



## A Study of Teachers' Teaching Styles and Students' Performance

**Dr. Shehzad Ahmed**, Assistant Professor University of Okara, shazy91@yahoo.com

**Dr. Muhammad Tahir Khan Farooqi**, Associate Professor University of Okara, drtahir khanfarooqi@gmail.com

**Asif Iqbal**, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Education Lahore, Faisalabad Campus, asif.iqbal@ue.edu.pk

**Abstract-** The study explored the teaching styles of teachers and its effect on students' achievement. The objectives were to find the impact of teaching styles of teachers on achievement scores of students and examine the correlation of teachers' teaching styles with students' achievement. The study comprised of 480 BS students from Education University Faisalabad from 5 classes. The Teaching Styles Survey was used as instrument. The result showed that the top most teaching style of teachers was role model. Female students had achieved higher grades in the class than that of male class fellows. Female students rated that teachers use formal authority, role model, delegator and facilitator as most frequent used teachers' styles. The level of classes had an impact on the formal authority, role model, delegator and facilitator teaching styles. Expert teaching style has weak positive correlation with role model, moderate correlation with formal authority and facilitator teaching styles and strong positive correlation with delegator teaching style. It is suggested that students should train to get more benefit of teachers teaching styles.

**Key Words:** Teaching styles, Achievement score, Role Model

### I. INTRODUCTION

Teaching profession requires intelligence, skills, insights, and diligence in succeeding different ways to fulfill the challenge of classrooms (Kardia & Wright, 2004). Teaching style is a multitask phenomenon that illuminates how teachers teach knowledge; accomplish classroom work, and supervision of students (Sheikh & Mahmood, 2014). In view point of Olufemi (1993), the women role is expected to nourish the kids and to care for home. These tasks do not spare and inspire women to contribute in economic and social development. Women are given less educational chances than for men. They dislike the jobs in male dominant professions like architecture, business and engineering. Many studies have presented their results that teaching styles are associated with achievement score of students (Aitkin & Zuzovsky, 1994; Evan, 2004; Zin, 2004). Constructivist style of teaching based on the notion that learning is an active process. It states that students generate their own ideas and link it with previous knowledge (Bohren, 2019). Huang and Fraser (2009) revealed that male teachers supposed to exhibit better relationship with students than that of female teachers. Research found that evaluation of students inclined to gender of teachers. Many studies highlighted that students rank male teacher differently than female teacher (Whitworth, Price & Randall, 2002; Tartro, 1995). There are many reasons behind that students show biased views male and female faculty members (Andersen & Miller, 1997; Burns-Glover & Veith, 1995).

### II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Teaching styles are classified on the basis of their application and merits. The styles have both merits as well as demerits. The popular current teaching styles are designated by Brown (2001) and discovered by Grasha (2002). According to Brown (2001), refers teaching styles as teachers' personal behaviors to deliver knowledge. According to Sun & Wang (2007), teaching styles are Authoritarian, democratic, and laissez faire. The proper working facilities make teachers more productive, comfortable and competent (Ijaduola, 2007; Ijaduola, 2010; Ijaduola, 2011).

#### **Gender and Teaching Styles**

Many studies conducted by Driessen (2007), Martin et al. (2008) and Martin and Marsh (2005), investigated that gender of students is motivated and influenced by gender of teachers. Jones (2003) explained that male teachers were more motivating for boys than female teachers. According to Banmeke (2006) inadequate physical environment of institutions dampens the morale of teachers. According to Mullola et al. (2011), the gender of teachers did not have an impact on students' grades. Driessen (2007) revealed that male teachers assess their students better than females. Male teachers stressed on cognitive development of students in classroom because male teachers have more qualification and content knowledge than females. According to Chudgar and Sankar (2008), teachers have dominance in sustaining classroom authority through severe self-control. Green et al. (2008) acknowledged the change

