Comparative Study of Teaching Styles of Various School Groups at Secondary Level in District Chiniot of Punjab

Abstract
Teaching style involves students in the learning process and assists them to improve critical thinking abilities. Customary teaching styles have progressed with the arrival of distinguished teaching, stimulating teachers to modify their teaching styles towards pupils’ learning requirements. The present study was intended to compare teaching styles of teachers working in various school groups at secondary level in district Chiniot. There were three objectives which were probed by the respondents to discover and compare teaching styles of public and private secondary school groups. The sample of 240 teachers of 24 public and private secondary schools was selected randomly from district Chiniot. A questionnaire developed and used by Grasha [1] in many countries, was used as research instrument to collect data. The responses were analyzed through SPSS (V-20) to find out Mean, Standard Deviation, and Frequency Distributions for the description of data. Values of t-test were also applied to measure significant difference among various variables related to research questions. It was concluded by analysis that there were five teaching styles found in public and private school groups. It was revealed that in public and private school groups there was no significant difference observed on expert, facilitator and delegator teaching styles. Only significant difference was found on formal authority and personal model teaching styles in favour of public school groups.
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1. Introduction
Education is the spine of improvement of any country in the globe. It is reality that any sort of development and improvement in the globe is the direct result of education [2]. Teaching strategies play a crucial role in transformation traits and transfer of knowledge to the next generation. Teaching techniques of developed nations are greatly reputable as compare to other nations. Such nations are observed as the pioneers of the world. In short it is guidelines that can transform the number of population in any homeland into helpful human asset. Truth be told, teaching is the apparatus that builds up the crude capacities of beings into helpful abilities and information on the premise of which the people lead towards the innovation and development of their social orders and in this way the individuals are twisted from burden to human capital [3].

Secondary education is a turning phase, so superlative teaching style is to be implemented in the class considering the requirements of the learners so that appropriate guidance can be given. A teaching style is concerned with how an action is conveyed, instead of what is conveyed [4].

“Teaching style” is the general attributes and qualities that an instructor shows in the classroom and that is reliable for different circumstances [5]. Teaching styles comprise of an educator’s own manners and the media used to convey information to or get it from the students. This clarification tells us the implication of educators’ manners and media that significantly influence the conveyance of the instructions [6].

Teaching style is the most significant factor influencing the improvement of teachers’ professional talent that is forever reliable with teachers’ individuality type and differ with individuals [7,8].

As per Grasha [1] individual practices and attributes in the educating learning methodology the teachers show and exhibit express that different teaching styles exist. Instructors vary by the way they deal with their classes, how they collaborate with their learners, and how they see their parts as teachers. At the point when classroom teachers disclose learners how to choose and utilize suitable methodologies, they show their own particular
favored teaching styles. Therefore, teaching styles influence instructional methods received by teachers as well as learners’ learning capacities.

As indicated by Callahan, Clark, and Kellough [9], teachers must adjust their teaching styles and show an expansive stock of methods. One teaching style can’t be utilized with all students. For figuring out how to happen, instructors need to utilize different teaching styles and to encourage students, including those with learning troubles, build up their own particular learning systems and utilize these methods successfully and productively.

An explanation with the purpose of teaching style is “a pervasive way of approaching the learners that might be consistent with several methods of teacher”. This explanation strains the significance of teaching styles and the talent of the teacher to choose the accurate style for the learners. In this way, teaching styles had a tendency to be linked with teaching methodologies clearly [10].

1.1. The Concept of Teaching

Edmund [11] announced teaching is a universal inquiry about perfect substances in the universe. It is an investigation of general principles and comprehension of all that comes in the scope of human experiences. Teaching is a procedure which normally happens in the classroom circumstances. It is a greater amount of formal techniques. In the classroom circumstances, we see that the educator has something in his brain and he needs to pass it on to the students. For this reason, he takes the assistance of teaching. He takes all activities to make the students comprehend it. His teaching is effective if the students have the ability to grip it completely.

