SoLLs.INTEC.13: International Conference on Knowledge-Innovation-Excellence: Synergy in Language Research and Practice

# The Relationship between Lecturers' Teaching Style And Students' Academic Engagement

Abdull Sukor Shaari[a*], Nurahimah Mohd Yusoff[b], Izam Mohd Ghazali[c], Rafisah Hj Osman[d], Nur Fatirah Mohd Dzahir[e]

[a,b,c,d,e] Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.

**Abstract**

This study aimed to identify the relationship between lecturers' teaching style and students' academic engagement in a university in Malaysia The study was conducted using a survey through questionnaires distributed to 266 students. Types of teaching styles used are in accordance with the teaching style of Grasha (1996). In order to determine the dimensions of the lecturers' teaching style and students' engagement level in academic, the descriptive statistics based on percentage, mean and standard deviation were used. As for the lecturers' teaching styles, majority of the lecturers use personal model followed by expert style, while delegator style gets the lowest mean. Majority of the respondents were found to have involved in academic engagement. The results also show that there is a significant but moderate relationship between lecturers' teaching style with the students' academic engagement.

*Keywords:* teaching style; academic engagement; lecturers and students

## 1. Introduction

Student academic excellence is the main agenda for any educational institutions and colleges. To ensure that academic excellence can be achieved, it requires action and cooperation from all parties. The learning

---

[*] Corresponding author. Tel.: +600-0000000; fax: +0-000-000-0000 .
*E-mail address:* abdsukor@uum.edu.my

environment which is inviting, conducive and fun is essential in teaching and learning. This is because the students' ability and readiness to learn does not only depending on the students themselves, but also lie in the suitability of a teacher's teaching style (Felder & Henrique, 1995).

Research involving college and university students development shows that time and energy students devote to educationally purposeful activities is the single best predictor of their learning and personal development (Astin, 1993; Pascarella, 2001). Thus, those institutions that engage their students more in the variety of activities' that contribute to valuable outcomes of college can claim to be of higher quality in comparison with similar types of college and universities.

Student engagement is defined as the student's psychological investment in and the effort directed toward learning, understanding, and mastering knowledge, skills, or crafts that academic work intends to promote (Newman, 1992). More than just the energy to complete the task, engagement represents the psychological investment that cognitively involves students in the work they are doing. Student involvement has been found to be one of the important predictors of their academic performance. A student who is more involved in university life would perform better academically.

Students' involvement theory which was developed by Astin (1984). Claims that students involvement in academic will influence the student's psychosocial development throughout his/her university or college life. To ensure the academic excellence, it requires actions and cooperation from all parties. The learning environment which is inviting, conducive and fun is essential in teaching and learning. This is because the students' ability and readiness to learn does not only depend on the students themselves, but also lie in the suitability of a teacher's teaching style (Felder & Henrique, 1995).

Grasha and Hicks (2000) argues that in order to guarantee the effectiveness of a teaching and learning process, it is simply not enough to focus only on the students' learning styles. Teaching styles also need to be considered as an important element in a lesson. According to Grasha (1996), the teaching styles are the pattern of belief, knowledge, performance and behavior of teachers when they are teaching. In this study, according to Grasha (1996), there are five dimensions of teaching styles which are the expert style, formal authority style, personal model style, delegator style and facilitator style.

There were studies done to identify the association between teaching styles with students' achievement such as the study by Zin (2004) and Aitkin and Zuzovsky (1994) and there is also a study that connects their teaching with students' cognitive styles (Evans, 2004). Past studies on the engagement of students found that there is a correlation between students' engagement and the teaching and academic achievement (OECD, 2000). However, their studies found that teaching is not the main factor affecting academic achievement of students.

Studies regarding university teaching style are very less conducted, especially the teaching styles which are related to students involvement or even as university graduates. Therefore, this study will be answering questions of what is the dominant teaching style practiced by university lecturers and whether there is a relationship between lecturers' teaching styles and students' participation.