in male and female teachers about class organization. Female instructors experience more behavioral challenges than male teachers. On the otherhand, Yazuz (2009) gender teachers has no difference in managing class. Carrington et al. (2008) investigated that teachers' gender do not impact on students' attainment. The students may accurately assess teaching styles of teachers attributed to them (Centra&Gaubatz, 2000). Female teachers utilize inspiration to help content-oriented paradigms. Female teachers spend more time in preparation of lectures, plan course, and design learning tasks for assessing students' learning activities (Singer, 1996). National Centre for Education Statistics reported that female teachers dominate male teachers in teaching profession triple times (2006). National Education Association highlighted that American's elementary school teachers comprised only nine percent male teachers. Female instructors emphasized higher thinking abilities, promote learning environment and multiple experiences than male instructors (National Survey on Students' Engagement, 2005). Female teachers use more active learning strategies (Kuh, Laird, &Umbach, 2004). Female teachers use more interactive techniques than male teacher (Kuh et al., 2004). Female teacher influences girls' performance than boys. The female students outperform than male students in tests. Female teachers improve female test scores twenty percent more than boys. Many studies initiate that female teachers affect female students' achievement score (Dee 2007; Nixon & Robinson 1999; Winters, et al., 2013). Teachers' teaching styles have an impact on students' performance (Iqbal, 2010; Iqbal&Akhtar, 2012; Iqbal, Ali, Akhtar, & Ahmed, 2013; Iqbal, Aziz, Farooqi, & Ali, 2016).

### **Grasha's Teaching Styles**

Grasha presented teachers' teaching styles as, Formal Authority, Expert, Facilitator, Personal Model, and Delegator styles. Grasha (1994) evaluated teaching styles as formal authority, expert, facilitator, delegator, and personal model. Female teachers preferred a delegator or facilitator style because it guides students and consultant them in transmitting the knowledge, set goals, and provide feedback. Starbuck (2003) identified the gender inconsistencies in teaching styles with specific disciplines. In departments where women are in greater number, they control better discipline. Grasha and Hicks (2000) revealed that effectiveness of teaching styles is an important element of lessons. Female teachers liked while working with delegator and facilitator styles during teaching and learning process (Grasha, 1994). Bohren (2019) identified different teaching styles. Lecture style is called authority method as contains listening to teacher talk about a topic and students listen, memorize, and take notes according to their caliber. The coaching style is called demonstrator method which tries to sustain authority in classrooms. The Facilitator style is like the activity method that encourages self-learning. The Delegator style is a popular style same like group methods are used in group work and labs. The Hybrid style integrates personal preference of individual traits (Bohren, 2019). Teaching styles are the approaches that teachers use during lectures (Metzler, 2000; Rink, 2002). They link learning with instructions to attain the specific outcomes or result. Teachers are categorized with respect to teaching styles (Mosston& Ashworth, 2002).

Evans (2004) identified the holistic teaching style for new teachers. The low result indicates an extra holistic teaching style and high score leads to analytical teaching style. Majority teachers use analytical style rather than holistic style. Holistic style is same as formal style with flexible, and attention oriented. This style is recognized as learning in team in the world. Analytical style is more formal style in sequential, direct control, and structure when compare to holistic style. The students under analytical style work independently. Peacock (2001) identified that Chinese teachers avoid auditory style. The courses have an effect on teaching styles in different academic disciplines and institutions. The teachers teaching to large classes use expert or formal authority style. The demographic variables like gender and seniority promote their instruction (Chapman, Hughes, & Williamson, 2001). The studies of Kramlinger and Huberty (1990) categorized teaching styles as humanism, behaviorism, and cognitivist perspectives. In humanism style, the teacher acts as facilitator to inspire students in learning. Behavioral style aims to strengthen the required behavior that students need to control. The cognitivism style uses the information logically. An example of cognitivism style is lecture method that motivates the theory oriented students. Female teachers devote much time with students than male faculty members (Statham et al., 1991). Female teachers are more enthusiastic for teaching pupils than male teachers at university level. Female teachers had moderate feeling toward their pupils. In contrast, male teachers spend less time with pupils and show less association regarding teaching to students.

### **Expert Style**

It deals with knowledge and proficiency that students require. The teachers are equipped with knowledge, competence and skills that that make students intelligent. Teacher retain the status of specialist to present facts and figures to students. It attempts to sustain position as an expert among pupils by showing thorough knowledge and by stimulating scholars to improve their ability. The teacher

stimulates pupils to improve sharing of knowledge. Teacher prepared the students to solve every day problems with competence and skills.

#### **Formal Authority Style**

This is the teacher-centered style in which teacher is responsible to pass the content to students. Possess prestige among the pupils because of understanding and work as a faculty member. The formal style holder teacher maintains status among students to control the content and manages his or her role as faculty member. Concern with response, establish learning objectives, anticipations, and rules for students' conduct. The teachers get productive feedback, develop learning strategies and opportunities for students.

