Evaluations of Students and Teachers on Quality of Teaching Process Regarding Working Styles

Amel Alić

associated professor, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zenica

Haris Cerić

associated professor, Faculty of Political Science, University of Sarajevo

Sedin Habibović

psychologist-therapist, Public Health Institution, Zenica

Abstract

Within our research, we have focused on the quality of interpersonal relations at the high education institutions, i.e. we have been interested in inter-perception among teachers and students at some faculties in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We especially were eager to find out whether some differences could be found in preferring different working styles both teachers and students at various faculties and study departments. Using quantative methods, checking up the influence of variables related to working styles that have impact upon the general evaluation of teaching process quality and interpersonal relations teachers-students, we have conducted within the aimed sample of students and teachers of the University of Sarajevo and the University in Zenica, consisting of 309 examinees.

Keywords: evaluation of teaching process, working styles, socio-emotional status of teachers and students.

Introduction

Teaching process, according to customary determinations from didactic-methodical literature, represent the most organized aspect of education. The inclination to improve the teaching process does not seize to occupy educational experts, so, in the immense abundance of literature dealing with this issue, we can find numerous suggestions in that regard. So, Lee Shulman (1987, according to Woolfolk, 2004) on the basis of teacher's competencies suggests that the expert teacher has to possess: knowledge about the academic subject they teach; general knowledge about teaching strategies that apply all subjects; the curriculum materials and programs appropriate for their subject; subject-specific knowledge for teaching; knowledge about personal characteristics background of learners; the settings in which learners learn (pair, small groups, teams, classes, etc.); and the goals and purposes of teaching (p. 7).

Meanwhile, the education is imminently also a social category, i.e. the process of education cannot exist out of the frame of social relation, a relation established between teacher and pupil. Consequently, the very essence of teaching process is comprised of interpersonal relations. Within the frame of wide and sometimes hardly perceived area of interpersonal relations, every day the numerous factors are involved of which neither teacher nor student are not prepared for, and seemingly not fully aware of them. Jones and Jones (2004) outline a series of researches conducted at schools along The United States from which we learn that there is a growth of percentage of those students who do not finalize their schoolwork's and assignments, the constant growth of behavioral problems, disrespect of teachers from students' side, and non-attendance. As background factors, Jones and Jones, summing up numerous researches, emphasize family factors, poverty, consuming the drugs, abuse of children, life in stress and dynamic rhythm of life, as well as a life in encounter cloyed with violence (p.10). Considering the interpersonal relation within the teaching process, Bratanić (1993) defines it as "process established between educator and student, a teacher and single student and whole class" (p.32). Bratanić emphasizes a need for awareness of such process where a reversible relation exists, where teacher does not only influence on student by his behavior, but there is also a reverse influence. Factors, according to Bratanić influence the quality of interpersonal relations are: elements of successful relation (personal inclination, mutual familiarity, interests, attitudes and

values, intelligence, social background and working methods), social perception (interdependent perceiving within social situation), emotional attitudes (feeling towards something or someone), and empathy (cognitive-emotional ability of identification with the state of another person and perceiving the world through her/his eyes).

