



# STUDY OF TEACHING STYLES OF SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR LOCALITY

**Dr Ruchi Malhotra**

**Assistant Professor Department of Education, ICDEOL Himachal Pradesh University , Shimla  
Himachal Pradesh**

## **Abstract**

The present study was undertaken to find out the differences between urban and rural school teachers on teaching styles. The sample of the study consisted of 403 school teachers drawn from 21 schools of District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh by random method. The data were collected with the help of Teaching Style Inventory for Secondary School Teachers developed and standardized by Dr. Nain Singh and Dr. Balbir Singh (2007). The results of the analysis accepted research hypotheses which anticipated that there will be no significant differences in the teaching styles of teachers in relation to their locality.

## **Introduction**

Taner & Lindgren (1971) are of the opinion that the teacher is the most powerful person in the classroom. His power is such that even when he does nothing, he does something to the class. He even has an effect on unique teaching style which has enormous influence on cognitive and non-cognitive behavior of the students.

Teaching styles are tools to enhance student's abilities to achieve learning objectives and let students learn easily and effectively. Teaching style is a unique way of teaching. Every teacher teaches the students in a characteristic way. Teaching style is a way a teacher prefers to approach the teaching task. A variety of styles blend together in the classroom. Some attempts have been made to define the term teaching styles. Schultz (1982) points out that the construct of teaching style has been very crucial in relation to student's performance. He further highlighted the fact that the teachers exhibiting different teaching styles attempt to

create class room socio-psychological climate consonant with their styles. Eble (1983) holds that it is a characteristic way a teacher goes about his work. Butler (1984) conceived teaching style as a set of attitudes and actions. Hanson and Silver consider teaching style as a reflection of the individual value system regarding human nature and the kinds of goals and environment that enhance human learning. Gregorc (1987) opined that different teachers bring their uniqueness to the way they teach, we call this teaching style. Spear and Sternberg (1987) said one reason for why teaching style is important is that by adopting a certain style teacher models a certain role for students. Grasha (1994) holds that teaching style affects how teachers present information, interact with students, manage classroom tasks, supervise course work, socialize students to the field and mentor students. Indeed, teaching styles affect learning style of students as well as what transpires in the classroom.

Several researches such as Sarlak (1983), Buchanan (1984), Roquemore (1987), Smith (1988), Eagly and Johnson (1990), Grasha (1994, 1996), Brakel (1997), Singh

(2000) and Kumari (2008) found that gender was related to teaching style. However, study conducted by Simon (1987) did not find any significant difference between gender and teaching styles but no parallel study was available in relation to locality. So the researcher found it worthwhile to undertake the present study.

Teaching styles of teachers have an enormous effect on the classroom transaction with the students and learning outcome of teaching. They particularly affect how teachers present information, interact with the students, manage classroom tasks, supervise course work and socialize students to the field. Teachers use a blend of teaching styles. Mainly five teaching styles given by Grasha i.e; Expert , Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator are used by the teachers.

Review of related literature reveals that teaching styles have been studied in relation to number of background factors such as educational philosophy, qualification, formal training, ethnicity, teaching experience, level taught, level of courses, disciplines, teaching competency, teaching effectiveness, self-efficacy, age and rank. However, a few studies have been conducted on teaching styles with reference to personality factors (Schluck, 1969, Hans, 1986 and Allen, 1968). Only one study could be traced on teacher self-concept and teaching style (Trowbridge, 1973). No study has so far been conducted in India and Abroad on the relationship of locality and teaching style of school teachers. The investigator is of the opinion that by conducting the present study new and meaningful information pertaining to teaching styles at school level will be emerged out which may give new direction in improving the teaching learning process. Therefore, it was considered to great significance to take up a study in this neglected area.

## Objectives

The following objective was formulated for pursuance in the study:

- 1 To find out the differences between urban and rural school teachers on the following teaching styles:
  - (i) Expert teaching style;
  - (ii) Formal Authority teaching style;
  - (iii) Personal Model teaching style;
  - (iv) Facilitator teaching style; and
  - (v) Delegator teaching style.

## Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were framed for testing:

- 1 There will be no significant differences between urban and rural school teachers on the following teaching styles:
  - (i) Expert teaching style;
  - (ii) Formal Authority teaching style;
  - (iii) Personal Model teaching style;
  - (iv) Facilitator teaching style; and
  - (v) Delegator teaching style.

## Method and Procedure

The study was conducted following the Descriptive Survey Method of research.

**Sample:** The sample comprised of 403 school teachers. Out of 403 teachers 259 teachers were from urban locality and 144 teachers were from rural locality. These teachers were selected randomly from 21 schools of District Shimla of Himachal Pradesh.

**Variables:** Locality was the independent variable, the effect of which was studied on criterion variables. Five teaching styles were considered as criterion variables in the study.

## Tools Used

The following tool was employed in the study:

- 1 Teaching Style Inventory by Dr. Nain Singh and Balbir Singh (2007).

The above tool has adequate validity and satisfactory reliability.