#### **Role Model style**

It is teacher-centered style in which teachers display the activities and skills for learning of students. This teaching methods encourage students' involvement in classes and presentation assignments. The teacher motivates students by sharing personal experiences and examples to promote learning among students. It guides, directs, and inspires students to follow the teachers' method. The teacher prefer supervision, motivation and demonstration strategies to improve students' learning.

#### **Facilitator Style**

This teaching style is reflected as student centered method. The role of teacher is only facilitator and students are responsible for developing multiple tasks. It deals with interactions between teacher and student. It develops independency and responsibility among students. This autonomous style helps students in two-way learning strategies. The students participate in active learning strategies and cooperate with each other to solve problems. Guide pupils to ask questions, explore options, and inspire them to improve standards to make knowledgeable choices.

#### **Delegator Style**

This style is concerned with students' involvement where teachers control students' learning. It deals to develop autonomous thinking among learners. Scholars work autonomously on plans.

#### **Objectives of the Study**

- i. To examine teachers' teaching styles.
- ii. To trace out the impact of teachers teaching styles on achievement scores of students.
- iii. To find the correlation of teachers teaching styles with students' achievement.

#### **Research Questions**

RQ1: What are different types of teaching styles used by the teachers?

RQ2: What is the difference in achievement score of students under different teaching styles?

RQ3: What is the difference of teaching styles of teachers with respect to gender as perceived by students?

RQ4: What is the impact of class level on teaching styles of teachers as perceive by the students? RQ5: What is the relationship of teaching styles of teachers with students' achievement?

#### **Research Design**

The study used survey method in descriptive style and data were collected with the help on an instrument. The students rated the styles of their teachers.

#### **Population and Sample**

The population was all students and respective teachers teaching at general public universities in Punjab. The BS level students were selected for the study. Four hundred and eighty BS level students were selected randomly from five classes of BS English, Mathematics, Education, Physics and chemistry. The UE campus Faisalabad was selected as sample.

#### **Instrument of the Study**

Teaching Styles Survey [TSS] adapted from Grasha (1994) and modified by the researchers. The instrument was designed by It was a five point Likert scale type tool. The students' result of semester was their achievement score. As the instruments adapted instrument was validated by experts in education field and was pilot tested upon forty students. The teaching styles were categorized as expert style 8 items; role model 8 items, formal authority 8 items; delegator style 8 items; and facilitator style 8 items. The instrument had .862 reliability value.

#### **Data Analysis**

The data analysis was made using mean, sd, t-test, Pearson r, and ANOVA tests.

### III. RESULTS

RQ1: What are different kinds of teaching styles used by the teachers? Table 1. *Teaching Styles Used by The Teachers*

Test	Expert	Formal Authority	Role Model	Facilitator	Delegator
Mean	4.142	4.378	4.523	4.350	4.304
Std. D.	.5345	.3448	.7451	.8895	.4358

The table revealed that the top most teachers' teaching style was role model. The second highest teaching style that teachers use was formal authority. The third teaching style of the teachers was facilitator. The fourth teaching style of teachers was delegator and the last teaching style of teachers was expert. RQ2: What is the difference in achievement score of students under different teaching styles? Table 2. *Achievement Score of Students Under Different Teaching Styles*

Score	Gender	n	M	Std. D.	t	p
CGPA	Male	40	3.252	.390	-2.527	.012*
	Female	440	3.386	.313		

\* $p < 0.05$

In table 2, t-test used for comparison of achievement scores with respect to gender of students under various teaching styles. There found a noteworthy variance in the mean scores of male students ( $M = 3.252, SD = .390$ ) and female students ( $M = 3.386, SD = .313; t(478) = -2.527, p = .012$ ). Female students had better grades in the class than that of male class fellows. So the question about the difference in achievement scores of students under different teaching styles was answered in positive.

RQ3: What is the difference of teaching styles of teachers with respect to gender as perceived by students?

