GALAXY INTERNATIONAL INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL (GIIRJ)
ISSN (E): 2347-6915
Vol. 11, Issue 06, June (2023)

RESEARCH ON TEACHING STYLE PREFERENCES OF UZBEK UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Tanzilla Artikova
EFL Instructor, Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the characteristics of the language teaching style preferences of Uzbek University teachers. A quantitative investigation was conducted for this study. Due to the Covid-19 outbreak, the data for the research was collected electronically from 90 teachers (48 males and 42 females) of the Department of English at Namangan State University, Uzbekistan, 2020. Reid's Perceptual Teaching Style Preferences Questionnaire had been adopted for the research instrument. The researcher designed an online questionnaire on the Google Drive platform. Basically, the results were analyzed in the SPSS program.

Keywords: Teaching styles, visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, independent, dependent, perceptual teaching style preference

INTRODUCTION

Educators ought to apply innovative approaches and strategies; and they should explain the content clearly; overcome misconceptions; implement various methods for their students in order to promote communicative teaching and learning in EFL classrooms. They have to acknowledge lots of different ways of teaching methods in the classroom for the individuals. It is said that each person is different in his or her human characteristics such as self-studying, motivation, memorizing, decision-making, and language learning habits, styles, preferences, and interests. If EFL teachers consider such differences and peculiarities of the students in the language classroom, this might utilize the learning environment to be more efficient and pleasant for the learners. There have been plenty of educational research revealing significant differences in how learners comprehend and learn new materials in second language acquisition. It is understood that learning is done not only in groups but also by working individually. Each individual learns according to their own learning style. Thus, individual differences make the learning process more facilitating and rewarding. Identifying the strengths of different learners and investigating their weaknesses further drives educators to develop and promote pedagogy that values effective teaching and learning. Considering the further improvements in the Uzbek university context the researcher aimed to investigate Uzbek university teachers' teaching styles preferences in Uzbek context.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire survey was conducted with 90 teachers of the Namangan State University. The respondents were the EFL instructors of this university majoring English Language Education. They were chosen as the research site for the following reasons. Firstly, they are one of the largest group of English teachers in the Namangan region; adding to this, it is the native town of the researcher. Secondly, she would consider implementing the survey results

and plan upcoming research projects in that university. The following table (Table 1) records the demographic data of the survey respondents.

Table 1 *The Demographic Data for the Teachers*

		Teachers (90)	
		Frequency	Percentage
		90	100
Gender	Male	48	53.3
	Female	42	46.7
Highest Academic qualification	Bachelor's degree	15	16.7
	Master's degree	60	66.7
	Doctoral degree	15	16.7
Teaching experience	Less than 2years	30	33.3
	2-5years	6	6.7
	6-10years	27	30.0
	More than 10years	27	30.0
Professional training	Yes	87	96.7
	No	3	3.3

As shown in Table 1, it indicates gender, the highest academic qualification, year of teaching experience, and holding professional training certificate of the respondents. Moreover, the teacher group were 48 male and 42 female teachers who were working as EFL teachers in Namangan State University. They were the teachers of the respondents who were student research participants of the current study. The largest group of the survey teachers were those holding their Master's degree (66.7%) while Bachelors and Doctoral degree holders made up 16.7% each.

The data illustrated in Table 2 indicates that the respondents among teachers were mostly young teachers (30) who had been working at the university for less than 2-years. Teachers of 6 - 10-year experience and more than ten-year teaching experience teachers both numbered 27. Therefore, both groups made up 30% each. The last item of the personal data illustrates that almost all of the teachers (87) got the professional training certificates whereas the small size of the group (3) do not have their training certificates.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The teacher's questionnaire consists of 2 parts: the first part contains demographic data questions which ask the teachers' gender, year of teaching experience, professional language certificate and educational backgrounds. The latter is used to identify teacher's language teaching style preferences in EFL contexts. Teachers' foreign language teaching style preferences were examined by using a self-reported questionnaire based on the students' learning style questionnaire developed by Wai Lam (see Appendix C). The questionnaire was administered to 90 teachers from NSU. The major aims are to explore university teachers' teaching styles preferences; and to provide data for further investigation to match between learning styles and teaching styles. The second part asks teachers about their teaching styles

using the same six categories (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group and individual) and categories of teaching styles identified by the researcher (independent, dependent, teacher-modeling, analytic). The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale: from 1 ("*Strongly Disagree*") to 5 ("*Strongly Agree*"). The researcher sent the "Information sheet for the teachers" (see Appendix A) electronically in order to inform the teachers about the purpose of the study. Additionally, they were informed that completion of the questionnaire was voluntary and that the data collected would be confidential. Table 2 represents ten domains of teaching style preference and description of the domains.