## 2. Objectives of study

The objectives of the study are to:
1. identify lecturers' teaching styles in Universiti Utara Malaysia
2. explain students' academic engagement in Universiti Utara Malaysia
3. determine the relationship between lecturers' teaching style and students' academic engagement

## 3. Literature review

Good teachers, are able to wheedle and motivate though there are teachers who are strict, and emotional. There are studies that found that most teachers teach according to how they have first learnt (Stitt-Gohdes, 2001)

and how they were taught (Bailey, Bergthold, Braunstein, Fleischman, Holbrook, Tuman, Waissbluth, & Zambo, 1996).

Different researchers use different definitions to define teaching style. According to Peacock (2001), the teaching style is the way a person teaches by nature, habitual, inclination or even a custom that is used to convey information and skills in the classroom. In addition, according to Wright (1987), one teaching style involves a complex mix of beliefs, attitudes, strategies, techniques, motivation, personality and control. The teachers teaching styles can be seen when they conduct the teaching and learning process. Teaching style is determined by the personal qualities and attitudes. Gregorc (1989) says that the teachers' teaching styles are their personal behaviors and the media that they have been using are for transferring data and information to students. Grasha (1996) says that teaching styles represent the pattern of needs, beliefs and behavior shown by teachers in the classroom.

In terms of teaching style category, Onstein and Miller (1980), have categorized two types of teaching styles and they are expressive teaching styles and instrumental teaching style. Expressive style refers to the emotional relationship created by the teacher to the student or the class as a whole, including warmth, authority, sympathy, trust and some emotional aspects shown by the teacher. The interpersonal relationships between teachers and students is involved in this teaching style and related with attitudes toward learning. Expressive teaching style works to control the students, managing classroom activities as well as negative or positive feelings toward teaching. Other than that, this teaching style is also associated with a sense of confidence in students and understands the purpose of education in general. Commonly, teachers who practice this style will serve as a helpful mentor and could tolerate students. Teachers also believe in the existence of the best ways for students to learn about learning. On the other hand, instrumental style refers to the way teachers carry out the task to assist students, planning the lesson, setting up the classroom standard and ensure that students achieve the standards set.

Cornsten and Miller (1980) highlight the model based on the idea that only a part of the expressive and instrumental teaching styles. According to this model, teaching styles are categorized into four styles. Normally consists of task solving style, mastery style, problem solvers and humanist. In this model, the expressive dimensions reflect emotional engagement while the instrumental dimension involves students' behavior.

Jarvis (1985) uses three classifications to determine methods of teaching:
   a)   Controlled didactic style through lectures and students taking down notes
   b)   Socratic style when teacher asks a question and students respond.
   c)   Facilitator style is when a teacher prepare the learning environment and the students themselves are responsible for their education.

Besides, the teaching style is also classified from the perspective of humanism, behaviorism and cognitivism as advocated by Kramlinger and Huberty (1990). Humanism emphasizes personal experience where the teacher will act as a facilitator and encourage students to share their experiences and opinions. Humanism techniques are consistent with the pragmatic, reflective and activist students. Behavioral style shapes the desired behavior through rewarding. The aim is to reinforce the required behavior so that the students will be able to control the behavior. This style suits the pragmatic and activists students. Cognitivism is a style that resembles the traditional academic approach and aims to present the information logically, usually through lectures. This style fits the theoretical students.

Another model by Doherty (2003) lists teaching styles as:
   1. Style A - Order - Teachers will make all decisions
   2. Style B - Drill - Students carry out tasks assigned by teacher
   3. Style C - Reciprocal - Students complete the task in pairs
   4. Style D - Check yourself - Students check their own performance. Do they own the stated criterion?
   5. Style F - Inclusion - Teachers plan while students evaluate their own work
   6. Style F - Guided Exploration - Students solve problems according to a set of guidelines given with the help of assistant teacher

7. Style G - Divergent - Students solve problems with the help of teachers according to a set of guidance provided.
8. Individual style - Teacher makes decisions on the content, while students make decisions in planning programs
9. Student Initiative Style - Students plan their own program and the teacher as an advisor
10. Self Instructional style - Students are fully responsible for their learning process.