Table 3. *Teaching Styles of Teachers with Respect to Gender*

Teaching Styles	Gender	n	Mean	Std. D.	t	p
Expert	Male	135	4.19	.656	1.171	.243
	Female	345	4.12	.478		
Formal Authority	Male	135	4.26	.520	-3.443	.001**
	Female	345	4.42	.229		
Role Model	Male	135	4.37	.295	-3.934	.000**
	Female	345	4.58	.852		
Facilitator	Male	135	4.16	.561	-2.845	.005**
	Female	345	4.42	.980		
Delegator	Male	135	4.26	.435	1.321	.188
	Female	345	4.32	.435		

\*\* $p < 0.01$

In table 3, t-test was run for the comparison of difference in the use of teaching styles of teachers with respect to their gender under expert teaching style as perceived by students. There found no noteworthy variance in the mean scores perceived by male students ( $M = 4.19, SD = .656$ ) and female students ( $M = 4.12, SD = .478; t(478) = 1.171, p > 0.05$ ). Both female and male students rated no difference when teachers use expert style in the class. Under formal authority teaching style as perceived by students, there found a noteworthy variance in the mean scores perceived by male students ( $M = 4.26, SD = .520$ ) and female students ( $M = 4.42, SD = .229; t(478) = -3.443, p < 0.01$ ). Female students rated that teachers use formal authority style more frequently in the class than male students. Under role model teaching style as perceived by students, there found a noteworthy variance in the mean scores perceived by male students ( $M = 4.37, SD = .295$ ) and female students ( $M = 4.58, SD = .852; t(478) = -3.934, p < 0.01$ ). Female students rated that teachers use role model style more frequently in the class than male students. Under facilitator teaching style as perceived by students, there found a noteworthy variance in the mean scores perceived by male students ( $M = 4.16, SD = .561$ ) and female students ( $M = 4.42, SD = .980; t(478) = -2.845, p < 0.01$ ). Female students rated that teachers use facilitator style more frequently in the class than male students. Under delegator teaching style as perceived by students, there found no noteworthy variance in the mean scores perceived by male students ( $M = 4.26, SD = .435$ ) and female students ( $M = 4.32, SD = .435; t(478) = -1.321, p > 0.05$ ). Both female and male students rated no difference when teachers use expert style in the class. So the question about the difference of teaching styles of teachers

with respect to gender as perceived by students was answered in positive for formal authority, role model and facilitator, and negative for expert and delegator.

RQ4: What is the impact of class level on teaching styles of teachers as perceived by the students? Table 4. *Impact of Class Level on Teaching Styles of Teachers*

		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Expert	Between Groups	1.752	4	.438	1.539	.190
	Within Groups	135.107	475	.284		
	Total	136.858	479			
Formal Authority	Between Groups	2.195	4	.549	4.761	.001**
	Within Groups	54.751	475	.115		
	Total	56.946	479			
Role Model	Between Groups	13.249	4	3.312	6.225	.000**
	Within Groups	252.737	475	.532		
	Total	265.986	479			
Facilitator	Between Groups	18.462	4	4.615	6.080	.000**
	Within Groups	360.551	475	.759		
	Total	379.013	479			
Delegator	Between Groups	3.861	4	.965	5.261	.000**
	Within Groups	87.143	475	.183		
	Total	91.004	479			

\*\*p<0.01

In table 4, ANOVA test was performed for the comparison of the impact of class level on teaching styles of teachers as perceived by the students. There were five classes, BS English, B. Ed. Hons, BS Chemistry, BS Physics and BS Mathematics. with class 1 (B. Ed. Morning and evening), class 2 (English), class 3 (Physics). There found a non-significant impact of level of classes on the expert style of teachers ranked by pupils. For expert style the result of  $F(4, 475) = 1.539, p > .05$ . There found a significant impact of level of classes on the formal authority style of teachers ranked by pupils. For formal style the result of  $F(4, 475) = 4.761, p < .01$ . There found a significant impact of level of classes on the role model style of teachers ranked by pupils. For role model style the result of  $F(4, 475) = 6.225, p < .01$ . There found a significant impact of level of classes on the facilitator style of teachers ranked by pupils. For facilitator style the result of  $F(4, 475) = 6.080, p < .01$ . There found a significant impact of level of classes on the delegator style of teachers ranked by pupils. For delegator style the result of  $F(4, 475) = 5.261, p < .01$ . It was concluded that class level has an impact on all the teaching styles of teachers except for expert styles as perceived by the students.

RQ5: What is the relationship of different teaching styles of teachers?

Table 5. *Relationship of Teaching Styles of Teachers with Students' Achievement*

		Expert	Formal Authority	Role Model	Facilitator	Delegator
Expert	Pearson	1				
	r					
Formal Authority	Pearson	.437**	1			
	r					
Role Model	Pearson	.168**	.122**	1		
	r					
Facilitator	Pearson	.431**	.165**	.071	1	
	r					
Delegator	Pearson	.655**	.355**	.323**	.291**	1
	r					

\*\*p<0.01

The table 5 revealed the relationship of different teaching styles. Expert teaching style has weak positive correlation with role model (.168), moderate positive correlation with formal authority (.437) and facilitator (.431) teaching styles and strong positive correlation with delegator (.655) teaching style.