Table 2 *Teaching Style Preference Domains*

Domains	Items
Visual	think students learn better by reading; think students learn better with written instructions; think students understand language concepts (e.g. grammar) better with written notes than oral explanation; think students learn more by reading textbooks than by listening to lectures;
Auditory	think students learn better in the class with oral instructions; think students remember better the things that they have heard in the class than they have read; think students learn better in the class if they listen to a lecture (instead of reading a book); think students learn better with instructions that allow them to hear what they are learning;
Kinesthetic	think students prefer to learn better by doing practical work in the class (e.g. practice writing a good introduction in an academic writing lesson); think students learn better by doing things in the class; (e.g. jotting down vocabulary meanings, instead of reading handouts given by teachers); think students enjoy learning in the class by doing practical work (e.g. Practicing how to cite an article in a class, instead of reading referencing manuals given by the teachers); think students understand things better in the class when they participate in active activities (e.g. role-playing);
Tactile	think students learn more when they can make something by themselves. (e.g. giving a poster presentation); think students learn more when they make something for a class project (e.g. collecting and summarizing readings for a class project); think students like teachers explaining language concepts by making drawings (e.g. concept mapping / mind mapping); think students remember better what they have learned (e.g. writing my own notes for revision);
Individual	think students learn better by working on individual tasks; think students learn better by working alone; think students remember things they have heard in class better than things they have read; think having personal consultation with teachers helps students; understand new concepts or things that they do not understand;

Group	think learners like working with other students; think learners learn more when they work with other students; think learners enjoy working on an assignment with two or three classmates; think learners learn better when they study with others;
Independent	think learners prefer to solve problems by themselves first (instead of relying on teacher's explanation); think learners prefer to participate in activities that allow them to explore topics which they are interested in; think when learners are interested in a topic, they prefer finding out more about it on their own (instead of relying on teachers); think when learners don't understand something, they prefer figuring it out by themselves first;

Table 3 *The Reliability of the Teachers' Questionnaire*

Domain	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha based on Standardized item	N of the items
Visual	.670	.693	4 (1-4)
Auditory	.870	.820	4(5-8)
Kinesthetic	.811	.815	4(9-12)
Tactile	.799	.801	4(13-16)
Individual	.742	.743	4(17-20)
Group	.800	.817	4(21-24)
Independent	.840	.838	4(25-28)
Dependent	.826	.831	4(29-32)
Teacher Modeling	.793	.801	4(33-36)
Analytic	.864	.864	4(37-40)

A generally accepted rule of thumb is that 0.6 to 0.7 indicates an acceptable level of reliability (Hulin, Netemeyer, and Cudeck, 2001). The result shows that alpha coefficients is higher than 0.65. It can be concluded that both of the questionnaire is sufficiently reliable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Teaching Style Preference According to Ten Domains

To measure whether there is any significant difference among the ten domains used by teachers, Repeated Measures ANOVA was conducted using SPSS software. The results are indicated in the Table 11. The result from repeated measures ANOVA revealed that there is statistically significant difference among the ten domains used by teacher group that we can reject null hypothesis: $F(9, 890) = 9.919$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 4 The Choices of Teaching Styles According to Ten Overall Categories

Type	N	M	SD	F	P	Note
Visual [a]	90	3.91	0.653			
Auditory[b]	90	3.64	0.742			
Kinesthetic[c]	90	4.11	0.756			
Tactile[d]	90	4.35	0.564			
Individual[e]	90	3.75	0.755			
Group[f]	90	4.28	0.608	9.919***	0.000	i=c<j=g<f<d b<e<h<a
Independent[g]	90	4.15	0.637			
Dependent[h]	90	3.89	0.788			
Teacher Modeling[i]	90	4.10	0.597			
Analytic[j]	90	4.15	0.631			

