

## Evaluation of Faculty Members' Teaching Style (Case Study: Islamic Azad University, Roudehen Branch)

Shayesteh Ahmadi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Master of Educational Research, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University

Received: Nov. 2014 & Published: Jan. 2015

**Abstract:** Introduction: Teachers' teaching style is effective in improving learning outcomes. Achieving such an objective requires that teachers in their teaching styles use different ways. Understanding the characteristics of individual teaching styles and professors can be effective on teacher training's model and on educational success of students. Method: The aim of the present study is evaluation of faculty member's teaching style of Islamic Azad University, Rodehen branch. This research statistical society consists of all faculties of engineering, science and agriculture that their number is 130 people. Evaluation sample size was determined according to sampling formula with random classification as 100 people. Survey tool is self-administered questionnaire of teaching style inventory TSI (2009). Every teacher according to his teaching style in the classroom gave a score between 1 and 4 to each one of the questionnaire. Questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive statistics, chi-square test of the questionnaire and instructions, reliability and validity of the instrument was determined by researchers so that reliability is 0.75. Findings: results show that majority of the faculty of Engineering, Islamic Azad University of Agriculture and Biological Sciences, Rodehen branch prefer presenting applied content, deep learning, cognitive processing and a symbol and cooperative activities. No significant correlation was found between the teaching style of the teaching faculty, teaching experience, academic rank, gender and age. Results: Teachers as guide students have a crucial role in guiding learners and they are basic factor to create desired success in achieving educational objectives. Each of learners without realizing, learn with its own style.

**Keywords:** teaching styles, faculty, Islamic Azad University, Rodehen branch

### 1. Introduction

Faculty members play biggest role in improving the quality of teaching, research and social services of universities and it is evident that teacher's scientific knowledge can have a good performance when use by audiences according to exploited styles. In education, teachers' efforts is that transfer his knowledge to students but each of students have their own characteristics, and this makes a special teaching method, does not meet the learning needs of all students. Therefore, we need different styles in order to transfer knowledge regarding the realities of teaching and learning. Teaching is interactive, targeted action that is measured, designed, implementation and evaluation by the teacher (Seyf, 2013).

In fact, teaching including skills that before, during and after the implementation of the

teaching process takes place and to provide student training. It helps students to meet their learning style and goals, learning theory based on provided conditions. Teaching is a team and a two-way process in which the learner and the educator are both affected by each other's (Safavi, 2003). Each faculty member in terms of abilities, capabilities, interests, and needs of the institution may be more active in one or more areas, but one of the main tasks is to teach and train students that its quality has great effects on improving motivation, freshness, innovation and increase student and teacher's performance (Adhami, 2005). One of the fundamental problems of is lack of effective teaching index of a set of functions and features master which can help achieve the objectives of teaching and learning student. Although learning depends on other factors such as student behavior learning

motivation, curriculum content, environment and physical resources (Delaram, 2006).

The success of educational programs and activities in each country depends on teachers. In other words, the most effective way of achieving the desired objectives of teacher education is a wise and powerful or attention to this that importance and role of the teacher's work and its deep impact becomes clear on the success and progress and decline and degeneration of society future generations training leadership of any community is on teachers. In every society, the teacher has value and is worthy of dignity and respect, even in primitive societies teacher has value and respect. No doubt teacher's personal and professional character is effective in development learning. According to several research studies have been conducted on students' learning styles and the matter has been referred. But besides learning style, attention to the teaching style is also important (Thompson, 2004). Because knowledge of teaching styles, matching teaching styles, learning styles and diversity of its deployment has great effect on learning and learner satisfaction and the dynamics of teaching and learning styles is backup learner satisfaction (Brown, 2003). Many people believe that style is an important element in teaching (Heimlich, 2002. Heredia, 2011).

In education, teachers' effort is to transfer knowledge to students, but students each have their own unique characteristics and this cause a special teaching method, does not meet the learning needs of all students. Therefore, in order to transfer knowledge regarding the realities of teaching and learning we need to various styles (Yaran, 2007). There are many different styles that professors can use in learning process, but teacher should choose the best style due to lesson subject, condition learners and learning environment (Nazari, 2007).