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The top most teaching style of teachers was role model. The second highest teaching style that teachers use was formal authority. The third teaching style of the teachers was facilitator. The fourth teaching style of teachers was delegator and the last teaching style of teachers was expert. Female students had achieved higher grades in the class than that of male class fellows. Under formal authority teaching style as perceived by students, there found a noteworthy variance in the mean

scores. Female students rated that teachers use formal authority style more frequently in the class than male students. Female students rated that teachers use role model style more frequently in the class than male students. Female students



rated that teachers use facilitator style more frequently in the class than male students. Both female and male students rated no difference when teachers use expert style in the class. There found a significant impact of level of classes on the formal authority style of teachers ranked by pupils. There found a significant impact of level of classes on the role model style of teachers ranked by pupils. There found a significant impact of level of classes on the facilitator style of teachers ranked by pupils. There found a significant impact of level of classes on the delegator style of teachers ranked by pupils. It was concluded that class level has an impact on all the teaching styles of teachers except for expert styles as perceived by the students. Expert teaching style has weak positive correlation with role model (.168), moderate positive correlation with formal authority (.437) and facilitator (.431) teaching styles and strong positive correlation with delegator (.655) teaching style.

#### REFERENCE S

1. Aitkin, M. L., & Zuzovsky, R. (1994). Multilevel interaction models and their use in the analysis of large-scale school effectiveness studies. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5, 45-73.
2. Andersen, K., & Miller, E. D. (1997). Gender and student evaluations of teaching. *Political Science & Politics*, 30, 216-219.
3. Anthony, A. J. (2007). Defining the administrative function. *Journal of Education Research*, 46, 6-17.
4. Banmeke, N. O. (2006). *A handbook on school administration and management*. Lagos: Fortunate Books Publishers.
5. Bohren, A. (2019). *Teaching Styles: Everything you need to know about teaching methods and strategies*. Retrieved on 06 August 2020 from, <https://blog.cognifit.com/teaching-styles>
6. Brown, H. D. (2001). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Addison, Wesley Longman.
7. Burns-Glover, A. L., & Veith, D. J. (1995). Revisiting gender and teaching evaluation. Sex still makes a difference. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality: Special Issue: Gender in the workplace*, 10(6), 69-80.
8. Carrington, B., Tymms, P., & Merrell, C. (2008). Role models, school improvement and the gender gap do remembering out the best in boys and women the best in girls? *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(3), 315-327.
9. Chapman, J. K, Hughes, P., & Williamson, B. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of classroom competencies over a decade of change. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(2), 171-184.
10. Centra, J. A., & Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is there gender bias in student evaluation of teaching? *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 17-33.
11. Chudgar, A., & Sankar, V. (2008). The relationship between teacher gender and student achievement: Evidence from five Indian states. *A Journal of Comparative Education*, 38(5), 627-642.
12. Dee, T. S. (2004). Teachers, Race, and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 195-210.
13. Driessen, G. (2007). The feminization of primary education: Effects of teachers' sex on pupil achievement, attitudes, and behavior. *Review of Education*, 53(2), 183-203.
14. Evans, C. (2004). Exploring the relationship between cognitive style and teaching style. *Educational Psychology*, 24(4), 509-530.
15. Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*, 42(4), 142-149.
16. Grasha, A. F. (2002). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Alliance Publishers. CA.
17. Grasha, A. F & Hicks, N. Y. (2000). Integrating teaching styles and learning style with instructional technology. *College Teaching*, 48(1), 2-15.
18. Green, S. P., Shriberg, D., & Farber, S. (2008). What's gender got to do with it? Teachers' perceptions of situation severity and requests for assistance. *Journal for Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 18(4), 346-373.
19. Huang, S. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2009). Science teachers' perceptions of the school environment: Gender differences. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 46(4), 404-420.
20. Ijaduola, K. O. (2007). Effects of staff perception of participative administration on staff efficiency in Ogun state. *Sokoto Educational Review*, 9(1), 73-85.
21. Ijaduola, K. O. (2010). Management fear motivational strategy as a correlate of task performance among Nigerian secondary school teachers' education secretariat. *Journal of Curriculum Studies and Instructions*, 3(1), 193-201.