On the basis of former researches we can conclude that there are three vast areas of researching of the relation between teacher and student: tutoring, guidance and socio-emotional relation where each of this three includes bigger number of individual constructs and is equally important for creation of working atmosphere at every single level of education. In our research, we focused on the quality of interpersonal relations at high education that is we were interested in inter-perception between students and teachers at some faculties in Bosnia and Herzegovina. With that, research on interpersonal relations at high education are still rare ones although extremely needed for on the basis of such research it is possible systematically influence the quality of interpersonal relations at high education. Within the context of such relations, we have been especially interested in that whether some differences by extremely specific manner we can find also at different preferable students' and teachers' styles of various faculties and study departments. Namely, the misunderstanding between teachers and students could be rooted in preference to various cognitive styles, learning styles, but for sure as well as in regard to preference of different working styles. If we could recognize the differences existing among us during the teaching process, and based on such understanding adjusted an approach to students, being mutually surprised we would find out as teacher and student were not bad in mutual evaluations, just they have not understood each other. The addition of improving of mutual understanding is also hidden in knowledge on working styles-drivers. Following the Bern's idea as the patterns learnt during the childhood can be present at very short period, Taibi Kahler in 70's had started a large-scale clinic research (Stewart, I., Joines, V. 2008). He noticed the existence of five specific answers covering the script. He named them „drivers": Hurry up, Be Perfect, Be Strong, Please (others), and Try Hard. At too emphasized drivers, a person will face personal difficulties, but he/she can cause the same to the others. The usage of the drivers is very applicable at organizations, but in case of this research we have stated the correlation between teachers and students. A teacher who recognizes the student's drivers can make a process of teaching or training make more adequate and efficient one. Advantages and disadvantages of the drivers are (Stewart, I., Joines, V., 2008; Hay, J., 2009) are as follows:

Hurry Up – persons having this driver are capable of doing things fast. If you want some fast activity, they are right persons for that, and on the other had they are persons taking over too many things at the same time, they are always in a hurry, on the brink of patience, often not paying attention to details.

Be Perfect – they want to do all in a perfect way, they pay too much attention to details, capable of excellent organization of working activities, are excellent at carrying out reports, they can have some problems with deadlines (due to strong urge all to be perfect), they can critical to themselves and others, etc.

Be Strong- can work excellently under pressure, being excellent in critical times, can take over control, so the others to feel safe at their presence. When others being close to them have panic reactions, these persons usually think logically, they can be emotionally distant from the situation, at the other hand so often they do not recognize their personal weaknesses, they have the lack of emotions (they may look like robots),

Please (others) - is a profile of people that are fantastic team players, even they will make others comfortable before asked to do so, sympathize with others, emphatic, managers like them, but they have a problem saying NO, they avoid conflicts, constructive critics, they save the others, they do not express their personal opinion, so could easily frustrate the others.

Try Hard- are persons capable of doing splendid pioneer's jobs, they like new projects, new things, under stress they are able to start with numerous things but often they got a problem due to moving on man jobs and activities they do not finalize, they are more oriented as to „try hard" than to success and easily they change small jobs with bigger ones.

Everyone has their set of motivational drivers, some more or less developed. Keeping in mind above mentioned descriptions, it is very important to recognize those and accordingly the teacher may form teams for some tasks or give individual directions. It is also important for the managers and teachers to be familiar with personal working styles. Each working style carries a vulnerability to stress. "Be Perfect" relations between teachers and students inevitably lead to stress, conflicts, criticism. Conflicts at educational institutions can be prevented by knowing the working styles. The working atmosphere can be modified, leading to higher productivity.

Purpose of the study

The goal of this research is to scrutinize the quality of teaching at faculties from the angle of few important factors influencing the successfulness of interpersonal relations. Examining the mutual evaluations of factors that impact the successfulness of teaching process of teachers and students and working styles, analyzing the results, we got a sequence of criteria variables that impact as to the quality of mutual relations so on the quality of teaching process. We have been interested to find out whether some other variables, such as empathy level, locus of control, and success gained during the period of study, have influence on preferring different working styles of students. The data collected could be the important source of awareness to teachers in their thrive to improve the teaching process and understand the inner logic of study and students' needs, especially in the field of understanding the influence of preferred working styles of students. The testing of variables related to working styles and differences arising between students of different study groups, we have conducted within an intended sample of both students and teachers of the Universities in Sarajevo and in Zenica comprising of 309 examinees in total.