Some researchers have tried to identify the various nature of teaching, such as teachers need to have the most dominant teaching style (Conti, 1985; Ladd, 1995). However, researchers who study teaching style prefer to produce their own indicators to identify the variety of teaching styles. The results of this situation have led to the definition of various teaching styles and produce a number of dimensions to measure the difference of teaching styles (Allen, 1988; Dunn & Dunn, 1979; Grasha, 2003).

Based on Evans (2004), he developed the Teaching Style Questionnaire (TSQ) to measure the analytic holistic style of teaching for trainee teachers who enrolled in a year program of training for postgraduate certificate in education in United Kingdom. In the questionnaire, the lower score indicates a more holistic teaching style and the highest indicate a more analytical style of teaching. Overall, teachers tend to be using analytical style than holistic style. Holistic style is characterized as a more formal style, flexible, interactive, spontaneous and full attention to the individual. The style is more concerned in terms of global learning, learning process, and work as a team. Analytical style also is a more formal style, control, direct, structured, sequential, and concerned on details compared to holistic style. Individuals with this style prefer to work alone and in their interactions with students, they are more impersonal, inflexible and provide a more detailed response.

In terms of the factors that influence the teaching style, Peacock (2001) found that teaching styles used by teachers are very much depending on the teacher's ethnicity, of which he found that Chinese teachers avoid auditory style. Teaching style is also influenced by the purpose and design of courses, norms of learning institutions and academic discipline. For example, the expert style or formal authority tend to be used by teachers who teach large classes. In addition, gender, seniority and time also played a role in influencing their teaching (Chapman, Hughes, & Williamson, 2001). Zhorik (1990) also found that teachers' teaching style was influenced by the ideology and beliefs of students and knowledge.

Study on compatibility of teaching styles also managed to grab the attention of the researchers. Felder and Henriques (1995) and Tudor (1996) studies suggest that teaching style which parallels with the learning styles of students will be able to improve learning, attitudes, behavior and motivation. Furthermore, the way a teacher presents the content of education depends on her communication style. Based on personality theories, Sturt (2000) has analyzed the teaching style using the Myers Briggs Inventory and categorized teaching styles to sixteen categories. All were measured by four dimensions of *Extrovert-Introvert, Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling* and *Judgemental-Perception* (Sturt, 2000).

Chia (1997) also found that teachers prefer to use progressive style. The study was conducted using an instrument developed by Bennet et al. (1976). Meanwhile, a study by Noriah and Sakinah Mohamed (2003) found that teachers enjoy being the facilitator and delegator during the teaching and learning process.

*3.1. Grasha Teaching Style (1996)*

Although there are many types of teaching styles, this section will only discuss the style of teaching by Grasha (1996). Anthony Grasha proposed five different styles of teaching and they are expert style, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator (1996). Grasha stressed that these five teaching styles are grouped into four clusters. The first cluster encompasses an expert style and formal authority style; Second cluster includes personal model style, expert style and formal authority style; Third cluster includes facilitator style, personal model style and expert style and the fourth cluster includes delegator style, facilitators and experts. Each teaching style is described as below.

Expert style is highlighted by teachers who have the knowledge and expertise in the subject matter. Teachers who have this style are always encouraging their students to excel and teach in detail and depth. Teachers who practise this style require their students to always be prepared and emphasize the dissemination of information to the maximum. The formal authority style is when a teacher of this style always gives positive or negative feedback to the students. They assume that the teaching should be done in a standard form, accurate, and accepted by students which include teaching goals set by the school, and students' behavior rules enshrined in school law. Teachers with this style prefer to use a structured teaching.

For personal model style, the teaching should be done using personal examples and 'teach by example'. Teachers tend to act as a prototype to students on how to think and behave. They tend to direct and guide the students to observe and imitate the method shown after that. Facilitator style emphasized teacher interaction with students. They provide guidance and give direction by asking questions, giving options to explore, give recommendations of alternatives and develop criteria for selection. The overall goal is to develop students' ability to be self-reliance, initiative and responsible. Teachers with this style prefer to teach using projects by providing guidance and support.