## Data Collection

The data were collected by administering above mentioned tool on individual teachers. On completion of the data scoring was done with the help of standard scoring key of the tool developed by the authors.

## Statistical Technique

Obtained data were analyzed by 't'- test.

## Results

In order to find out significance of mean differences in teaching styles of urban and rural school teachers, 't' values were computed. Table 1 presents the obtained results.

**Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations and 't' – Values for Teaching Styles in respect of Urban and Rural Teachers**

Sr.No.	Teaching style	Group	N	Mean	SD	't'-value
1	Expert	Urban	259	58.8919	5.32617	.404NS
		Rural	144	59.1111	5.15374	
2	Formal Authority	Urban	259	50.9537	6.19435	.745NS
		Rural	144	51.3681	4.82091	
3	Personal Model	Urban	259	56.3205	6.41715	.032NS
		Rural	144	56.2986	6.67223	
4	Facilitator	Urban	259	55.5328	6.22152	1.623NS
		Rural	144	56.5208	5.64444	
5	Delegator	Urban	259	56.3127	6.08457	1.356NS
		Rural	144	57.2014	6.42066	

NS = Not Significant at 0.05 level

It is evident from Table 1 that all the five 't' –values were found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance for df 401 meaning thereby, both the groups of teachers were similar with regard to use all the five teaching styles. i.e Expert teaching style; Formal Authority teaching style; Personal Model teaching style; Facilitator teaching style and Delegator teaching style.

Hence the research hypothesis stating that" there will be no significant differences between urban and rural school teachers on the five teaching styles" was accepted.

## Discussion of Results

The findings revealed that locality does not affect the teaching styles. Both urban and rural teachers tend to use similar teaching styles i.e., Formal Authority teaching style; Personal Model teaching style; Facilitator teaching style and Delegator teaching style. There is no parallel study available for supporting or contradicting this finding

## References

- Allen, R.H., (1998). Relation Between Personality Factors and Teaching Style Preferences. DAI, Vol. 59(2), 457-A.
- Brakel, T.D., (1997). Attrition of Instrumental Music Students as a function of Teaching Style and Selected Demographic Variables. DAI, Vol. 58(12), 4592-A.
- Buchanan, W.E., (1984). Teaching Styles of Adult Educators. DAI, Vol. 45(12), 3520-A.
- Butler, K.A., (1984). Learning and Teaching Styles in Theory and Practice, Columbia. The Learners Dimension, (Rev. Ed.).
- Eagly, A.H. and Johnson, B.T., (1990). Gender and Leadership Styles : Meta Analysis; Psychological Bulletin, 108, 233-256.
- Eble, K.E., (1983). The Aims of College Teaching, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Grasha, A.F., (1994). A Matter of Style: The Teacher as Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator. College Teaching, 42, 142-149.
- Grasha, A.F.,(1996). Teaching with Style: A Practical Guide to Enhancing Learning by Understanding Teaching and Learning Styles, Alliance Publishers, Pittsburg, P.A.
- Gregorc, A.F., (1987). Inside Styles: Beyond the Basics, Maynard, Mass : Gabriel Systems, Inc.
- Hans, R., (1986). Relationship among Teaching Style, Learning Grains and Teaching Effectiveness. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Aligarh Muslim University.
- Kumari, V., (2008). A Study of Thinking and Teaching Styles of Teacher Educators in Relation to Some Selected Variables, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis H.P.U. Shimla.
- Roquemore, R.A., (1987). A Study of the Relationship between the Instructional Styles of University Professors and Selected Variables. DAI, Vol. 48(4), 847-A.

- Sarlak, M.G., (1983). Teaching Preferences of Teaching with Operative and Cooperative Teaching Styles. DAI, Vol. 44(11), 3237-A.
- Schluck, C.G., (1969). Predicting Teaching Style Using The MMPI. DAI, Vol. 31(3), 1089-A.
- Schultz, R.A., (1982). Teaching Styles and Psychological Climates. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XXIII (1), 9-18.
- Simon, J.R., (1987). The Preferred Learning Styles of Two Year College Students and Preferred Teaching Styles of College Instructors. DAI, Vol. 48(7), 1672-A.
- Singh, B., (2007). Standardization of Teaching Style Inventory for Secondary School Teachers and Establishing Norms, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis H.P.U. Shimla.
- Singh, N., (2000). Teaching Styles in Higher Education with Special Reference to Teachers of Himachal Pradesh University, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis H.P.U. Shimla.
- Smith, T.D., (1988). An Assessment of the Self-Perceived Teaching Style of Three Ethnic Groups of Public School Teachers in Texas. DAI, Vol. 49(8), 2062-A.
- Spear, L.C. and Sternberg, R.J., (1987). Teaching Style: Staff Development for Teaching, Thinking. Journal of Staff Development, 8 (3). 35-39.
- Tanner, L.N. and Lindgren, H.C. (1971). Classroom Teaching and Learning : A Mental Health Approach, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Trowbridge, N., (1973). Teaching Self-Concept and Teaching Style. IN G. Chanan (Ed.) Towards Science of Teaching. Slough: FER.