Methods

In this research, using the quantitative methods, we have processed data gained on the basis of research battery consisting of a questionnaire on general examinee's information, the questionnaire for both students and teachers on the evaluation of teaching process (Bratanić, 1993), the empathy scale (Baron –Cohen, S., 2012), the scale of locus of control (Bezinović, P., 1990), and the scale of working styles (Hay, J., 2009). This research represents the sequel to research on life styles and students' habits as well as the level of empathy. Regarding the former research, this sample is somehow bigger, comprising of 266 examinees of the Universities in Sarajevo and in Zenica, so the summed-up results covered additional 43 teachers from above mentioned faculties[1]. Within the sample itself, 117 examinees study at the Faculty of Political Sciences, 82 of them at the Faculty of Philosophy but 67 of them at the Mechanical Engineering faculty and the Polytechnic faculty, and 43 teachers from all included faculties making the total of 309 examinees[2]. The reliability of internal consistency has also been examined and expressed through the coefficient of reliability Alpha Crombach for all instruments used and it is 0.746 for the empathy scale, 0.85 for the working styles scale, and 0.765 for the locus control scale.

Findings and results

On the students' sample (N=266) and teachers (N=43) of the Universities in Sarajevo and in Zenica we applied a questionnaire for students and teachers (Bratanić, 1993), adjusted for the purpose of research at high education level. Students and teachers evaluated the characteristics they mutually appreciate most respectively, problems from teaching process that especially occupy their minds, factors influencing the creation of positive attitude in relation teacher-student, the most often causes of misunderstanding between teachers and students, factors that condition a discipline among students at class, what gives them most enjoyment during the class, and what do they feel towards each other.

Table 1. Mutual evaluations of students and teachers on quality of teaching process

Questionnaire for students	Students' replies	Questionnaire for teachers	Teachers' replies
From suggested features, choose one you appreciate at your teacher the most	Kind and warm relation to students 33,1%	From suggested features, choose one you evaluate students appreciate at you the most	Distinct, clear and interesting presentation 39,5%
Which students' problems occupy the teacher the most	Discipline and non-attendance 30,3%	Which students' problems the most occupy you as a teacher	Success in learning 53,5%

---

[1] For further reference on this part of research, see: Alic, A., Ceric, H., & Habibovic, S. (2015). The Connections of Empathy and Life Styles

among Bosnian Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *205*, 457-462; and Alić, A., Cerić, H., Habibović, S. (2015). Povezanost

socioemocionalnog statusa i međusobnog percipiranja nastavnika i studenata na visokoškolskim institucijama. *Quality 2015,* 9, 371-376.
[2] The Faculty of Political Sciences is a part of the University of Sarajevo, while The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and The Faculty of Polytechnic are a part of the University of Zenica. It is important to mention as these two universities are public ones being financed by the cantonal governments that are lower instances of state authority.

What, in your opinion, influence the creation of positive attitude in relation teacher-student	Readiness of the teacher to help the student 22.3%	What, in your opinion, influence the creation of positive attitude in relation teacher-student	Understanding and appreciation of students' personality 34,9%
What is the most usual reason of misunderstanding between teachers and students	Defiant student's attitude toward the teacher 27,7%	What is the most usual reason of misunderstanding between teachers and students	Underestimating teachers' attitude toward student 34,9%
	the teacher's attitude being right as a must always 27,3%		
What does a discipline of students during class depend on	On teacher's ability to make them interested 27,7%	What does a discipline of students during class depend on	On teacher's ability to make them interested 58,1%
What does give you the most pleasure during the class	Interesting curriculum 25,8%	What does give students the most pleasure during the class	Distinct, clear and interesting presentation 41,8%
What do you feel towards your teachers	Respect 86%	What do you evaluate the majority of students feel toward you	Respect 81,4%