Delegator style is concerned to shape students' ability to learn autonomously. Students are encouraged to carry out tasks independently when implementing a project. Teachers will assist if needed, and serve as the main information source to students. Teachers can help students to become self-reliant and self-supporting. However, if the teacher is less sensitive to a student's or some students' readiness to perform tasks on his own, they might feel anxious when they are given autonomy.

### 3.2. Previous Studies on Student Engagement

There are two parts of student engagement in the school. The first is the engagement of students in learning, and the second is the engagement of students in the school community.
The study found that students' involvement at school is a key factor of students' engagement. Students' engagement includes many forms and ways. For example, they are actively involved in school activities, active in the classroom, the adaptation to the culture of the school, good relationships with teachers and peers. In addition, male and female students are also one of the factors that influence participation of students where female students are more likely and are keen to participate in any school activities and more active in the classroom such as diligent in asking questions and more. The study found that students who come from families with higher education are more active in their engagement in the school. The study also found that students who aspire to pursue higher education after school will be actively involved in school. These students have planned ahead for their future. They also often seen taking part in activities organized by the school compared to other students who do not intend to pursue their studies after school. The study also found that students who are comfortable with the environment and culture of the school will be active learners and their engagement in school will increase and these in turn affect their academic performance.

According to Marcsh (1992), students who are active in school activities will have a positive impact on the students, thereby improving the students' engagement in school activities. This will also indirectly affect students' academic achievement. In addition, students will also have the nature of discipline and commitment. This is also similar to Gerber's (1996) study which is employed by the *National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS)* to investigate whether students' engagement in school activities can affect academic achievement.

*In addition, the OECD Program for International Student Assessment* (2000) found that there is a relationship between students' engagement and teacher's teaching style. The study found that the culture of a school can affect student participation and academic achievement. Culture which the school includes a dedicated group of teachers, effective discipline and a healthy learning environment. The study also found that students who felt he was accepted at the school will affect students' participation in class or at school. The study also found that attitude and behavior are two important factors that can influence the students in academic engagement. Students' attitudes include attendance, complete the tasks assigned by the teacher, pay attention when teacher teaches, involve in activities organized by the school and etc. Students who perceived as less active

in school are more likely to have problems when dealing with the community after they have ended schooling. Problems faced by the students are also experienced by other students around the world.

## 4.Methodology

### 4.1.Research Design

This study is a correlation study that aims to predict the performance score and explain the relationship of variables (Creswell, 2008). It also tries to identify the relationship between the variables in a group of subjects (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002).

### 4.2.Sampling

The target population in this study are lecturers and students of Universiti Utara Malaysia. A total of 226 questionnaires were collected. 80% of the respondents were under 24 years of age.

### 4.3.The Instrument

The instrument used in this research is a structured Likert scale questionnaire which consists of three parts. The questionnaire was constructed to measure the independent variable which is lecturer's teaching style and the dependent variable of students' academic engagement.

### 4.4.Part A-Background of the Respondents (10 items)

This questionnaire contains items of demographic details and background of respondents, specialization and CGPA.

### 4.5.Part B – Lecturers' Teaching Style (25 items)

The items are about the lecturers' teaching styles either expert style, formal authority style or facilitator style and more. This variable is measured by using questionnaires (self-report questionnaire) which was adapted from Grasha teaching style inventory (2006). It is used to measure a teacher's or lecturers' teaching style preferences. The reliability of this questionnaire shows an internal consistency of 88 (Grasha, 2006). This questionnaire used a Likert scale with a score range starts from "1" which is strongly agree to "5" which is strongly disagree. The questionnaire consists of five styles;

    a)    expert style
    b)    formal authority
    c)    personal model
    d)    delegator and
    e)    facilitator

### 4.6.Part C – Students' Academic Engagement (31 items)

This section is used to measure the degree of students' engagement in educational practice. This variable is measured using a questionnaire adapted from the *National Survey on Student Engagement (2006) conducted by The College Student Report, Indiana University, USA*. It measures key aspects of the students' experience that can contribute to learning and personal development of the student.