***p<0.001

The results are illustrated in Table 4. As can be observed from the table, some of the teaching styles such as kinesthetic, tactile, group, independent, teacher modelling and analytic were more favored by the teachers compared to other teaching styles. Specifically, tactile style was the most popular among Uzbek teachers with the mean value of 4.35 and standard deviation of 0.564. This suggests that Uzbek teachers prefer to provide opportunities to their students to try out the activities themselves in order to learn the concept best. The next most preferred teaching style was group style with a median score of 4.28 and a standard deviation of 0.608. This data clearly indicates that, many teachers liked to facilitate group work in their classes and considered group collaboration most beneficial for the students' learning. Independent and Analytic came about as the subsequent most favored teaching styles with the same mean values of 4.15 and 4.15, standard deviations of 0.637 and 0.631 respectively. Kinesthetic and teacher modelling also received relatively high mean scores of 4.11 and 4.10, respectively. The least preferred teaching styles were Visual, Dependent, Individual, and Auditory each with the median scores of 3.91, 3.89, 3,75 and 3.66. Thus, it can be perceived that the teachers in Uzbek university less prefer to deliver the information about the concepts through lectures or oral instructions.

CONCLUSION

The question of this research was to deal with the teaching styles of the Uzbek university teachers. Descriptive statistics was applied. Findings revealed quite interesting results as some of the most and least preferred teaching styles seemed to align with the learning style choice of the students. Specifically, like in case of students, Tactile style is highly preferred by the Uzbek university teachers. Group, Analytic and Independent styles were subsequently the most favored teaching styles. Regarding the least favored teaching styles, Auditory and Individual were on the top of the list. Although descriptive statistics results suggested a match between the teaching styles and learning styles in terms of Analytic, Auditory and Individual styles results of the T-test for this study showed a significant difference. The results of the T-test

addressed the relationship between the teaching styles of the teachers and learning styles of the learners. As mentioned above, there were significant differences between the teachers' teaching styles and students' learning styles. Specifically, teaching styles of the teachers and learning styles of the students did not match in Kinesthetic, Tactile, Independent, Teacher Modelling and Analytic learning styles. This implies that teaching strategies used by the Uzbek teachers did not coordinate with the diversity of their students' learning styles. Furthermore, the fact that a lot of teachers apply a particular technique to the entire class may not be productive for students who have various learning styles This fits a handful of previous studies which found a mismatch between the teaching and learning styles (e.g., Peacock, 2002; Ridwan, Sutresna.

REFERENCES

1. Hayes, J., & Allinson, C. W. (1997). Learning styles and training and development in work settings: lessons from educational research. Educational Psychology, 1 (2), 185-193.
2. Ibtisam, A. (2007). An analytic survey of the learning styles of students in the Department of English. Journal of Kerbala University, 5 (4),1-9.
3. Moenikia, M., & Babelan, Z. (2010). The role of learning styles in second language learning among distance education students. Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2 (2),1169-1173.
4. Otkirov, A. (2020). Active learning and teaching of foreign languages in Uzbekistan [article] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347342574 Oxford, R. L. (2001). Pallant, J. (2001). SPSS Survival Manual, Buckingham, Philadelphia, Open University Press
5. Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11(1), 1-20.
6. Pithers, R. T. (2002). Cognitive learning style: A Review of the field-dependent field independent approach. Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 54 (1),117-132. Radwan, A. (2014). Gender and learning style preferences of EFL learners. Arab World English Journal, 5 (1), 21-32.
7. Reid, J. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. TESOL Quarterly, 21(1),87-111
8. Ridwan, H., & Sutresna, I. (2018). Teaching styles of the teachers and learning styles of the students. Journal of Physics. Conference series,13 (18).
9. Shuib, M., & Azizan, N. (2015). Learning Style Preferences among Male and Female ESL Students in Universiti-Sains Malaysia. Journal of Educators Online, 12 (2), 103-141.
10. Synekop, O. (2018). The cognitive aspect of learning style in differentiated ESP instruction for the Future IT specialists. Advanced Education, (10),40-47.
11. Wong, W. L. (2015). A study of language learning style and teaching style preferences of Hong Kong Community College students and teachers in English for academic purposes context. [thesis] University of Canterbury.
12. Yasuda, T. (2019). An exploratory study for factorial validity of cognitive styles among Japanese adult EFL learners: from educational and cultural perspectives. Asian-Pacific Journal of second and Foreign Language Education ,4 (1).