The results have shown that both teachers and students gave the most congruent answer to the question related to socio-emotional relations – 86% of total students examined state as they do feel respect towards their teachers, while 81,4% teachers evaluate as the majority of students feel respect towards them. Therefore, from the above answers a conclusion is that mutual respect between teachers and students contributes a great deal to creation of positive socio-emotional relations. The answers to questions on what are the most often reasons of misunderstanding between teachers and students (students claim it is defiant students' attitude towards the teacher 27,7%, and the attitude as a must he has to be right always 27,3% while the teachers mention underestimating of teacher toward student 34,9%) which influence a creation of positive attitude in relation teacher-student / students mentioned a readiness of the teacher to help students 22.3%, but teachers mentioned understanding and appreciation of students' personality 34,9%, so the evaluation 33,1% of students examined as they appreciate most a kind and warm attitude towards them, also give very useful inputs on creation of positive socio-emotional climate in working with students. The remaining answers are mostly related to teaching as an important aspect of relation teacher-student on high school level. So, 39,5% of teachers evaluate as students appreciate the most their distinct, clear and interesting presentation, 53,5% of teachers is especially occupied with students' success in learning, for 25,8% students the most pleasure during the class is interesting curriculum, while 41,8% of teachers consider that the most pleasure for students during the class is distinct, clear and interesting teacher's presentation, so students (27,2%) and teachers (58,1%) agree as a discipline of students during the class depends on the ability of teacher to make them to be interested in. The only one answer given by 30,3% of students as discipline and non-attendance are of special occupation of teachers could be correlated to the style of teacher's conduct eventually. The results gained by the usage of the empathy scale showed some worrying trends. Namely, on total sample, 17,5% of students examined gained low scores, 64% average, and only 18,5% above-average ones. We consider this information to be worrying one keeping in mind that three fourth of examinees study social and humanistic sciences. The groups are significantly different in regard to empathy, giving the advantage to female examinees. Female examinees are in average more empathetic than male ones –when we observe both female and male examinees we find statistically considerable difference at the empathy level with preference to female examinees having average arithmetic mean in relation to male examinees 40,10 on level p<0,01 (t= 2,671; df=198; p=.008). According the expectance, students of social and humanistic studies show more secure attachment (63% students of the Faculty of Philosophy and 56,3% of the Faculty of Political Sciences), while with students studying technical departments a high percentage of non-secure attachment is noticeable (even 67%) students of the Faculty of Polytechnic out of 40% avoiding non-secure attachment; and 60% students of The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering among which32% of them show avoiding non-secure attachment). The range of correlation between empathy and the habit of reading books at level P<0,01 (r= -0,184; p=.009) show that those examinees who read books not related to study less and on non-regular basis gain lower scores on the empathy scale, i.e. we can state them to be less empathetic. Respectively, student not having developed habit of reading books not related to study incline to external locus at level P<0,05 (r=0,168; p=.016).

Using Spearman's rho coefficient of correlation, we intended to state the possible correlations between criteria of variable of examinees' age in relation to the empathy scale and locus of control. There is negative correlation between empathy and external locus at level P<0,01 (r=-0,176; p=. 010) meaning that students inclining to external locus of control less empathetic from those inclining to internal locus of control. Correlation between students' age and locus control scale at level P<0,01 (r=0, 241; p=.001) signify that with age the eternity decreases but internality increases. In relation of the

examinees' age and empathy level none correlations are noted. If we sum up the results gained by the usage of eternity scale we can conclude as students inclining to the external locus of control and lower empathy stand at passive-aggressive position that, according to transaction analysis of quadrant of cultural identity (Transactional Analysis of Cultural Identity Quadrants) being observed by Sue and Sue (2008) could be picturesquely described as: "I am not O.K. and I don't have much control; might as well give up or please everyone. Society is not O.K. and is the reason for my plight; the bad system is all to blame" (p. 304). On the other side, a part of students' sample that incline to internal locus of control and express higher scores on the empathy scale could be placed into quadrant assertive-assertive position that Sue and Sue described by the expression: I'm O.K. and I have control, but need a chance. Society is not O.K. and I know what's wrong and seek to change it (p. 304).