According to Gage [12] that throughout teaching, the instructor goes for issuing some learning to the learners, passing some data to them, making the learners obtain some ability, changing the character of the learners, modifying the conduct of the learners, giving a few examples of life, and so on. An authentic and dedicated teacher tries to accomplish the desired conclusion. Teaching is a skill of teaching to other individuals. In this period of science and innovation when there is flash of learning, the methodology of teaching has come to new measurements. It is no more a straightforward skill of discussing facts to the students. It is presently having a tendency to turn into an innovation without any else instructional TV, PC helped direction, teaching machines, and so on. Teaching is an activity which goes ahead between the two individuals i.e. the supplier and the recipient. Teaching is not a mechanical procedure. It is complicated, demanding and testing employment. Teaching can’t be come down to a helpful recipe of “telling and testing”. It is the complex art of directing students through a mixture of selected experiences.

1.2. What is Style in Teaching?

Eble [13] investigated that style is essential in teaching, arranging the components of our styles as teacher have ended up being difficult. One reason is that generally the idea of style has been seen in a negative way. It has been mistaken for insincerity, criticized as a kind of posturing to cover an absence of substance, or suffered as a characteristic sign of individual unreliability. Eble also discovered that to characterize style and to understand it, to create it and to apply it successfully requires moving past the negative sense in which it is in sometime apparent. Style in teaching as in art, music, games; overseeing individuals and different territories of effort is not something that is put on for the event. Moreover it turns into a shallow covering veil, or a gathering of fascinating traits that are utilized to make an impression. Our teaching style speaks to those continuing individual qualities and practices that prove up by the way we direct our classes. In this way, it is both something that characterizes us, that aids and coordinates our instructional styles, and that has consequences for students and their capacity to learn.

Grasha [14] stated that teaching styles illuminate to those individual abilities and performances that display up by the method we show our classes. It is both something that characterizes us, that aids and coordinates our instructional procedures, and that has impact on students and their capacity to learn. Brown [29] as well clarified that “Teaching style refers to an educator’s close to home practices and media used to transmit information to or get it from the learner and include the implementation of the teacher’s philosophy about teaching.

In the exploration investigation of Grasha [1] he clarified and recognized five teaching styles in his teaching style models in view of what he viewed as illustrations of good examples. These five styles are Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator Style. In spite of the fact that it may appear to be proper to place teachers into one of the five classes of teaching styles, Grasha [1] stressed that everybody who teaches has each of the five instructing styles to changing degrees. These teaching styles are presented as under:

1.3. Expert Type

Teachers with this teaching style have information and skill that students require. He or she attempts to sustain position as an expert between students by expressing detailed facts and by challenging students to improve their proficiency. The teacher is anxious with conveying information and ensuring that learners are well equipped.

1.4. Formal Authority Type
This style is a teacher-centered approach where instructors are responsible for giving and calculating the course of substance. The formal authority kinds of teachers have position between some students because of facts and role as a faculty member. The teacher is concerned with delivering constructive and unconstructive feedback, instituting learning targets, expectations and system of manner for learners.

1.5. Personal Model Type

Teachers with this style also known as a teacher-centered approach where the teacher displays the talents that students are likely to learn. This teaching style persuades students’ participation and teachers adapt their arrangement to comprise different learning styles. The personal model teacher considers in teaching by personal illustration and establishes an example for how to imagine and perform. This teacher oversees, guides and express by showing how to do things, promoting students to monitor and then to follow the teacher approach.

1.6. Facilitator Type

This is a student-centered style of teaching. The instructor performs as a facilitator and the responsibility is placed on the learners to attain results for different assignments. This teaching style promotes self-governing as well as mutual learning. The teacher naturally plans group activities that involve dynamic learning, student-to-student association and problem-solving.

1.7. Delegator Type

This teaching style is as well student-centered approach where the instructor delegates and places the control and the obligation regarding learning on the learners or clusters of students. The instructor is anxious with budding students’ ability to function in an independent method. Learners work freely on venture or as a major aspect of self-sufficient groups. The delegator teaching style frequently gives students an option in designing and applying their own difficult learning projects while the teacher acts in a counseling role.