The main content of the questionnaire is related to the behavior of students which has high correlation with good learning outcomes and learning practice such as feedback on exams, assignments, and the use of educational resources. Each item is answered through four statements ranging from 1 – never to 4 – always.

Reliability analysis on 34 respondents was done in May 2011, and the study shows that the teaching style questionnaire has a Cronbach alpha value of 0.85, while the Cronbach alpha for the academic engagement of students is 0.86. This finding indicates that the questionnaire was found to have high reliability.

**5.FINDINGS**

*5.1.Research Question 1: What are Lecturers' Styles of Teaching in Universiti Utara Malaysia?*

In this study, five lecturers' teaching styles are measured by the students' response to the 25 items in the questionnaire. Five dimensions of teachers' teaching styles are (a) the dimensions of experts, (b) dimensions of formal authority, (c) dimensions of personal model, (d) dimensions of facilitator and (e) dimensions of delegator. According to Table 1, the dimensions of personal model has the highest mean of 4.10, followed by expert teaching style dimensions is ranked second with the mean of 4.07. Facilitator teaching style (3.66) is higher than the mean of formal authority dimensions (3.52), and the mean of delegator dimensions (3.39). Delegator dimensions have the lowest mean score (3.39). The findings show that there are many UUM lecturers using personal model teaching style and expert teaching style. The lecturers are also using the formal authority teaching approach, personal model and delegator style in class.

Table 1.*Domain item distribution of Lecturer's Teaching Style*

| Type of Style | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Expert | 4:07 | .52 |
| Formal authority | 3:52 | .47 |
| Personal Model | 4.10 | .56 |
| Delegator | 3:39 | .43 |
| Facilitator | 3.66 | .42 |

*5.2.Research Question 2: What is the Student Academic Engagement Level Universiti Utara Malaysia?*

In this study, students' participation is measured by the response of students to 31 items of academic engagement presented in the questionnaire. Table 2 shows that only half of the respondents (51.1%) like to give their opinion in class, but the majority of the respondents regularly involve in presentation in front of the class (89.3%). In terms of cooperation, the majority of students give full cooperation to other students when they are doing group work which 89.3% agreed with the item. The majority of respondents also enjoy doing extra work which 87.8% agreed with the item. A total of 79.1% of the respondents prefer to ask the lecturer if they do not understand what is taught by the lecturer.

Table 2. *Frequency and Percentage of Students Academic Engagement in the Teaching and Learning (M = 4.08, SD = .38)*

| Item No. | Item | Strongly Disagree | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I always give an opinion in class | 1 (0.8%) | 6 (4.6%) | 57 (43.5%) | 43 (32.8%) | 24 (18.3%) |
| 2. | I have presented the assignments in front of a class | 2 (1.5%) | 4 (3.1%) | 8 (6.1%) | 60 (45.8%) | 57 (43.5%) |
| 3. | I always follow teachers' instructions and do all the homework | 0 | 1 (0.8%) | 8 (6.1%) | 56 (42.7%) | 66 (50.4%) |
| 4. | I always give my full attention to get the job done | 0 | 0 | 7 (5.3%) | 62 (47.3%) | 62 (47.3%) |
| 5. | I was able to learn and complete the work assigned | 1 (0.8%) | 4 (3.1%) | 10 (7.6%) | 66 (50.4%) | 50 (38.2%) |
| 6. | I go to class without being completing the assigned task | 53 (40.5%) | 50 (38.2%) | 8 (6.1%) | 13 ((.9%) | 7 (5.3%) |
| 7. | I always cooperated with other students to complete tasks assigned | 1 (0.8%) | 4 (3.1%) | 9 (6.9%) | 58 (44.3%) | 59 (45.0%) |
| 8. | I, along with the other students, we do our homework after school hours | 3 (2.3%) | 5 (3.8%) | 20 (15.3%) | 65 (49.6%) | 38 (29.0%) |
| 9. | I take immediate action when task is assigned | 1 (0.8%) | 2 (1.5%) | 33 (25.2%) | 68 (51.9%) | 27 (20.6%) |
| 10. | If I have a problem, I'll try to solve it | 0 | 1 (0.8%) | 4 (3.1%) | 65 (49.6%) | 61 (46.6%) |