This huge difference among students regarding the locus of control, visibly, is projected into the successfulness during the study. That is, among other things, confirmed by correlation between the empathy levels and average score during study at level $P<0,01$ ($r=0,357$; $p=.001$) which points out that students having higher scores are more empathetic than students with lower scores inclining to internal locus of control. By ANOVA test we wanted to see whether the groups differ in relation to observed variables working styles in a way we have observed five different groups- students of four faculties and teachers. It is interesting that students of the Faculty of Political Studies prefer working style Be Strong, students of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering mostly prefer working style Be Strong, and students of The Faculty of Philosophy and the Faculty of Polytechnic, working style Hurry Up. As per the teachers almost equal working styles are shown Be Perfect, Hurry Up and Be Strong; and it is interesting that teachers gain the lowest scores on working style Please (others) (Table 2).

Table 2. Scores of working styles preference of students and teachers per faculties

Faculty/ working style	Try Hard	Please (others)	Be Perfect	Hurry Up	Be Strong
The Faculty of Political Sciences	17.3158	17.1930	18.8673	19.4737	21.6018
The Faculty of Philosophy	15.5926	15.6790	18.2658	21.0864	20.9136
The Faculty of Polytechnic	16.7500	13.1667	20.0000	22.5000	21.9167
The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	18.6800	16.0800	18.7400	21.3000	22.8400
All faculties	17.0117	16.3113	18.7087	20.4786	21.6406
Teachers	17.8372	16.0930	20.1860	20.4651	20.1628

Knowing that we expect from students a higher aspiration level and desire for self-affirmation ad success, we have especially observed the working style Try Hard. In relation to variable Try Hard we can find statistically significant difference between students of the Faculty of Technical Engineering and the Faculty of Philosophy at level from 5% accordingly gaining significance of 0,016. Arithmetic mean at students of The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering is 18,68, and at students of The Faculty of Philosophy 5.75. At the same time, standard deviation with "mechanical engineers" is 4,97 and with students of The Faculty of Philosophy is 5.75. Observing it in regard to entire sample, students of Mechanical Engineering gain the highest results on this scale i.e. they have the most emphasized working style Try Hard, while students of the Faculty of Philosophy also prefer this working style, but less than them. With working style Be Strong, we find that students of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering mostly prefer the same one, while in this case the teachers have it less emphasized. The difference is at level of 5% but significance is 0,019. It is noticed as the entire sample of students incline to externality, but students differ in relation to teachers at level of 1% except for students of the Faculty of Polytechnic that differ at level of 5% in relation to variable locus of control.

We noticed that students of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering have the lowest empathy level and that they do differ in regard to students of the Faculty of Political Sciences as well in regard to teachers whatsoever. Also, we found interesting information that teachers have the highest empathy scores. The extract from correlation matrix shows that correlations between students' age and working styles Be Perfect at level $P<0,05$ ($r=0,129$; $p=.039$) and Hurry Up at level $P<0,01$ ($r=0,184$; $p=.003$) are noticeable, showing that at higher study years the preference of working style Be Perfect declines but preference of working style Hurry Up increases.

Table 3. Extract from correlation matrix for empathy, locus of control, average score and working styles

The scales		Try Hard	Please (others)	Be Perfect	Be Strong	Hurry Up
Empathy scale	Spearman's rho Correlation	.069	.201**[1]	.329**	-.042	-.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.272	.001	.000	.502	.258
Locus control scale	Spearman's rho Correlation	.079	.176**	-.006	.154**	.155**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.182	.003	.921	.009	.008
Average score at study	Spearman's rho Correlation	.314**	.201	.188	.094	.085
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.084	.107	.423	.468
Study year	Spearman's rho Correlation	.164*[2]	.029	.085	-.146*	-.167*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.679	.236	.040	.018