22. Ijaduola, K. O. (2011). Empirical analysis of school plant planning as a determinant of secondary school students' academic performance. *Academic Leadership*, 9(1), 1-7.
23. Iqbal, A. (2011). *A comparative study of the impact of principals' leadership styles on the job satisfaction of teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Punjab Lahore.
24. Iqbal, A., & Akhtar, M. S. (2012). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 49-65.
25. Iqbal, A., Ali, M. S., Akhtar, M. S., & Ahmed, S. (2013). A comparison of the perceptions of secondary school teachers' satisfaction about their jobs. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR- JHSS)*, 7(5), 92-98.
26. Iqbal, A., Aziz, F., Farooqi, M. T. K., & Ali, M. S. (2016). Relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and students' academic performance. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 335-344.
27. Jones, D. (2003). The right kind of man: The ambiguities of re-gendering the early years school environment—the case of England and Wales. *Early Child Development*, 173(6), 565-575.
28. Kramlinger, T., & Huberty, T. (1990). Behaviorism versus humanism. *Training and Development Journal*, 4, 1-45.
29. Martin, A., & Marsh, H. (2005). Motivating boys and motivating girls: Does teacher gender really make a difference? *Australian Journal of Education*, 49(3), 320-334.
30. Martin, A. J., Marsh, H. W., & Cheng, J. H. S. (2008). A multilevel perspective on gender in classroom motivation and climate: Potential benefits of male teachers for boys? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(1), 78-95.
31. Metzler, M. W. (2000). *Instructional model for physical education*. Boston, DC: Allyn and Bacon.
32. Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (2002). *Teaching physical education*. (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Benjamin, Cummings.
33. Mulla, S., Ravaja, N., Lipsanen, J., Alatupa, S., Hintsanen, M., Jokela, M., & Keltikangas-Jarvinen, L. (2011). Associations of student temperament and educational competence with academic achievement: The role of teacher age and teacher and student gender. *Teaching & Teaching Education*, 27(5), 942-951.
34. National Education Association. (2001, August). Status of the American Public School Teacher.
35. Nixon, L. A., & Michael, D. R. (1999). The educational attainment of young women: Role model effects of female high school faculty. *Demography*, 36(2), 185-194.
36. Olufemi, S. (1993). Mobilizing women for rural development: Some principles for success from Nigeria. *Women and Environments*, 163(3-4), 33-35.
37. Kardia, D. B., & Wright, M. C. (2004). *Instructor identity: The impact of gender and race on faculty experiences with teaching*. Occasional Paper. University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.
38. Kuh, G. D., Laird, T. F., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). Aligning faculty and student behavior: Realizing the promise of Greater Expectations. *Liberal Education*, 90(4), 24-31.
39. National Survey of Student Engagement (2005). *Exploring different dimensions of student engagement*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
40. Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning style and teaching style in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
41. Rink, J. (2002). *Teaching physical education for learning*. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Boston, DC: MacGraw Hill.
42. Singer, E. (1996). Espoused teaching paradigms of college faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(6), 659-679.
43. Sheikh, A., & Mahmood, N. (2014). Effect of different teaching styles on students' motivation towards English language learning at secondary level. *Science International*, 26(2), 825-830.
44. Sun, M. Y., & Wang, C. H. (2007). The relationship between teacher discipline and students' learning motivation in school. *Journal of Primary and Secondary Education Research*, 18, 165-193.
45. Starbuck, G. H. (2003). *College teaching styles by gender*. Paper presented at the Western Social Science Association Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, NV, April 9-12.
46. Statham, A. Richardson, L., & Cook, J. A. (1991). *Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
47. Tartro, C. N. (1995). Gender effects on student evaluation of faculty. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 28(3), 169-73.
48. Winters, M. A., Robert, C. H., Thomas, T. S., & Katarzyna, A. P. (2013). The effect of same-gender teacher assignment on student achievement in the elementary and secondary grades: Evidence from panel data. *Economics of Education Review*, 34, 69-75.



49. Yazuz, M. (2009).An investigation of burn-out levels of teachers working in elementary and secondary educational institutions and their attitudes to classroom management.*Educational Research and Reviews*, 4(12), 642-649.
50. Zinn, L. M. (2004). *Exploring your philosophical orientation*.In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.). Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction (3rd ed., Pp.39-74). FL: Krieger Publishing Company.