| 11. | I am not easily feel disappointed when difficulties occur at the early phase of my work | 0 | 6 (4.6%) | 14 (10.7%) | 64 (48.9%) | 47 (35.9%) |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------|-----|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 12. | I'll try to get help from people when I'm in trouble | 0 | 2 (1.5%) | 13 (9.9%) | 67 (51.1%) | 49 (37.4%) |
| 13. | I enjoy doing work that is challenging | 1 (0.8%) | 1 (0.8%) | 20 (15.3%) | 66 (50.4%) | 49 (37.4%) |
| 14. | I am committed in completing tasks even no points is awarded | 1 (0.8%) | 5 (3.8%) | 22 (16.8%) | 67 (51.1%) | 36 (27.5%) |
| 15 | I work with high concentrations | 0 | 0 | 19 (14.5%) | 66 (50.4%) | 46 (35.1%) |
| 16 | I like to ask questions to gain knowledge | 0 | 2 (1.5%) | 24 (18.3%) | 65 (49.6%) | 40 (30.5%) |
| 17 | I am used to be independent | 0 | 0 | 14 (0.7%) | 58 (44.3%) | 59 (45.0%) |
| 18 | I like to do task where students are allowed to choose the topic than those not allowed | 2 (1.5%) | 2 (1.5%) | 23 (17.6%) | 52 (39.7%) | 50 (38.8%) |
| 19 | I like to learn new things and involve in meaningful learning even without a teacher | 1 (0.8%) | 3 (2.3%) | 13 (10.1%) | 74 (57.4%) | 38 (29.5%) |
| 20 | I will try to avoid the difficult work | 14 (10.9%) | 0 | 17 (13.0%) | 48 (37.2%) | 50 (38.8%) |
| 21 | I continue learning even if all tasks have been completed | 1 (0.8%) | 2 (1.6%) | 24 (18.6%) | 69 (53.5%) | 33 (25.6%) |
| 22 | I used to work without supervision | 7 (5.4%) | 10 (7.8%) | 16 (12.4%) | 73 (56.6%) | 23 (17.8%) |
| 23 | I always completed the task within the stipulated time by the lecturer | 0 | 3 (2.3%) | 13 (10.2%) | 65 (50.8%) | 47 (36.6%) |
| 24 | I am not satisfied with my homework due to the lack of understanding and not because I'm not working on it | 13 (10.2%) | 19 (14.8%) | 39 (30.5%) | 45 (35.2%) | 12 (9.4%) |
| 25 | I completed my work with the intention of obtaining good results | 0 | 4 (3.1%) | 12 (9.3%) | 56 (43.4%) | 57 (44.2%) |
| 26 | I studied with the aim to have more knowledge in all subjects | 0 | 0 | 6 (4.7%) | 42 (32.6%) | 81 (62.8%) |
| 27 | My interest in a course will increase if I perform well in the course | 1 (0.8%) | 2 (1.6%) | 10 (7.8%) | 52 (40.3%) | 81 (62.8%) |
| 28 | I can improve my performance in a course | 0 | 0 | 12 (9.3%) | 60 (46.5%) | 57 (44.2%) |
| 29. | I would be happy if I can finish the challenging chore | 0 | 1 (0.8%) | 8 (6.2%) | 55 (42.6%) | 65 (50.4%) |
| 30 | I will study hard if my ability is recognized by lecturers. | 1 (0.8%) | 6 (4.7%) | 21 (16.3%) | 48 (37.2%) | 53 (41.1%) |
| 31 | I love to ask questions if I do not understand the teacher | 0 | 0 | 27 (20.9%) | 54 (41.9%) | 48 (37.2%) |

*5.3. Research Question 3: Is there any relationship between lecturers' teaching styles with student academic engagement?*

Based on Table 3, there is a positive relationship between lecturers' teaching styles with student academic engagement. However, the results of Pearson's correlation analysis show a weak relationship between teaching style and student academic engagement.