Different researchers have focused on individual abilities of styles in instructing. Gregorc [15] called attention to in his study that a teaching style comprises of an instructor’s close to home practices and the media used to exchange information to or obtain it from the learner. Teaching style mirror the instructors’ strategies as they educate in the classroom.

Many research studies concluded that the strong proof highlighted the teaching styles of teachers were the main factors affecting directly [16,17] and indirectly with students’ learning style to students’ outcomes [18,19]. However, numerous analysts have been trying to investigate the individual teaching style and foundation information to actualize for improving the teaching quality. Similarly students, each teacher could use many ways for their instruction, but the style always employed and helped their students to achieve the learning target effectively [18].

Zeeb [20] presented in his investigation that adjusting learning styles of students with teaching styles of educators could prompt a change in educational execution. He inspected how middle school learners learned and how their educator taught and found that there was connection between learners’ learning style and their instructors’ instructing styles. Zeeb also developed the information acquired from surveying learning and teaching styles to help instructors adjust their instructing styles to help shifting learning execution that brought about enhancing students’ test scores.

Farkas [21] additionally explored the impact of teaching styles on two groups of seventh-grade students. Learners in the examining group favored comparable learning styles and were taught by inclination, while the control group was taught with a traditional teaching style. In his examination, the learners in the investigational group, who obtain an
instruction style that coordinated their favored learning styles, outperformed the control group academically. The investigational group moreover confirmed more constructive manners toward learning more accepting of community’s emotions, and an improved capability to transfer what they had educated from one area to another.

Curtin [22] made study on a group of English as Second Language (ESL) students and their instructors and ordered teaching styles as instructive and intuitive. Pedantic instructors settle on a large portion of the choices in the classroom, stress showing the substance, and place students in a hidden part. Then again, intelligent educators take into account the assorted learning style of their learners, put much attention on the teaching and learning process, and anticipate that students will be dynamic learner. The discoveries of Curtin’s study recommended that teacher who embraces and intuitive teaching style can better meet the one of a kind of their ESL students. The intuitive educators used more agreeable learning procedures alongside various exercises that worked best with ESL students.

Norzila [23] conducted a study on 175 school students with a survey adjusted from Grasha’s Teaching Style Inventory (1996) to check whether there was dissimilarity among students’ recognitions and inclination of their English language teachers’ teaching styles. The specialists found that there were no sexual orientation contrasts in students’ favored and saw instructing styles. However, students favored learner-focused teaching styles, while the most often times employed teaching styles of teacher were instructor focused in nature.

Lada [24] conducted a research on eighteen teachers using Grasha’s description of teaching styles in Swedish University to examine the teaching styles at university level. He concluded that (28%) teachers prefer delegator teaching style which facilitates learners to identify themselves as a self-sufficient learner. The next favored teaching style is formal authority (26%) that spotlights on clear desires and adequate methods for doing things. Facilitator style of teaching utilized by (11%) of teachers. This style stresses the individual personality of teacher-student communications, similarly demonstrator (personal model) teaching style is also used by (11%) of tested teachers. The combination of formal authority and delegator teaching style is preferable by (11%) examined teachers. The combination of formal authority and personal model is used by (6.5%) of teachers and the combination of formal authority and facilitator is used by (6.5%) of teachers. In her study she found significant correlation between teaching style and gender, teaching style and level of course or teaching style and academic rank.

Claudio H. Diaz Larenas [25] conducted a research study to contrast the teaching styles of a cluster of thirty educators of English teaching in public and private secondary education in Chile. He also used Grasha’s [1] teaching style survey inventory. In his study results showed that public division teachers demonstrate a facilitator teaching style, while private division teachers demonstrate an authoritative teaching style.

After understanding about the teaching styles, the present research study has been planned to explore and compare the various teaching styles of teachers working in public and private schools groups at secondary level in district Chiniot of Punjab.