Teaching style reflects the quality of leadership behaviors that teacher's class use (Grasha, 1996). In the other term teaching style refers to behaviors that lecturer show in their dealings with students and plays an important role in various aspects of teaching. So guidance and leadership of educational process, their learners and learning ability impact is known as teach

style (Grasha, 1996). Given the importance of teaching style, there are several views. For example, "Dan" emphasizing that if you do not focus on quality teaching, learning, behavior modification may not be possible, he also says that a good teaching depends on the orientation of the teacher of teaching styles. He knows taught art as connector of student needs to learn and noted motivation by the teacher as an important note (Dunn, 1990). Krunzich also refer to this that, if the needs and preferences of their students' learning can be successful learners. So, he knows attention to different teaching styles, importance principle in education (Krunzich, 1986). Grasha also, knows teaching style as a particular pattern of beliefs and behaviors that teacher offers and emphasis on teachers facilitators. The main purpose of this role that is focused on the needs of learners is growth autonomy, initiative and responsibility that allow them to give creative thinking (Grasha, 1996).

Also Folder quoted by Pratt refers to five key factors that teachers must pay attention to them that they are:

Data transfer with focus on content and determine what students must learn, developing learner's comprehensive by development of problem solving and reasoning skills in learners, widespread acceptance as a trainee and personal factors affecting learning, also learners and reaction to their intellectual and emotional needs and social reform through the identification of learners (Folder, 2005).

In this context it is also expressed that a successful teacher is a person who helps students for high learning with respect to teaching principles and coordinate learning styles with teaching methods. Teaching program good design and its influence on student learning and engage students by subject are very important matter that Kolb has been stressed on it (Folder, 2005). Teaching models are actually learning patterns. Teacher using templates while help students to getting Information, ideas, skills, ways of thinking and tools to express themselves, learn them learning way. In fact, increasing capacity of students to learn easier and more efficient future of knowledge and skill acquisition and learning processes will dominate can be the most important long-term result of

training. Way of teaching has high effect on the ability of students to teach. Successful teachers aren't only charismatic providers and convince, but they enter their students to cognitive and social work and teach them effective use way (Jois, 2009).

In Flander idea, indirect teaching style that relies on presenting questions, acceptance feelings, respect for students idea and appropriate incentives and rewards increase students' desire to learn. Although in some cases use of direct style of teaching means speech, criticism, justification of power and order is inevitable. However, optimal use of indirect teaching techniques implies effective teaching behavior (Ceet, 2012).

### Research Methods

This research is applied in terms of objective and it is descriptive in terms of method.

Population, sample, sampling method:

Statistical society of this research is including all teachers of faculty of Engineering, Agriculture and Biological Sciences of Islamic Azad University, Rodehen branch that according to the latest figures from the Office of Human Resources of Islamic Azad University, Rodehen branch that total population in the year 2012 is 130 people.

Proportional sample is 100 people as random sample formula. When the study population was heterogeneous and within strata, class, or group of diverse but revealed a staggering percentage of population can use of stratified random sampling or size. Population of each class divided by the total population percentages obtained for each class and then above percentage multiplied to sample size to share of each class is obtained. The researcher also estimates their sample size using sampling. Sampling was as this method that, school of Computing, Engineering, Agriculture and Science were selected, after identifying the target population for each of schools sample size for each category was determined as described in the table below (Mirzaee, 2011 p 176).

Table 1: Society size and sample of teachers

	Society	Sample
Science	47	36
Engineering Sciences	42	32
Agricultural Sciences	30	23

Computer sciences	11	9
-------------------	----	---

### Research tools

Data collection tool of teaching style questionnaire was (Teaching Style Inventory or TSI) (Landel, 2009) that gave to faculty members of the teaching faculty at the School of Engineering, Agriculture and Biological Sciences of Islamic Azad University of Rodehen branch and 120 people in second semester 2012 as personality and they were asked to specify a day to deliver questionnaire to the researcher after the completion. Every teacher according to your preferences and style of teaching in the classroom gave any of items 1 to 4 score (on a Likert scale).

This questionnaire has designed and standardized by (Center for Occupational Research and Development) (CORD) in 2005 (Landel, 2009) and consisting of 12 parts. Any of these parts consist of 4 choices about the ways in which the teacher may react in this way during teaching. This questionnaire has been ranked 1 to 4 which reflects the teacher's teaching style preferences. Rating Options include 4 (The best description for the teaching style) to 1 inappropriate describe to teaching style. Teaching style based on the questionnaire consists of 2 parts. Some words used in this study are as follows:

- 1) Teaching objectives include the provision of concept: abstract: teaching objectives include: developing problem solving process and create creative thinking through problem solving and asking questions from learners, applied: based on previous knowledge of the students when describing a topic, creation Linkage between concepts to apply in real world and help students to transfer knowledge into practice and learning type: surface: preparing learners for the final exam by repeating and remembering information, forcing students to apply previously learned responses to solve, deep: determine various duties, the curiosity of students to provide new content and presenting program summary for class discussion.
- 2) Teaching objectives include: individual interaction, all skills as individual to cooperative group:

Suggest to students to participate, rather than compete with each other to perform duties, evaluating other students' opinions, assign roles to students as evaluators and observers and organizing group activities and cognitive processing: symbolic: following the presentation by asking questions frequently insist on students and provide short and continuous tests, provide same problem, enactive: enhance learning by providing training and creative problem solving, library activities, projects and activities that require the creation of data collection, analysis, and discussion and prediction (Landel, 2009). After collecting data, graded according to the instructions contained in the questionnaire were summarized. Data collected according to the guidelines of teaching objectives and teaching methods went into object matrix. Methods and teaching objectives matrix have vertical and horizontal axes and four

quadrants and objectives and research questions to be addressed in the judgment based on the obtained position. Above mentioned questionnaire was selected due to standard and consistent with research objectives between some questionnaires. Also the reliability of the questionnaire was analyzed by Cronbach's alpha test that its result was obtained as 0.95 that determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Collected data was analyzed in SPSS software and using descriptive statistics (percent & Frequency) and 2 chi-square tests to determine relationship between teaching objectives and teaching methods with academic rank, teaching faculty and teaching faculty, teaching experience, age and sex of the faculty members.

### Research Findings

Descriptive analysis of data

Table 2 : Frequency of subjects on the basis of sex

Frequency of subjects on the basis of sex			
Cumulative frequency percent	Frequency percent	frequency	
63.0	63.0	63	Men
100.0	37.0	37	Female
	100.0	100	Sum

Based on above table, 63 people equal 63% of testers are men and 37 people equal 37% of

testers are female that it shows that men quantity is more.

Table 3 : Frequency of subjects on the basis of group

Frequency of subjects on the basis of group				
Cumulative frequency percent	Frequency percent	frequency		
37.0	37.0	37	37	Base
60.0	23.0	23	23	Agriculture
92.0	32.0	32	32	Engineering
100.0	8.0	8	8	Computer
	100.0	100	100	Sum

Based on above table, 37 people equal 37% of testers are from base group and 23 people equal 23% from agriculture group, 32 people equal 32% from engineering group, 8 people equal 8%

from computer group, that it shows base group is more than other groups.

Inferential analysis of data

Table 4 : Cross table Schools and processing of Contents

Cross table Schools and processing of Contents			
	Process		Sum
	Executive	Symbolic	
Science	14	23	37
Agriculture	10	13	23
Engineering	12	20	32
Computer	3	5	8
Sum	39	61	100

Based on top cross table, 14 of subjects of process in action and 23 are symbolic act in the Faculty of Science. In faculty of Agriculture 10 people have administrative processing 13 people have symbolic processing. Executive processing in Engineering 12 and 20 are

symbolic processing. In Faculty of Computer 3 people are of administrative processing and 5 of symbolic processing. Thus the number of subjects that are material to the symbolic processing is dedicated to the highest level of other group.

Table 5 : Chi-square test

Chi-square test			
Significant level.	Degrees of freedom	The chi-square value	
.969	3	.253	Pearson's chi-square
.969	3	.251	Likelihood ratio
.953	1	.004	Linear relationship
		100	Count

Since calculated  $X^2$  (.253) in (.969) is bigger than 0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis is confirmed of no relationship between college

and process and can say with confidence 0.95, there is no relationship between colleges and process.

Table 6 : Cross table of Schools and interaction

Cross table of Schools and interaction			
	Interaction		Sum
	Collaborative	Individual	
Science	30	7	37
Agriculture	15	8	23
Engineering	24	8	32
Computer	4	3	8
Sum	73	27	100

Based on top cross table, in Faculty of Sciences of 30 participants in the interaction act collaboratively and 7 individually. In college of Agriculture 15 people have collaborative interaction and 8 people have personal interaction. In college of Engineering 24 people have collaborative interaction and 8 people have

personal interaction. In college of Computer 4 people have collaborative interaction and 3 people have personal interaction. Thus the number of subjects that are material to form collaborative interaction is dedicated highest level than other group.

Table 7 : Chi-square test

Chi-square test			
Significant level.	Degrees of freedom	The chi-square value	
.246	3	4.145	Pearson's chi-square
.266	3	3.958	Likelihood ratio
.176	1	1.830	Linear relationship
		100	Count

Since calculated  $X^2$  (4.145) in (.246) is bigger than 0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis is confirmed of no relationship between college and process and

can say with confidence 0.95, there is no relationship between colleges and process in teaching subjects.