Correlation is noticeable between working style Please(others) and empathy scale at level P<0,01 (r=0,201; p=.001), but between empathy and working style Be Perfect at level P<0,01 (r=0,329; p=.000), meaning that students preferring working styles Please(others) and Be Perfect gain higher scores on empathy scale (shown in table3). We find a correlation and between average score during study and working style Try Hard at level P<0,01 (r=0,314; p=.006) meaning that students gaining better academic achievements during their study expectably prefer more this working style. Students preferring working styles Please(others), Be Strong and Hurry Up incline to external locus of control and regarding the correlation at level P<0,01 (r=0,176; p=.003) in case of working style Please(others), P<0,01 (r=0,176; p=.003), Be Strong P< 0,01 (r= 0, 154; p= .009), and working style Hurry Up P<0,01 (r=0,155; p=.008) that is visible on table 3.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Special value of this research is related to the fact that up-to-present there were no serious researches in regard of empathy, working styles and mutual perception of teachers and students at the universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, so on the ground of these results could develop programs as formal so informal work with students' population in sense of more elaborate and articulated social engagement. The entire sample inclines to external locus of control meaning that majority of judgments and actions conditioned by external factors. Significant differences are noticeable between preferring the working styles of students regarding the study department. Therefore, students of the Faculty of Political Sciences prefer working style Be Strong, students of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering mostly prefer working style Be Strong, while students of the Faculty of Philosophy and the Faculty of Polytechnic working style Hurry Up. As per teachers, almost equally present styles are Hurry Up and Be Perfect. Observing the spreading of the sample regarding to academic achievement during the study, the empathy level and locus of control, also interesting differences are noticeable. Students preferring working styles Please (others) and Be Perfect gain higher scores on empathy scale. We can find a correlation between average study score and working style Try Hard, while students preferring working styles Please (others), Be Strong and Hurry Up incline to external locus control. If we sum up the results gained by using the externality scale, we conclude as students inclining to external locus of control and lower empathy take up passive-aggressive position, while a part of the sample of students inclining to internal locus of control and express higher scores at scale of empathy could be placed into quadrant of assertive-assertive position. These data had been neglected up-to present in the teaching process at high educational level but they could be important direction to all experts of helping professions as well as to the university professors that are directly and on every day basis directed to students. If the reliability of battery used is additionally tested upon bigger sample, it could be used also for the selection of candidates as for helping professions so for the study of engineering studies.

---

[1] ** Correlation is signficant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

[2] * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level(2-tailed).

References

[1] Alic, A., Ceric, H., & Habibovic, S. (2015). The Connections of Empathy and Life Styles among Bosnian Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 205, 457- 462.

[2] Alić, A., Cerić, H., Habibović, S. (2015). Povezanost socioemocionalnog statusa i međusobnog percipiranja nastavnika i studenata na visokoškolskim institucijama. *Quality 2015,* 9, 371-376.

[3] Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D., & Akert, R.M. (1998). *Social Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

[4] Baron-Cohen, S. (2012). *The science of evil: On empathy and the origins of cruelty*. Basic books.

[5] Bezinović, P. (1990). Skala eksternalnosti (lokus kontrole). In: N. Anić (Eds.), *Praktikum iz kognitivne i bihevioralne terapije III* (pp. 155-157). Zagreb: Društvo psihologa Hrvatske.

[6] Bratanić, M. (1993). *Mikropedagogija*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

[7] Hay, J. (2009). *Working It Out at Work – Understanding Attitudes and Building Relationships* (2nd ed.). Sherwood Publishing.

[8] Jones, V., Jones, L. (2004). *Comprehensive Classroom Management*. Boston: Pearson Education.

[9] Lapworth, P., Sills, C. (2011). *An Introduction to Transactional Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

[10] Stewart, I., Joines, V. (2008). *TA Today - A New Introduction to Transactional Analysis*. Nottingham and Chapel Hill: Lifespace Publishing.

[11] Sue, D.W., Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the Culturally Diverse*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[12] Woolfolk, A. (2004). *Educational Psychology*. The Ohio State University: Allyn and Bacon