Table 3.*Correlation Between Lecturer's Teaching Styles with Students' Academic Engagement*

|  | Academic Engagement |
|--------------|---------------------|
| Teaching Style | .53 * |

Note: Correlation is significant at 0:05

## 6.Discussion

This study has identified the relationship between variables of teaching styles of the lecturer and students' academic engagement. In this study, UUM lecturers' were found to use variety of teaching styles in their lesson. It is also found that each teaching style dimension has high mean value. This indicates that UUM lecturers are active by using various teaching styles in the classroom. The methods used by lectures were found to help the students to understand subject matter.

In addition, the diversity of the teaching styles is encouraging for the students to learn systematically. Nevertheless, many lecturers were found using personal model teaching styles followed by expert teaching styles. The lowest teaching style being used is delegator. Personal modeling style of teaching is very important when delivering lessons to students to learn. Teachers, who have the vision and deliver good content, will inspire students to strive for more.

Mergel (1998), states that behaviorist learning is learning that involves conditioning and imitation. This study supports the view that personal model teaching style has great influence to students' attitudes to participate in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. This finding is supported by Maher, Siti Haishah and Nur Atikah (2009) that the function of teaching is to produce effective teaching. Therefore, a good lesson should involve teachers' skills to ensure the teaching methods suit with students' learning objectives and learning style. This is because learning is the activity of mental, physical and spiritual to the students. Thus, the openness, reflective and objective attitude are necessary in order to produce continuous learning in teaching so that lessons could become organized to bring change in students' attitude. Therefore, a systematic approach should be done by teachers in the development of knowledge using appropriate method in order to create an effective learning environment in the classroom.

### 6.1. The relationship between the lecturers' teaching style and academic engagement

In this section, the study is divided into two parts; they are lecturers' teaching styles and students' academic engagement. Based on the findings, their teaching styles have a significant relationship towards students' academic engagement. Pearson's correlation analysis showed a significant relationship, but weak between teaching style and students' academic engagement.

Through facilitator teaching style, teachers can use problem-solving strategies. This strategy does help the students to work with others. The study is supported by Ahmad Faris (2008), when he found that by using problem solving teaching strategy, it has improved students' attitudes toward science.

Adesoji (2009) too, when explaining his findings, saying that students will lead to positive direction if the lecturers use problem solving method in their teaching. Style of teaching using problem solving involves facilitator and delegator teaching style. This statement is in accordance with the statement from Grasha (2003).

### 7. Conclusion and Implications

The results have shown that in terms of lecturers' teaching styles, the majority of lecturers use personal model followed by expert styles while delegator style gets the lowest mean. Majority of the respondents also found involved in academic engagement. The results have also shown that there is a significant but modest relationship between lecturers' teaching style with the student's academic engagement. The results show no significant differences between lecturers' teaching style in academic programs.

These findings may have implications to students, parents and lecturers in relation to teaching and learning process in the classroom. To encourage the participation of students in the university academic can be encouraged by understanding the appropriate teaching styles of the lecturer.

It is hope that university students could recognize and understand that academic engagement is one of the momentums towards success in their studies. There is a positive relationship between lecturers' teaching styles with students' academic engagement. Hence, the university students need to identify their style of academic engagement and suit themselves with lecturers' teaching styles in the classroom.

For lecturers, we know that the university is the main contributor in providing formal education training to students. Therefore, the university and the lecturers should provide a positive teaching and learning

environment which is up to date because it can form a conducive and suitable environment for students' academic engagement style and also contribute to the better achievement.

## References

Adesoji, F. A. (2008). Managing students' attitudes towards Science through problem-solving strategy. *Anthropologist, 10* (1), 21-24.

Ahmad Faris (2008). *The impact of PBL on the student's attitudes towards science among nine graders in Hamza Independent School.* Unpublished project paper.

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.

Allen, R. (1988). *The relationship between learning style and teaching style of secondary teachers in south central Kansas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS.