Table 8 : Cross table Schools and presentation concept

Cross table Schools and presentation concept			
	Concept presenting		Sum
	Abstract	Applied	
Science	12	25	37
Agriculture	3	20	23
Engineering	12	20	32
Computer	2	6	8
Sum	29	71	100

Based on top cross table, from subjects, in Faculty of Sciences 12 people of participants in abstract and 25 in applied. In college of Agriculture 3 in abstract and 20 people in

applied. In college of Engineering 12 in abstract and 20 people in applied. In college of Computer 2 in abstract and 6 people in applied. Thus the number of subjects that present issues as applied are dedicated highest level than other group.

Table 9 : Chi-square test

Chi-square test			
Significant level.	Degrees of freedom	The chi-square value	
.237	3	4.241	Pearson's chi-square
.199	3	4.655	Likelihood ratio
.859	1	.032	Linear relationship
		100	Count

Since calculated  $X^2$  (4.241) in (.237) is bigger than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is confirmed of no relationship between college

and concept presenting and can say with confidence 0.95, there is no relationship between colleges and concept presenting in teaching subjects.



Table 10 : Table Cross School and learning

Cross School and learning			
	Learning type		Sum
	Deep	Surface	
Science	20	17	37
Agriculture	16	7	23
Engineering	19	13	32
Computer	6	2	8
Sum	61	39	100

Base on top cross table, in Faculty of Sciences 20 people of subjects prefer learning as deep and 17 people prefer it as surface. In college of Agriculture 16 people prefer learning as deep and 7 people prefer it as surface. In college of Engineering 19 people prefer learning as deep and 13 people prefer it as surface. In college of Computer 6 people prefer learning as deep and 2 people prefer it as surface. Thus the number of subjects that prefer learning type as deep is dedicated highest level than other group.

Since calculated  $X^2$  (5.029) in (.170) is bigger than 0.05, therefore the null hypothesis is confirmed of no relationship between college and learning type and can say with confidence 0.95, there is no relationship between colleges and learning type.

This research is done for researching styles of teaching of faculty members in engineering, agriculture and science. Total of 120 questionnaires that were given to faculty members, 100 faculty members completed questionnaires. Based on the results obtained in the field of information processing 39 people teach actions as administrative to students and 61 people teach actions as symbol to students. Engage in teaching 73 people of teachers prefer actions as collaboration and 27 people of teachers prefer as individual. 29 people of

teachers prefer learners learn issues as abstract and 71 people of teachers prefer learners learn issues as applied. .Chi-square test didn't show two significant relationships between the objectives and methods of teaching faculty with academic rank, school, tutoring and teaching experience. Comparison of the results obtained from the four schools of Islamic Azad University, Rodehen branch can be concluded that for teaching purposes, the preferred style of Teachers colleges of engineering, technology, agriculture and science closer together, in the other word, teachers of Faculty of Engineering , Agricultural and Biological Sciences deep understanding prefer provide practical concepts, symbolic interaction and participatory exercises. Accordingly we conclude that teachers are likely to pay more attention to teaching model and use of modern methods of teaching more that by the time the student's creative thinking and learning is essential, use styles for active , student-centered and student involvement in learning and self-centered in the use of his ability is necessary. Surely, to give the opportunity to express an opinion, responsibility, confidence and encourage independent study and evaluation criteria available in obtaining competency is effective in increasing motivation and satisfaction (Grasha, 1996).



So it can be concluded that the college instructors teaching have demonstrated more attention to this issue and interaction.

(Rodbari, 2011) conclusion that affiliated members of the Faculty of Medical Sciences of Iran prefer providing a practical sense, deep learning, cognitive processing in executive and corporate activities. This is consistent with Morgan theory that believes instructor teaching style must fit with needs of learners. In a study with the objective necessity of revising the traditional methods of teaching and the application of new methods of working and learning, students learning rank increased in participatory methods.

In a study in medical science of Rafsanjan it was shown that teaching style with high qualifications is an expert and attorney and teaching style with low qualifications is advocate and facilitator. Results of research in the School of Esfahan Medicine have shown flexible teaching style is allocated to the highest frequency. Due to the fact that in some studies, one of the causes of stress in teachers is their unfamiliarity with the teaching style and mismatch of teaching styles and students learning style which it finally leads to a lack of learning and taking into consideration the results of the present study, this matter clear raise awareness of the issue of faculty members from different teaching styles and more attention to new methods of teaching.