2. Methodology

The present study was a descriptive in nature. So, it was integrated surveys that were conducted with the help of Teaching Style Survey Questionnaire. This study concerned quantitative statistics investigation. One feedback form: “Teaching Style Survey Questionnaire for Teachers (TSSQ)” developed and validated by [1] was selected after prior permission and utilized in this research.

2.1. Sample of the Study

There were 3 tehsils in district Chiniot of Punjab province and 117 (67 public and 50 private) secondary schools affiliated with BISE (Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education) Faisalabad were present in these 3 tehsils (www.schools.punjab.gov.pk, www.bisefsd.edu.pk). A total 24 Secondary Schools (16 from Head tehsil and 4 from each its sub-tehsil total 24) for Sample of the study were selected from the District Chiniot.

2.2. Objective of the Study

Following were the objectives of the current study:
1. to explore the different teaching styles of public and private schools teachers at secondary level
2. to compare teaching styles of public and private school teachers at secondary level (Urban vs Rural, Male vs Female)
3. to make suggestions on the basis of the findings of the study

3. Findings

On investigation it was discovered that there was five sorts of teaching styles were present in the public and private school groups which were expert style of teaching, formal authority style of teaching, personal model style of teaching, facilitator style of teaching, and delegator style of teaching.

On comparing the teaching styles of public and private school groups it was found that no important difference was found on expert, facilitator and delegator teaching styles. Only significant difference
was observed on formal authority and personal model teaching styles in favour of public schools groups. (Shawn in Table 1)

On comparing the teaching styles of males and females teachers, it was found that no significant difference was found on expert, personal model, facilitator, and delegator teaching styles. Only significant difference was found on formal authority style of teaching in favour of females teachers. (Shown in Table 2)

On evaluating the teaching styles of urban and rural teachers it was found that no significant difference was found on expert, formal authority and delegator teaching styles. Only significant difference was found on personal model and facilitator teaching styles in favour of urban teachers. (Shown in Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Style</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Type</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Authority</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Model</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.841</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicated that public teachers were more agreed to the statements relating to personal model teaching style while private teachers were least agreed with this teaching style.

In facilitator style of teaching both sectors confirmed same attitude. It is evident from P-value (.401) that the results are insignificant. Results showed that public and private teachers were same decision about the statements containing to facilitator teaching style.

In delegator style of teaching both sectors showed equal estimation. It is evident from P-value (.93) that the results are insignificant. Results presented that public teachers and private teachers were the same opinion about the statements relating to delegator teaching style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Style</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Type</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Authority</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Model</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32.01</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.832</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.845</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In expert style of teaching both gender showed same opinion. It is evident from P-value (.942) that the results are insignificant. Results revealed that both genders were equal level of opinions relating to expert teaching style. It means that both type of gender was the same style of teaching.

In formal authority style of teaching female teachers was more agreed as compare male teachers. It is evident from P-value (.002) that the results are significant. Results showed that female teachers were more agreed about the statements relating to formal authority teaching style while male teachers were least agreed with the statements relating to formal authority teaching style.

In personal model style of teaching both genders exposed same opinion for this teaching style. It is obvious from P-value (.406) that the results are insignificant. Results showed that both genders were agreed to statements relating to personal model teaching style.

In facilitator style of teaching both genders were same attitude. It is apparent from P-value (.399) that the results are insignificant. Results showed that both genders were agreed to facilitator teaching style.
In delegator style of teaching both genders showed equal estimation. It is clear from P-value (.239) that the results are insignificant. Results showed that both genders were agreed to delegator teaching style.

### Table 3. Comparison of five teaching styles with respect to Locality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Style</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Type</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Authority</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.898</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Model</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.2.39</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-.2.94</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy of the homeland. Trainings and workshops of pre-service and in-services teaching faculty must be started to recognize their style of teaching.

3. Private School groups should plan training sessions for their teaching faculty to achieve the targets of their institution.

4. It is also recommended for the budding researcher to conduct a study on students learning styles also.

5. It is also recommended to compare the achievements of the students regarding different teaching styles of teachers.

6. It is also recommended to compare the achievements of the students regarding different learning styles of the students.
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