Ary, D., Jacobs, LC, & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed). California: Wadsworth / Thomson Learning.

Astin, A. W.  (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years visited*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*, 297-308.

Awang Had Salleh. (2000). *Default di kalangan guru sebagai pendidik: Sebuah pemerhatian peribadi.* Paper presented at the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia on 31st January 2000.

Bailey, K. M., Bergthold, B., Braunstein, B., Fleischman, N. J., Holbrook, M. P., Tuman, J., Waissbluth, X., & Zambo, L. J. (1996). The language teacher's autobiography: Examining the apprenticeship of observation. In Bailey, K. M. (1997). Reflective teaching: Situating our stories. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 7,* 1-19.

Bennett, N., Jordan, B. Long, G., & Wade, B. (1976). *Teaching styles and pupil progress.* London: Open Book Publishing Limited.

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.

Chia, K. B. (1997). *Professional self-esteem and teaching styles of English language teacher in Malaysia.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Manchester.

Chickering, A. W. & Gamson, Z.F. (1991). Development and adaptation of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *Direction for Teaching and Learning, 80, 75-81.*

Chickering, A. W. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Conti, G. J. (1985). Assessing teaching style in adult education: How and why? *Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research, 8 (8),* 7-11.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research*. Third Edition. Pearson International Edition

Doherty, J. (2003). *Teaching style in physical education and Mosston's spectrum.* Sports Media.

Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K.J. (1979). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they... can they... be matched? *Educational Leadership, 36*(4), 238-244.

Evans, C. (2004). Exploring the relationship between cognitive style and teaching style. *Educational Psychology, 24*(4), 509-530

Felder, R. M., & Henriques, E. R. (1995) Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28* (1), 21-31.

Gerber, S. B. (1996). Extracurricular activities and academic achievement. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 30* (1), 42 - 50.

Grasha, A. F. (1996). Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhance learning by understanding learning and teaching style. *College Teaching, 48,* 1-12.

Grasha, A. F. (2003). The dynamics of one-on-one teaching. *Social Studies, 94*(4), 179-187.

Grasha, AF & Hicks, N. Y. (2000). Integrating teaching styles and learning style with instructional technology.*College Teaching, 48* (1), 2-15.

Gregorc, A.F. (1989). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they can they be match? *Educational Leadership, 36,* 234-237.

Jarvis, P. (1985). Thinking critically in an information society: *A Sociological analysis. Lifelong-Learning, 8*(6), 11-14.

Kramlinger, T. & Huberty, T. (1990). Behaviorism versus humanism. *Training and Development Journal, 4,* 1-45.

Ladd, P. D. (1995). The learning and teaching styles of Tennessee secondary business education teachers. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 37*(1), 29-45.

National survey of student engagement (2006). *The college student report.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning.

Newman, P. R. (1992). *Conceptual models of student engagement*. National Center of Effective Secondary Schools. University of Wisconsin.

On Stein, A.C., & Miller, H. C. (1980). *Looking into teaching: an introduction to American education.* Boston: Houghton.

Pascarella, E. T. (2001). *Identifying excellence in undergraduate education. Are we even close? Change, 33* (3), 19 – 23.

Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning style and teaching style in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics.* Retrieved from http://searchglobal.epnet.com .

Stitt-Gohdes, W. L. (2001). Business education Students' preferred learning Styles and Their Teachers; preferred instructional Styles: Do for hire match? *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 43,* 137-151.

Sturt, G. (2000). *Teaching styles*. Retrieved from http://psychology.colchsfc.ac.uk/gary.htm

*The College Student Report (2000).* Retrieved November 30, 2011

*The OECD Programme for international student assessment (PISA)* (2000).

Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centerednessas language education.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Woolfolk, A. E. (1995). *Educational psychology.* 6 th Ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wright, T. (1987). *The role of teachers and learners*. Hong Kong: ELBS with Oxford University Press.

Zahorik, J. A. (1990). Stability and flexibility in teaching. *Teacher and Teaching Education, 6* (1), 69-80.

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.