### Conclusion

It can be concluded of this reference that effective teaching helping students to master learning. Those who learn well add strategies reserve for obtaining education .Enhance learning ability is one of essential purposes teaching patterns. Teachers as students guide have a crucial role in guiding learners and they are essential factor for desired success in achieving educational objectives. Learners without realizing it, each learn own style of learning.

Since the implementation of teaching without learners doesn't have any particular meaning and a two-way process is done with the goal of learning, it is proposed according to major differences in student learning styles and teachers teaching style a study design and do in order to assess the students' satisfaction with

teaching styles and their relationship with their academic achievement

### References

1. Adhami A, reihani H, fattahi Z, nakhaei N, fasihi harandi T. comparison of student assessment of educational performance of the faculty with the teachers self assessment in kerman university of medical sciences sdme 2005: 2(1):25-32.(in persian)
2. Beran G Atcinz M.[Amoozesh moaser dar amoozesh ali].[dissertation] Tehran2007
3. Brown BL. Teaching Style vs. Learning Style. 2003 [cited 2011 22 Jun]; Available from: <http://www.calpro-online.org/eric/textonly/docgen.asp?tbl=mr&ID=117>.
4. Delaram M. Clinical education from the viewpoints of nursing and midwifery students in Shahre-e-Kord University of Medical Sciences. IJME 2006; 6 (2): 15-21. [In Persian]
5. Dr.Khalil. (2011). Gray's research and research and research writing. (Second edition). Tehran: Sociologists issued. [In Persian]
6. Dunn, R., Deckinger, E. L., Withers, P., & Katzenstein, H. (1990). Should college students be taught how to do homework? The effects of studying marketing through individual perceptual strengths. *Illinois School Research and Development Journal*, 26(3), 96-113
7. felder rm, spurlin j. applications. Reliability and validity of the index of learning styles. *International journal of engineering education*. 2005;21(1): 103-12
8. Grasha AF. Teaching with style: a practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles. Pittsburg, PA: Alliance Publishers; 1996.
9. Joyce brevis, Weil, Marsha Vkalhvn, Emily. (1992). New models of teaching. Translation: Reza Behrangi (2011). (Seventh Edition). Tehran: Physical Perfection
10. Joyce, brevis, Weil, Marsha and Kalhvn, Emily (1992). New models of teaching, translated by Mohammadreza Behrangi (2011), seventh edition), Tehran: Kamale tarbiat publication

11. Seif, A., (2013) Educational psychology. (Print fifty four) .Tehran: Roshd publication
12. Kit, Acheson, scabies, Merdmit domain. Supervision training, Translated by Mohammadreza Behrangi (2013) (Sixth edition) Tehran: Kamale tarbiat publication
13. Mirzaee, KH. (2011) Research and ecological research and research writing .( Second edition ) .Tehran : Jame'e shenasan publication
14. Heimlich JE, Norland E. Teaching Style: Where Are We Now? New Directions for Adult and Continuing
15. Education. 2002; 2002(93): 17-26.
16. Heredia A. Cultural Learning Styles. 1999 [cited 2011 20 Jun]; Available from:
17. <http://library.educationworld.net/a12/a12-166.html>.
18. Kit, Acheson, scabies, Mrdmyt domain. Training supervision. MR Translation Behrangi (2013). (Sixth edition). Tehran: Physical perfection. [In Persian]
19. krunchich jm.assessment of student and faculty learning styles: research and application. Journal of social work education 1986: 22(3): 22-30
20. Landel G, Orcutt VL. Is Your Teaching Style Driving Your Students Crazy? Identifying and Broadening You're Teaching Style. 2009 [cited 2011 12 Jun]; Available from <http://www.paeaonline.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/96132>.
21. Nazari H. [Chegone tadriskonem ta yadgeri behtar angam shaved. [Dissertation].2007.
22. safavi A.general teaching methods and techniques. Tehran:mahyar pub;2003.(in Persian)1.
23. Seif, AA (2013). Educational Psychology. (Fifty-Fourth Edition). Tehran: Publication of growth. [In Persian]
24. thompson s,greer jg,greer bb.highly qualified for successful teaching: characteristics every teacher should possess 2004 (cited 2011 23 jun): available from: [www.usca.edu/assays/vollo2004/thompson.pdf](http://www.usca.edu/assays/vollo2004/thompson.pdf)