	4	96	384	0.21	0.0441	4.23
Moderate	3	102	306	-0.79	0.6241	63.66
Poor	2	22	44	-1.79	3.2041	70.49
Very poor	1	12	12	-2.79	7.7841	93.41
Σ		342	1296			392.84
$\bar{X} = 1296 \div 342 = 3.79$						
$SD = \frac{\sqrt{392.84}}{342} = 1.07$						

342						
DURATION OF FOCUS						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}$	$(\bar{X}-\bar{X})^2$	$f(\bar{X}-\bar{X})^2$
Very appropriate	5	80	400	1.28	1.6384	131.07
Appropriate	4	128	512	0.28	0.0784	10.04
Moderate	3	106	318	-0.72	0.5184	54.95
Poor	2	15	30	-1.72	2.9584	44.38
Very poor	1	13	13	-2.72	7.3984	96.18
Σ		342	1273			336.62
$\bar{X} = 1273 \div 342 = 3.72$						
$SD = \sqrt{\frac{336.62}{342}} = 0.99$						

Table 2: Computation of Standard Deviations for Audience Perception of Production Procedures of *Consumer Speaks* from Responses to the Questionnaire

AUDIENCE NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN CONSUMER SPEAKS						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}$	$(\bar{X}-\bar{X})^2$	$f(\bar{X}-\bar{X})^2$
Very appropriate	5	157	785	1.08	1.1664	183.13
Appropriate	4	178	712	0.08	0.0064	1.14
Moderate	3	101	303	-0.92	0.8464	86.49
Poor	2	13	26	-1.92	3.6864	47.92
Very poor	1	22	22	-2.92	8.5264	187.58
Σ		471	1848			506.26
$\bar{X} = 1848 \div 471 = 3.92$						
$SD = \sqrt{\frac{506.26}{471}} = 1.04$						
FORMAT OF CONSUMER SPEAKS						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}$	$(\bar{X}-\bar{X})^2$	$f(\bar{X}-\bar{X})^2$
Very appropriate	5	107	535	1.37	1.8769	200.83
Appropriate	4	178	712	0.37	0.1369	24.37
Moderate	3	133	399	-0.63	0.3969	52.79
Poor	2	9	18	-1.63	2.6569	23.91
Very poor	1	44	44	-2.63	6.9169	304.34
Σ		471	1708			606.24

$\bar{X} = 1708 \div 471 = 3.63$ $SD = \sqrt{\frac{606.24}{471}} = 1.13$						
TIME OF TRANSMISSION OF <i>CONSUMER SPEAKS</i>						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X} - \bar{X}$	$(\bar{X} - \bar{X})^2$	$f(\bar{X} - \bar{X})^2$
Very appropriate	5	39	195	2.65	7.0225	273.88
Appropriate	4	56	224	1.65	2.7225	152.46
Moderate	3	62	186	0.65	0.4225	26.20
Poor	2	188	376	-0.35	0.1225	23.03
Very poor	1	125	125	-1.35	1.8225	227.81
Σ		470	1106			703.38
$\bar{X} = 1106 \div 470 = 2.35$ $SD = \sqrt{\frac{707.38}{470}} = 1.50$						
DURATION OF <i>CONSUMER SPEAKS</i>						
RESPONSES	X	f	fX	$\bar{X} - \bar{X}$	$(\bar{X} - \bar{X})^2$	$f(\bar{X} - \bar{X})^2$
Very appropriate	5	88	440	1.42	2.0164	177.44
Appropriate	4	136	544	0.42	0.1764	24.00
Moderate	3	220	660	-0.58	0.3354	74.01
Poor	2	14	28	-1.58	2.4964	34.95
Very poor	1	13	13	-2.58	6.6564	86.53
Σ		471	1685			396.93
$\bar{X} = 1685 \div 471 = 3.58$ $SD = \sqrt{\frac{396.93}{471}} = 0.92$						

Table 3: Mean Scores of Selected Programmes for Educational Criteria from Content Analysis Data.

		EDUCATIONAL CRITERIA RATINGS OF SELECTED PROGRAMMES		
		Maximum Score	Focus	Consumer Speaks

S/n	OBSERVED EDUCATIONAL CRITERIA		Score	Score
1	Reliance on curriculum/defined issues	4	3.67	4.00
2	Presence of backgrounder	5	3.50	3.92
3	Depth of instruction	3	2.67	3.00
4	Cumulative learning	5	4.04	1.33
5	Interactivity	5	4.10	4.44
6	Use of recapitulations	5	4.00	3.67
7	Accommodation of feedback mechanism	5	3.48	4.43
8	Incorporation of evaluation device	5	0.33	0.00
TOTAL SCORES (Σ)		37	25.79	24.79
AGGREGATE MEAN SCORES ($\Sigma \div 8$)		4.63	3.22	3.10

Table 4: Computation of Aggregate Mean of Impact Level of *Focus* on Listeners from Responses to the Questionnaire

s/n	POSSIBLE IMPACT	IMPACT RESPONSE VALUES								Σf	Σfx	\bar{X}
		SA: X=4		S: X=3		D: X=2		SD: X=1				
		f	fx	f	fx	f	fx	f	fx			
1	Enriched listeners' knowledge	90	360	221	663	31	62	0	0	342	1085	3.17
2	Listeners enlightened others	124	496	166	498	31	62	21	21	342	1077	3.15
3	Listeners corrected impression	104	416	186	558	39	78	13	13	342	1065	3.11
4	Reinforced listeners notions	83	332	207	621	52	104	0	0	342	1057	3.09
5	Listeners participate in electoral process	72	288	166	498	62	124	42	42	342	952	2.78

6	Listeners appreciated electoral process	114	456	166	498	37	74	25	25	342	1053	3.08
7	Listeners improved relationship with persons involved in electoral process	62	248	166	498	76	152	38	38	342	936	2.74
Σ										2394	7225	
<p>Aggregate $\bar{X} = \Sigma(\Sigma fx) \div \Sigma(\Sigma f) = 7225 \div 2394 = 3.02$</p>												

Table 5: Computation of Aggregate Mean of Impact Level of *Consumer Speaks* on Listeners from Responses to the Questionnaire

s/n	POSSIBLE IMPACT	IMPACT RESPONSE VALUES								Σf	Σfx	\bar{X}
		SA: X=4		S: X=3		D: X=2		SD: X=1				
		f	fx	f	Fx	f	fx	f	fx			
1	Enriched listeners' knowledge	207	828	229	687	35	70	0	0	471	1585	3.37
2	Listeners enlightened others	149	596	276	828	37	74	9	9	471	1507	3.20
3	Listeners corrected impression	126	504	310	930	23	46	12	12	471	1492	3.17
4	Reinforced listeners notions	104	416	310	930	41	82	16	16	471	1444	3.07
5	Listeners insisted on their											

	consumer rights	172	688	264	792	28	56	7	7	471	1543	3.28
6	Listeners appreciated plight of consumers and persons involved in consumer protection	161	644	75	825	23	46	12	12	471	1527	3.24
7	Listeners improved relationship with persons involved in consumer protection	172	688	241	723	46	92	12	12	471	1515	3.22
Σ										3297	10613	
Aggregate Mean (\bar{X}) = $\Sigma(\Sigma fx) \div \Sigma(\Sigma f) = 10613 \div 3297 = 3.22$												